





A HISTORY OF ENGLAND



Elizabeth

QUEEN ELIZABETH

From the painting attributed to Marcus Gheeraedts in the National Portrait Gallery.

A HISTORY OF ENGLAND FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE PRESENT DAY

By A. D. INNES

SOMETIME SCHOLAR OF ORIEL COLLEGE, OXFORD

AUTHOR OF "ENGLAND UNDER THE TUDORS"

"ENGLAND'S INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT," ETC.



From the Prayer Book of 1662

ILLUSTRATED
FROM SOURCES MAINLY CONTEMPORARY
AND WITH MAPS

NEW YORK
G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
LONDON: T. C. & E. C. JACK

1913

A HISTORY OF
ENGLAND
BY
J. H. BURNETT

IIA30
I6
1913a

317100
23

PREFACE

EVERY period and every aspect of the history of the peoples who have created the British Empire has been dealt with in separate works of a manageable length; works, that is, comprised in one or two volumes. General histories covering all periods and many aspects have been written in many volumes; but with a single exception all the comprehensive histories of England which could by any possibility be printed in one volume in legible type have been written as class-books for use in schools, or have at least been composed primarily with a view to the needs of the youthful reader.

The one exception, that great classic, the late J. R. Green's *Short History of the English People*, is incomparable in its kind. Nevertheless it has appeared possible that another history, of the British nation, not confined to the English people, of approximately the same compass but wholly different in method and treatment, might appeal to that vast public who do desire to know the history of their native country but are repelled by the class-book; a work which will be found interesting as well as informing; a work which does not covertly suggest that the successful answering of examination papers is the great object of existence; a work which cannot be used as a class-book: a live history of the mighty nation whose children we are. The author has done his best to ensure the thoroughness and accuracy without which any professedly historical work must stand condemned; whether he has succeeded in superadding the desirable attractiveness, others must judge. An attempt to enumerate the modern authorities, not to speak of the older ones, to whose work he is consciously or unconsciously indebted, would be merely futile. It only remains for him to say that he can claim no credit for the illustration, and to express his warm admiration and gratitude for the manner in which Mr. S. G. Stubbs has carried out this task.

A. D. INNES.

GERRARD'S CROSS,
September, 1912.

CONTENTS

BOOK I

NATION MAKING: TO 1272

CHAPTER I

FROM CÆSAR TO ALFRED

SECTION	PAGE
I. Celtic Britain and the Roman Occupation	1
II. The English Conquest	6
III. The Rival Kingdoms	11
IV. Wessex and the Danes	15
V. Alfred the Great	18

CHAPTER II

KINGS OF THE ENGLISH

I. Alfred's Successors	22
II. From Knut to the Conquest	29
III. The Anglo-Saxon System	38

CHAPTER III

THE NORMANS

I. The Conqueror	50
II. William and the Church	57
III. England and the Conquest	59
IV. Rufus	67
V. The Lion of Justice	70
VI. Stephen	75
VII. Scotland	78

CHAPTER IV

THE EARLY PLANTAGENETS

I. Henry II.	81
II. The Annexation of Ireland	88
III. Cœur de Lion	91
IV. John	94
V. Henry III. and Simon de Montfort	101
VI. Aspects	108
VII. Scotland	113

BOOK II

NATIONAL CONSOLIDATION (1272-1485)

CHAPTER V

NATIONALISM AND CONSTITUTIONALISM

SECTION	PAGE
I. The Reign of Edward I.	117
II. Edward's Legislation	119
III. Wales	122
IV. Edward and the Constitution	126
V. The Lordship of Scotland	132
VI. Aspects of the Policy of Edward I.	138
VII. Robert Bruce	141
VIII. Edward II.	145

CHAPTER VI

EDWARD III. AND RICHARD II.

I. Before the Hundred Years' War	151
II. The Era of Victories	154
III. The Era of Failures	160
IV. Crown, Commerce, and Parliament	165
V. The Black Death and the Peasant Revolt	172
VI. The Reign of Richard II.	179
VII. Scotland	185

CHAPTER VII

LANCASTER AND YORK

I. Henry IV.	188
II. Henry V.	191
III. The Loss of France	198
IV. The Red and White Roses	206
V. Edward IV.	213
VI. Richard III.	215
VII. The Progress of England	218
VIII. Scotland	222

CHAPTER VIII

THE MIDDLE AGES

I. Political Aspects	226
II. Social Aspects	232
III. Intellectual Aspects	235

BOOK III

THE AGE OF TRANSITION

CHAPTER IX

HENRY VII

SECTION	PAGE
I. Problems of the Dynasty	241
II. The Reign of Henry VII.	243
III. Henry's System	249
IV. The Commercial and Agricultural Revolution	252
V. Ireland	257
VI. Scotland	259

CHAPTER X

THE DEFENDER OF THE FAITH

I. The Cardinal	262
II. The Dawn of the Reformation	268
III. The European Schism	271
IV. The Breach with Rome	274
V. Thomas Cromwell	282
VI. Scotland and Ireland	288
VII. Last Years	291

CHAPTER XI

IN DEEP WATERS

I. Protector Somerset	298
II. John Dudley	302
III. The Succession	305
IV. Mary	308

CHAPTER XII

THE ELIZABETHAN RECONSTRUCTION

I. The Queen	314
II. The Settlement in England and Scotland	316
III. The Continent: Mary Stuart in Scotland	320
IV. Cross Currents	325
V. Ireland	330
VI. The Seamen	332

CHAPTER XIII

THE DAY OF TRIUMPH

I. The Jesuit Attack	337
II. Coming to the Grip	340
III. The Armada	346

SECTION	PAGE
IV. After the Armada	350
V. Scotland	354
VI. Winter	357

CHAPTER XIV

UNDER THE TUDORS

I. The State	363
II. The Church	367
III. Economic Progress	372
IV. Literature	378

BOOK IV

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

CHAPTER XV

RIGHT DIVINE

I. The Spring of Troubles	383
II. Puritans, Romanists, and the Impositions	386
III. The Foreign Policy of James I.	391
IV. Buckingham	397
V. Puritanism	404
VI. Rule without Parliament	409
VII. Scotland	414
VIII. The Bishops' Wars	420

CHAPTER XVI

THE FALL OF THE MONARCHY

I. The Long Parliament	423
II. The First Stage of the Civil War	428
III. The New Model	433
IV. Downfall	437

CHAPTER XVII

THE COMMONWEALTH

I. Drogheda and Worcester	445
II. The Rump	450
III. The Protectorate Governments	454
IV. Foreign Policy	460
V. The End of the Commonwealth	463

CHAPTER XVIII

THE RESTORATION

I. The King's Return	467
II. Clarendon	469

CONTENTS

xiii

SECTION	PAGE
III. The Cabal and Danby	474
IV. The Popish Plot and the Exclusion Bills	480
V. Scotland	485
VI. The Victory of the Crown	488

CHAPTER XIX

NEMESIS

I. Quem Deus vult perdere—	491
II. —Prius dementat	495
III. Fulfilment	498

CHAPTER XX

THE REVOLUTION

I. The Revolution Settlement	505
II. Ireland	509
III. Scotland	513
IV. William's War	517
V. The Grand Alliance	524

CHAPTER XXI

THE CENTURY

I. Colonial Expansion	531
II. The Trading Companies	534
III. National Finance	540
IV. The Spirit of the Age	543

BOOK V

THE BRITISH EMPIRE

CHAPTER XXII

QUEEN ANNE

I. Marlborough	549
II. The Union	555
III. The Whig Ascendency	560
IV. The Tory Ascendency	566

CHAPTER XXIII

THE WHIGS, AND WALPOLE'S ASCENDENCY

I. The Hanoverian Succession	571
II. The French Alliance	575
III. Walpole and the System	581
IV. The Rule of Walpole	586

CHAPTER XXIV

THE FALL OF WALPOLE, AND THE PELHAM ADMINISTRATION

SECTION	PAGE
I. The War in Europe	592
II. The Forty-five	597
III. Dupleix	602
IV. Clive	605
V. After the War	608

CHAPTER XXV

EMPIRE

I. The Grouping of the Powers	612
II. Mismanagement	617
III. Pitt	622
IV. Bengal	629

CHAPTER XXVI

THE THIRD GEORGE

I. The New King	636
II. Bute	637
III. George Grenville	641
IV. The Rockinghams and the Earl of Chatham	647
V. Townshend's Taxes and John Wilkes	650
VI. India	655

CHAPTER XXVII

CLEAVAGE

I. The Breach Widens	658
II. From Lexington to Saratoga	661
III. France Intervenes	665
IV. The Struggle for Life	668
V. Warren Hastings in India	674
VI. North, the Whigs, and the younger Pitt	683

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

I. Ireland	688
II. Enclosure, Machinery, and Canals	695
III. Literature	702

BOOK VI

THE ERA OF REVOLUTIONS

CHAPTER XXIX

BETWEEN THE WARS

SECTION	PAGE
I. Pitt's Domestic Policy	707
II. Foreign Policy and the French Revolution	712
III. India and Canada	717

CHAPTER XXX

THE WAR WITH THE REPUBLIC AND THE UNION WITH IRELAND

I. The First Stage	724
II. The Second Stage	731
III. Ireland and the Union	738

CHAPTER XXXI

THE STRUGGLE WITH NAPOLEON

I. The Black Shadow and Trafalgar	743
II. The Continental System	749
III. The Peninsula War	754
IV. India and America	763
V. Waterloo	767

CHAPTER XXXII

FROM WATERLOO TO THE REFORM BILL

I. Castlereagh	775
II. Canning and Huskisson	782
III. Reform	787
IV. India and the Colonies	794

CHAPTER XXXIII

THE ERA

I. The Industrial Revolution	801
II. Literature	808

BOOK VII

THE MODERN BRITISH EMPIRE

CHAPTER XXXIV

THE REFORMED PARLIAMENT

I. After Reform	813
II. Grey and Melbourne	815

SECTION	PAGE
III. Peel	822
IV. After Peel	826
V. Ireland	831
VI. The Colonies and America	835
VII. India	844
VIII. Early Victorian	851

CHAPTER XXXV

THE PALMERSTONIAN ERA

I. The Crimean War	857
II. Dalhousie and the Sepoy Revolt	864
III. Palmerston	872
IV. Foreign Affairs	877
V. After Palmerston	883
VI. Mid-Victorian	888

CHAPTER XXXVI

DEMOCRACY

I. Europe	892
II. The Gladstone Administration	894
III. Beaconsfield	900
IV. India	905
V. South Africa	908
VI. The Eighty Parliament	911

CHAPTER XXXVII

LORD SALISBURY

I. The Home Rule Struggle	920
II. Lord Salisbury and the Unionists	925
III. The Storm Cloud in South Africa	930
IV. The South African War	934
V. The Second Salisbury Administration	939
VI. Transitional	946

CHAPTER XXXVIII

EPILOGUE

I. Under King Edward VII.	949
II. 1910-1912	958

INDEX	965
-----------------	-----

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS AND HISTORICAL NOTES	xvii
LIST OF MAPS	xxx
GENEALOGICAL TABLES	xxxii
LIST OF PLATES	xxxiii

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS AND HISTORICAL NOTES

	PAGE
THE WALL OF HADRIAN, NEAR HOUSESTEADS, NORTHUMBERLAND.—Hadrian's Wall ran from the mouth of the Tyne to the mouth of the Solway, a distance of about seventy miles. It was built in the years 121 and 122 A.D., and marked the limit of the <i>Pax Romana</i> in Britain. The Wall proper was of hewn stone, about 8 feet thick, and as high, perhaps, as 18 feet; in front was a ditch 40 feet wide, and at short distances, turrets and small forts were built on to the Wall, larger forts, or stations, being erected near the Wall at points four miles apart. The most important of all the stations on the Wall—called <i>Borcovicus</i> by the Romans—was at Housesteads, the site of which is shown in the drawing	3
SAXON SPEAR-HEADS.—Saxon arms are known principally from illuminated MSS. (some of which date back to the eighth century), and from actual examples found in barrow graves. Those shown here were found in Great Britain. They were fastened by nails or rivets to shafts made of ash	9
SAXON ARROW-HEADS.—The bow was used by the Saxons, though not extensively in earlier times. Several of the examples given are from graves	10
SAXON KNIVES.—The Saxon knife, or dagger, was a weapon common to all classes, and was used for all kinds of everyday purposes as well as for aggression. One in the centre is remarkable for the fact that it retains a carved wooden handle	12
SILVER PENNY OF OFFA, KING OF MERCIA.—Following the <i>sceat</i> (a generic name for silver coins of the seventh century) came the penny first coined by Offa of Mercia (757-796), and imitated from the Frankish silver <i>denarius</i> . Offa's pennies are remarkable for the variety and elaboration of their types, and, considering the age in which they were issued, their artistic merit	15
GOLD RING OF ÆTHELWULF.—This ring (now in the British Museum) is a fine example of gold and niello work, the decoration consisting in lines delicately engraved in the metal and filled with a black amalgam of silver, copper, lead, and sulphur, and highly polished. Æthelwulf's ring is an interesting Saxon example of an art practised in Europe from Roman times to the end of the sixteenth century	17
DRINKING AND MINSTRELSY AMONG THE SAXONS.—Taken from an English Psalter of the eleventh century (Harleian MSS. 603), the drawings in which are very freely imitated from the famous Utrecht Psalter, itself executed by an Anglo-Saxon artist at Rheims in the ninth century. It is, therefore, very suggestive of ninth-century manners. A party of gleemen are entertaining the guests with the harp, <i>fithelere</i> (the modern fiddle), pipe, and dancing	20
A GROUP OF SAXON SOLDIERS, ABOUT A.D. 1000.—From a paraphrase of part of the Old Testament by Ælfric, an old English homilist and abbot, who flourished about A.D. 1000, the subject of the drawing being taken from Joshua. One king wears a ringed bymie, while an unarmed armour-bearer carries a second shield. Note the double beards	25
EDGAR MAKING AN OFFERING.—Edgar granted a charter in 966 to the new minster (known as Hyde Abbey) founded by Alfred at Winchester. This drawing forms the lower portion of the frontispiece of the charter and supplies a contemporary, though crude, portrait of the king. The king is represented as supported by the Virgin Mary and St. Peter, and making an offering of his charter to Christ seated in glory above	26
AN ANGLO-SAXON BED, ABOUT A.D. 1000.—From Ælfric's Paraphrase of Genesis. The bed shown consisted of benches placed in a recess in the chamber separated by a curtain from the rest of the apartment. The modern word "bedstead" means, literally, "a place for a bed," and what we call bedsteads were probably in the ninth and tenth centuries only possessed by the higher nobles. It is interesting to note that even in bed Saxon women kept the head covered with the head-rail	28
KNUT AND EMMA, HIS QUEEN.—From a book of grants to Hyde Abbey (Stowe MSS.) similar to that of Edgar. Knut is shown confirming his grant on the Abbey altar	29
AN ENGLISH MONARCH.—Copied from an English Psalter of the eleventh century. Especially to be noted in the rather elaborate costume is the leather cross-gartering	31
SEAL OF EDWARD THE CONFESSOR.—From an impression of the First Great Seal of Edward	33
TAKING TOLL.—From the Psalter (Harleian MSS. 603), before quoted, representing the taking of toll in the market place or at the city gates	34
JAVELIN AND DAGGER.—A spirited little drawing from the Anglo-Saxon Psalter belonging to the Duc de Berri. It gives an example of the use of weapons shown on page 12	35
A SAXON SLINGER.—From the Saxon and Latin Psalter of Boulogne	35
THE KING UPON HIS THRONE.—Montfauçon (<i>Antiquités de France</i>) says that this drawing appeared in an English Book of Prayers of the eleventh century, and suggests that it represents Harold upon his throne	36

	PAGE
HAROLD RECEIVES AN ARROW IN HIS EYE, AND DIES.—A scene from the famous Tapestry of Bayeux discovered by Montfauçon in 1729. It was executed for Bishop Odo (half-brother of the Conqueror) soon after Senlac. A full-size facsimile of the Tapestry is now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington	38
THE KING PRESIDING OVER THE WITAN.—From Ælfric's Paraphrase before referred to. Ostensibly the drawing depicts Pharaoh and his ministers doing justice upon the unfortunate baker who was afterwards hanged, but the illuminator has so obviously drawn upon the only model of a royal council known to him that he has preserved a contemporary representation of the chiefs of the Witanagemot	40
THE KING AND HIS THEGENS.—A drawing from a paraphrase of the Bible (attributed to Cædmon, Bodleian MSS., Junius xi.), which, despite its nominal purpose, depicts a Saxon king with his quantum of knights, or <i>comites</i> , making up the <i>comitatus</i> , his personal bodyguard	42
THE SAXON TOWER OF SOMPTING CHURCH, SUSSEX.—An example, entirely unique in England, of a Saxon tower (early eleventh century) with a four-sided gable spire, and one of the few pre-Norman English buildings now existing in a fine state of preservation. Note how the builders, though they were working in stone, have used and imitated the forms of timbering to which they were accustomed, e.g. in the strips of stone down the centre of each side	43
A SAXON BANQUET AT A ROUND TABLE.—From an early eleventh-century Psalter. Roasted meats were brought to the Saxon table on the spits as they were cooked. Forks were not used, and each man's dagger served as his knife. The vessels represented are practically identical in form with those which are found in earlier Anglo-Saxon graves	45
ANGLO-SAXON GLEEMAN, OR JUGGLER.—From an eleventh-century Psalter	46
THE OLD ENGLISH BURH, OR FORTIFIED PLACE.—A drawing from the paraphrase of the Old Testament attributed to Cædmon in the Bodleian Library, intended to portray the Tower of Babel. Actually the illuminator has drawn the kind of building which he knew, and thereby gives a close idea, allowing for crudity of presentation, of the Saxon walled and fortified town. See also note on page 42	47
ANGLO-SAXON SPEARS AND SWORDS.—From contemporary MSS. and specimens found in grave-mounds. Notice the guards below the heads of the spears intended to prevent sword blows cutting through the ashen stocks	48
SAXON PUNISHMENTS.—The stocks were generally placed at the side of the road at the entrance to the town, where also offenders were chained in a kind of pillory. From an English Psalter of the eleventh century (Harleian MSS. 603)	49
THE GREAT SEAL OF WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR	51
NORMANS AT DINNER.—From the Bayeux Tapestry, representing Harold and his companions carousing. They are seated in an upper apartment separated from the miscellaneous throng that crowded the great hall	53
ARCHES IN THE NAVE OF ST. ALBANS ABBEY CHURCH.—The great nave of St. Albans, one of the longest in England, was built by Abbot Paul between 1077 and 1093	55
AN AISLE IN THE CHAPEL OF ST. JOHN, TOWER OF LONDON.—This chapel forms part of the magnificent White Tower, or Keep, which was built by Bishop Gundulf of Rochester about 1078. It is one of the most notable examples of early Norman work	58
A NORMAN BED.—From a twelfth-century MS., containing Anglo-Norman drawings of biblical subjects. Norman furniture was much more ornamental than that of the Saxons; the beds also assumed new and more elaborate forms	60
SCENES IN ENGLISH OUTDOOR LIFE IN THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.—From a Saxon calendar in a hymnarium in the British Museum, depicting the occupations of each of the twelve months of the year. The four given are for May, June, July, and October	61
AN IDEAL PLAN OF A NORMAN CASTLE.—From Grose's <i>Military Antiquities</i> , showing the arrangement of a typical castle of the eleventh and twelfth centuries	65
A MANOR-HOUSE OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.—From the Harleian MS. referred to in the note under page 20. This drawing illustrates Psalm CXI. The larger building with the stag's head and ending with a tower is the Saxon hall. On the right is the chapel. The house was probably of wood with a foundation and lower walls in masonry	66
SEAL OF ARCHBISHOP ANSELM.—From Ducarel's <i>Anglo-Norman Antiquities</i>	68
A NORMAN SCHOOL, ABOUT 1130-1140.—From a Psalter containing Anglo-Norman drawings. In the original the scholars form a complete circle round the teacher, who appears to be lecturing <i>viva voce</i> , while two MS. writers proceed with their work	72
AN ORGAN, ABOUT THE MIDDLE OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY.—This drawing from the Harleian MS. 603, before referred to, is one of those imitated from the earlier Utrecht Psalter. Church Organs were therefore known in England before the Conquest. William of Malmesbury speaks of an organ given to Malmesbury by Dunstan in the reign of Edgar	73
OFFICERS OF THE ROYAL TREASURY, ABOUT 1140.—From the same Psalter as the last illustration. It may well represent officials of the Court of Exchequer under Henry I., in whose reign payments were required to be made in silver instead of in kind	74
THE ENGLISH STANDARD, 1138.—From an almost contemporary MS. (at Corpus Christi, Cambridge), with an account of the Battle of the Standard by Ætheldred, Abbot of Rievaulx	76
SEAL OF HENRY, BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.—From an engraving in the <i>Journal of the Archaeological Association</i>	77
CHURCH OF ST. REGULUS, ST. ANDREWS.—A chancelled Scottish pre-Norman church. The tower dates from the tenth to twelfth centuries, but it is properly related, in its style, to the twelfth century	79
THOMAS À BECKET ARGUING WITH HENRY II. AND KING LOUIS.—From a French life of À Becket, written in England in the thirteenth century; a fine example of French illumination carried out by English hands. From a facsimile by the Société des Anciens Textes Français	83

MOUNTED SOLDIERS OF THE TIME OF HENRY II.—Taken from a page of drawings illustrating Maccabees I. in a vellum copy of the Bible of Henry II. (1154-1189) belonging to the Dean and Chapter of Winchester 85

KNIGHTS OF THE LATE TWELFTH CENTURY 86

LADIES OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY WEAVING.—From Badwine's Psalter at Trinity College, Cambridge, which is similar in many respects to the Utrecht Psalter and the Harleian MSS. (603), so often drawn upon. Weaving appears to have been practised very extensively in the larger Norman households 87

AN IRISH CHALICE OF THE TENTH TO ELEVENTH CENTURIES.—One of the most beautiful products of Celtic art. It was found at Ardagh, and belongs to an early class of two-handled cups meant for the communion of the minor clergy and people. It is 7 inches high, and is of silver and bronze gilt, ornamented with repoussé and filigree work in gold and also in fine enamels, of exquisite execution 89

AN ENGLISH MONARCH, ABOUT 1190.—From a Book of Prayers in the British Museum. It may, perhaps, represent Richard I. 92

TRANSLATION OF HOLY RELICS IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.—After a drawing by Matthew of Paris, a famous monk and chronicler of St. Albans, who died in 1259. His *Chronica Majora* give exceedingly vivid impressions of his age; as a draughtsman he was unequalled 97

WEST DEAN PARSONAGE.—A thirteenth-century building in Sussex, one of the earliest domestic buildings in England which remains substantially intact 99

AN EARLY THIRTEENTH-CENTURY KNIGHT.—From an incised slab on the tomb of Sir John de Bitton at Bitton, Somersetshire, 1227. A fine example of chain mail 102

SIMON DE MONTFORT THE ELDER.—The father of the English Earl Simon. From a window in Chartres Cathedral, 1230 106

ORDINATION OF A PRIEST.—From an Anglo-Norman MS. roll (late twelfth century) of pictures of the life of the holy Guthlac of Mercia, who lived at Crowland in the eighth century 110

TRAVELLERS IN ANGLO-NORMAN DRESS.—From a twelfth-century Psalter, with Anglo-Norman drawings. The one chosen represents the Flight into Egypt 112

DAVID I. AND MALCOLM IV.—As portrayed in Malcolm's Charter to Kelso Abbey, about 1160 114

A KNIGHT OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.—The Brass of Sir John D'Abernoun (d. 1277) in Stoke Dabernon Church, the earliest effigy on brass known in Great Britain or on the Continent. It is further unrivalled as an example of technique and patient, scrupulous work by its engraver 121

CONWAY CASTLE, NORTH WALES.—Built in 1284 by Edward I. after his conquest of North Wales 124

TOLL HOUSE AND PRISON, GREAT YARMOUTH.—Most of this building dates from the thirteenth century. It has a large chamber, which was used for the collection of tolls and, later, for meetings of the Borough Court. A dungeon under the building was in use as a prison until the beginning of the nineteenth century 127

EDWARD I. RECEIVING THE BULL OF POPE BONIFACE VIII.—From a thirteenth-century MS. in the British Museum containing drawings of English kings from Edward the Confessor to Edward I., with short notices of each king in French 130

A THIRTEENTH-CENTURY CARICATURE UPON THE JEWS OF NORWICH.—Norwich was one of the principal seats of the Jews in England in the reign of Henry III., and in this caricature (a sketch by the clerk who engrossed the Jews' Roll in the Public Record Office) Isaac of Norwich, the crowned Jew with three faces, is represented as chief among them. Demons (Dagon and "Colbif"), false balances, and forked tongues make up a piquant satire 140

HOUSEWIFE, EARLY FOURTEENTH CENTURY.—A figure from one of the Sloane MSS. showing an early example of the "barme cloth," afterwards called the apron 147

COSTUME OF THE COMMONALTY, EDWARD II.—Showing the women's headgear, the wimple, and boots of untanned leather 148

BRASS OF SIR JOHN DE CREKE, 1325.—In Westley Waterless Church, Cambridgeshire. A finely typical brass of the armour of the period, perhaps the earliest showing the use of plate armour 149

OPENING A JOUST IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.—From one of the Egerton MSS. in the British Museum, giving rules for the conduct of knightly jousts and tournaments 150

EDWARD III. AND ST. GEORGE.—From an electrotype in the National Portrait Gallery of the effigy on the king's monument in Westminster Abbey 151

A ROYAL DINNER PARTY IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.—From a Norman MSS. of the *Romance of Meliadus* in the British Museum. The comparative meagreness of the table and its appointments, though for the sovereign, is of interest. Forks are not yet in use 152

EDWARD III. MEETS HIS COUSIN OF FRANCE.—From a French MS. chronicle in the British Museum. Edward met the newly-confirmed Philip VI. in 1331 (after he gained his freedom from the Regency of his mother, Isabella, and Roger Mortimer) to do homage to Philip for Guienne and his other French possessions. Six years later he renounced that homage, and the Hundred Years' War began 153

A SEA FIGHT, ABOUT THE TIME OF THE BATTLE OF SLUYS.—From a MS. in the British Museum, illuminated about 1350. See also the note on the illustration on page 170 156

	PAGE
AN ARCHER OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.—From a British Museum MS., illuminated about 1330. It was in the fourteenth century that the efficacy of the bow, the most deadly weapon devised until the introduction of gunpowder, came to be fully recognised and the archer attained the height of his importance. Crécy proved that archery combined with infantry could utterly rout forces that relied upon cavalry charges	157
CROSS-BOW AND QUARREL AS USED AT CREÇY.—The quarrel of the cross-bow, or arbalet, was a heavy, short bolt with a square head and winged like an arrow. It did not carry so far as the arrow, but was deadly at short range	158
ARCHER AND ARBALESTIER.—Occasionally the archer and arbalestier (or cross-bowman) were protected with heavy armour, as in the two figures given here, taken from a MS.	159
A TEMPORARY BESIEGING FORT OF TIMBER.—From a MS. of Sir John Froissart's <i>Chronicles of England</i> in the British Museum. The gate of a castle is being attacked from a timber fort of great strength of construction. A battery of two cannon is included, and the mixture of arms includes long-bow, cross-bow, and hand-guns. As yet the bow and catapult remained weapons more effective than the clumsy hand-guns and cannon	161
ENGLISH MAN-AT-ARMS AND ARCHER.—From Froissart's <i>Chronicles of England</i> , a typical illustration of the complete plate armour of the fourteenth century. The archer is protected by plates of steel, a skirt of mail, and a visored helmet; the lower part of the body is unprotected	163
A FOURTEENTH-CENTURY ABBOT PREACHING.—In the fourteenth century, and later, congregations were accustomed to sit upon the floors of the churches as shown in this drawing from a MS. of Richard II.'s reign	164
A MERCHANT OF 1367.—From a very fine brass on the tomb of Robert Brauche, a wool merchant of Lynn, Norfolk. Under Edward III. the trade in English wool flourished greatly, and the merchants and burghesses of the east coast became men of affluence and importance	166
A GOLDSMITH'S SHOP IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.—An interesting picture of a medieval shop. The goldsmiths were the bankers as well as the jewellers of the Middle Ages	167
GOLD ROSE-NOBLE OF EDWARD III.—The noble long remained the sole gold currency of England. It was introduced by Edward III. in 1344. The figure of the king in a ship on the obverse is generally thought to refer to the naval victory of Sluys in 1340	170
A BISHOP'S COURT.—From an Italian MS. of the late fourteenth century in the British Museum	171
A STATE CARRIAGE OF ABOUT 1330.—From the Luttrell Psalter, a finely illuminated MS. written for Sir Geoffrey Luttrell (see page 227), who died in 1345	172
PENSHURST, THE HALL OF A FOURTEENTH-CENTURY BARON.—Penshurst was originally the residence of Sir Stephen de Penchester. By Henry VIII. it was granted to his chamberlain, Sir William Sidney, and thus it became the home of the Sidney family. The hall of the mansion, built about 1340, has a fine open-timbered roof and a minstrel's gallery	173
JOHN BALL HARANGUING.—From a picture in a Froissart MS. of John Ball addressing a crowd of Wat Tyler's insurgents in the market-place	176
RICHARD II.—From a diptych (representing the king being presented to the Virgin by three patron saints) at Wilton House, belonging to the Earl of Pembroke. Probably painted soon after Richard's accession by an Italian artist in England. In his reign the wildest extravagances in dress prevailed; his robes are noticeably luxurious	178
LADIES HAWKING.—From a fourteenth-century MS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris	181
LADIES SHOOTING RABBITS.—Archery was a favourite recreation with the ladies of the Middle Ages, and there are frequent examples of their prowess in the MSS. In this instance, from a fourteenth-century MS. in the British Museum, a bolt is used instead of the ordinary sharp-headed arrow	182
RICHARD II. GOES TO HIS FRIENDS AT CONWAY CASTLE.—From a magnificently illuminated metrical life of Richard, written by a Frenchman who was a member of the king's suite through the troublous later part of his life. In the British Museum	184
EDWARD III. AND DAVID OF SCOTLAND.—From an illumination at the head of the articles of the Peace of 1357 with David. One of the Cotton MSS.	186
AN ABBOT TRAVELLING.—From St. Alban's Book. The abbot wears a hat over his hood, and is giving his benediction to a passing traveller	191
A MEDIEVAL SIEGE-ENGINE.—A machine for throwing stones, etc., into a besieged city by the action of a twisted cord. From one of the Harleian MSS. in the British Museum	195
A BATTERING-RAM AND ITS USE.—The ram consists of a heavy timber beam with a head, probably of metal, swung from a frame by a rope. The drawing also shows the armour of the second half of the fifteenth century	195
THE SIEGE OF ROUEN BY HENRY V.—Part of a delicately executed drawing occurring in John Rous's <i>Lives of the Earls of Warwick</i> , in a MS. of the late fifteenth century in the British Museum. Rouen was the last town to hold out against Henry in his Normandy campaign	197
BESIEGING A FRENCH TOWN AT THE END OF THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR.—A phase in the siege of Dieppe by Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury. The English had captured and occupied a fort commanding the town, which the French are here represented as assaulting. The cannon used and portable bridges for crossing the moats are of interest. From one of the principal MSS. of Froissart's <i>Chronicles</i> at Paris, of which the first portion is in the British Museum	201
CARDINAL BEAUFORT'S CHAUNTRY IN WINCHESTER CATHEDRAL.—Henry Beaufort, half-brother of Henry IV., made Bishop of Winchester in 1404 and Cardinal in 1426, was Chancellor of England three times and the principal opponent of the schemes and intrigues of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester. He finished the building of Winchester Cathedral and died in 1447	203

	PAGE
TATTERSHALL, A FIFTEENTH-CENTURY CASTLE.—A splendid building in brick in the Perpendicular style	206
THE YOUTHFUL HENRY VI.—From a drawing in the beautiful MS. <i>Life of St. Edmund</i> by John Lydgate, possibly written and illuminated when Henry stayed at St. Edmundsbury in 1433. The MS. (British Museum) includes an illumination depicting Lydgate presenting the "Life" to the king	208
THE DUKE OF GLOUCESTER AND THE EARL OF WARWICK IN BATTLE.—From Rous's <i>Lives of the Earls of Warwick</i> , a late fifteenth-century MS.	210
A BEDROOM IN THE MIDDLE OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.—From Lydgate's <i>Life of St. Edmund</i> , representing the saint's birth and showing well the richness and luxury that was growing up in the fifteenth century	211
EDWARD IV., HIS SON, EDWARD V., AND THE COURT.—Representing Earl Rivers presenting his translation of the <i>Dictes or Sayengis of the Philosophres</i> to the king, to which this illumination forms the frontispiece. It also affords the only known contemporary portrait of the prince who became Edward V. It has been stated that the figure in monkish garb is Caxton, who revised and printed this translation by Earl Rivers, it being the first dated book printed in England	214
AN ALDERMAN OF LONDON, 1474.—From the brass of John Field, "sometime alderman of London, a merchant of the stapull of Caleys, the which deceased in the yere of our Lord God," 1474	220
A MERCHANT.—From Caxton's <i>Game and Playe of Chesse</i> , printed in 1475 at Bruges	221
AN ENGLISH KNIGHT IN FULL CAPARISON.—From the frontispiece illumination to the Luttrell Psalter, showing Sir Geoffrey Luttrell being armed by his wife and daughter	227
A ROYAL CARRIAGE AND ITS ESCORT, ABOUT 1480.—Up to the latter part of the fifteenth century horses were almost the only means of conveyance. About this time pictures of carriages are more often met with, but they are generally clumsy vehicles, however gorgeous, and seem only to have been used by persons of high estate	229
A COMPLETE SUIT OF GOTHIC ARMOUR, ABOUT 1470.—From the Wallace Collection	231
AN ENGLISH KNIGHT OF 1400.—From the brass of Sir George Felbrigge, Playford Church, Suffolk	233
A MS. REPRESENTATION OF A HOUSE.—From a fourteenth-century MS. of the <i>Romance of the San Graal</i>	234
A PUPPET SHOW.—From a French MS. <i>Romance of Alexander in the Bodleian</i> . It is of fourteenth-century origin, and suggests considerable antiquity for the modern Punch and Judy show	235
THE HIERARCHY OF THE SCIENCES AS CONCEIVED BY MEDIEVAL THOUGHT.—From a Bible in the British Museum illuminated about 1290 for Jehan, Duc de Berri. St. Peter and St. Paul are seated on either side of the Heavenly Throne. The other personalities are self-explanatory. The illumination is interesting in the emphatic precedence given to theology over science, which was natural to the mediæval mind	237
GEOFFREY CHAUCER.—From a portrait painted by Thomas Oocleve (a pupil of Chaucer) in a copy of his <i>Regement of Princes</i> , now in the British Museum. It shows Chaucer as an old man, perhaps as he might have been seen walking in the precincts of Westminster Abbey in the last months of his life	238
A SPECIMEN OF CAXTON'S PRINTING.—The dedication of the <i>Game and Playe of Chesse</i> , Caxton's second printed book, printed at Bruges (where he lived for thirty-five years) in 1475. See also the note on the illustration on p. 214	239
HENRY VII.—From a finely sculptured bronze bust in the Victoria and Albert Museum, ascribed to Torregiano, an Italian sculptor, who visited England early in the sixteenth century	244
THE HUNDRED MEN'S HALL AT ST. CROSS, NEAR WINCHESTER.—The Hospital of St. Cross was founded by Henry de Blois in 1136 to provide lodging for thirteen poor men and a daily dinner for a hundred others. It was enlarged by William of Wykeham and by Cardinal Beaufort, and is a unique example of a mediæval almshouse	246
THE POLITICAL GAME OF CARDS.—Perhaps the earliest example of the modern caricature. It is French, and represents Louis XII, as holding the winning hand. The other two players are the Swiss and Venetian rulers. Round are grouped Henry VII. of England and the King of Spain in conversation, Pope Alexander VI. (the infamous Borgia)—who is anxious as to the game his ally, Louis, is playing—the Emperor, with a fresh pack of cards, and other European princes	247
A SHILLING OF HENRY VII.—First struck in 1504 and introducing the practice of putting the head in profile, wherefore it was called a "testoon"	248
BEDESMEN, TIME OF HENRY VII.—From the initial letter of a deed by which Henry VII. founded a fraternity of thirteen poor men in Westminster Abbey. The abbot, monks, and royal bedesmen are shown	249
MONKS AND LAWYERS.—An illuminated letter from a deed of grant by Henry VII. to Westminster Abbey which had to be read in chapter yearly by the king's attorney	250
HENRY VII.'S CHAPEL, WESTMINSTER ABBEY.—This eastern chapel of the Virgin Mary in the Abbey, which replaced an earlier Lady Chapel, is ornamented with an extraordinary luxuriance and fineness of detail, and is, perhaps, the most remarkable English building of the period. It is in the late Perpendicular style	251
A GENTLEMAN OF THE TIME OF HENRY VII.—A drawing of a well-to-do citizen from a MS. of the <i>Romaunt of the Rose</i>	252
A FIFTEENTH-CENTURY WOOL MERCHANT.—From a brass in Northleach Church, Gloucestershire	253
AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS.—From woodcuts in Barclay's <i>Eclogue</i> , 1509	255

	PAGE
A COMMON OR OPEN FIELD.—This common or open field at Stogursey, near Watchet, Somersetshire, was carried on until 1879. The balks—pieces of unploughed land—separating each strip are well shown. The strips of land were ordinarily of an acre or half an acre in extent, forty rods long, and four rods wide, each man's holding consisting of strips distributed over the whole field or district, so that he might have as many as 150 strips to farm of which no two would be adjacent. From a photograph by Miss E. M. Leonard	256
JAMES III. OF SCOTLAND.—From a painting of James and his son at Holyrood	260
CARDINAL WOLSEY.—After the portrait by Holbein at Christ Church, Oxford	263
FRANCIS I. AND HENRY VIII. AT THE FIELD OF THE CLOTH OF GOLD IN PICARDY, in 1520.—From a sculpture at Rouen in a house of the sixteenth century of the scenes at the meeting of the two kings done by the order of Francis I.	266
THE ARMY OF HENRY VIII., ABOUT 1513.—From a contemporary MS. in the British Museum. The assault has just begun on the king's army, which consists of artillery, protected by <i>manicles</i> of timber, two lines of arquebusers and a main body of pikemen	267
ERASMUS.—The obverse of a German medal of 1519 in the Victoria and Albert Museum	269
JOHN FISHER, BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.—After the drawing by Holbein in the British Museum	270
MARTIN LUTHER.—After the painting by Lucas Cranach at Florence	272
THE POPE STRUGGLING WITH CALVIN AND LUTHER.—From Jaime, <i>Musée de la Caricature</i> . An early engraving representing the mutual hostility of the two great opponents of the Papacy	273
THE MUSIC OF THE DEMON.—A contemporary woodcut satirising Luther from the Catholic standpoint	274
THE OVERTHROW OF THE POPE.—From a pamphlet issued in 1521 by Lucas Cranach, presenting the idea that Antichrist was emblematical of the Papacy, and that the end of his reign on earth was then approaching	275
HENRY VIII.—After a painting usually attributed to Holbein; it is probable that none of the many paintings of Henry VIII. is by Holbein	277
THOMAS CRANMER.—From Vertue's engraving of Holbein's painting	279
HEADING OF THE PAPAL BULL AGAINST THE DISSOLUTION OF HENRY'S MARRIAGE	281
THOMAS CROMWELL.—After the engraving in Holland's <i>Herölogia</i>	282
QUEEN JANE SEYMOUR.—After the drawing by Holbein	286
IRISH GROAT OF HENRY VIII.—Struck in 1530. The first Irish coin on which the harp appears	290
SUIT OF ARMOUR FOR FIGHTING ON FOOT, HENRY VIII.—Preserved in the Tower of London. This suit, made in the Maximilian style for Henry VIII., is one of the finest in existence. It weighs 93 lbs.	292
THE SIEGE OF BOULOGNE BY HENRY VIII., 1544.—From an engraving in <i>Vetusta Monumenta</i> , after a painting which hung in Cowdray House, Midhurst, Sussex, until its destruction by fire in 1793. Sixteenth-century siege tactics are depicted with great vigour. The painting is one of a series executed about 1550	293
AN ARQUEBUSIER	295
A PIKEMAN.—Two drawings from the same MS. as the illustration on page 267. They show well the weapons and half-armour worn	296
A PORTRAIT MEDAL OF EDWARD VI.—A medal struck by a foreign artist in England, 1547. Medal-making was not practised in England till long after Continental artists had achieved high distinction, and it is only at rare intervals up to the middle of the eighteenth century that English medallists of note are met with	299
THE CORONATION PROCESSION THROUGH LONDON OF EDWARD VI.—Part of a large engraving published by the Society of Antiquaries of a contemporary painting at Cowdray House, Midhurst, destroyed in 1793. The procession is passing Cheapside Cross on its way to Westminster from the Tower	300
MUMMERS AT A FEAST ABOUT THE MIDDLE OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.—From an engraving in <i>Der Weiss König</i> , a life of the Emperor Maximilian	303
LADY JANE GREY.—From an engraving of the painting by Holbein	307
QUEEN MARY.—From a miniature painting by Luis de Vargas, 1555, in the Victoria and Albert Museum	309
STEPHEN GARDINER.—After a portrait by Holbein. Gardiner was Bishop of Winchester under Henry VIII., imprisoned in Edward VI.'s reign, and Lord Chancellor under Mary	311
THE MARTYRDOM OF LATIMER AND RIDLEY.—From John Foxe's <i>Actes and Monumentes of these latter and perillous Dayes touching Matters of the Church</i> , commonly spoken of as the <i>Book of Martyrs</i> , published in 1563. Latimer and Ridley were burnt in 1555	312
QUEEN ELIZABETH.—From the painting by Marcus Gheeraedts in the National Portrait Gallery. It is very similar to a portrait at Penshurst presented by the Queen to Sir Henry Sidney	317
QUEEN ELIZABETH'S STATE CARRIAGE.—From a print in Braun's <i>Civitates Orbis Terrarum</i>	319
QUEEN MARY STUART.—From a remarkable chalk-drawing, by François Clouet (generally known as Janet or Janette), in the Bibliothèque Nationale. The Queen is represented in her widow's weeds	321

	PAGE
THE BATTLE OF CARBERY HILL, 1567.—From an engraving after a contemporary original in <i>Vetusta Monumenta</i> . Queen Mary is seen surrendering herself to the Confederate Lords	323
JAMES STEWART, EARL OF MORAY.—After a contemporary painting	324
SIR THOMAS GRESHAM.—Banker and merchant under Mary and Elizabeth; he was known as the "greatest merchant in London." He built the First Royal Exchange in 1566 and established Gresham College	326
TOWN HOUSES IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.—From an engraving in the English edition of John Barclay's famous book of satires, <i>Stultifera Navis</i> , or <i>Ship of Fools</i> , 1570	327
QUEEN ELIZABETH HUNTING.—From Turberville's <i>Noble Art of Venerie</i> , 1575	329
KNIFE WHICH BELONGED TO DRAKE.—A clasp knife mounted in a handle of chamois horn and engraved brass	334
THE <i>GOLDEN HIND</i> AT JAVA.—From the rare chart of Drake's voyage round the world, and Cavendish's repetition of it in 1586. New Albion was the northernmost point of the American west coast that Drake touched at. The district that Drake discovered there includes the whole province of California and part of the north-west coast of America adjoining. From there he sailed home through Java and the Spice Islands	334
FRANCIS WALSINGHAM.—From an engraving by Vertue	339
QUEEN ELIZABETH IN PARLIAMENT, 1586.—From a contemporary print. Cecil will be seen on the Queen's right hand, and in the foreground the Commons	341
AN ENGLISH SHIP IN THE ARMADA FIGHT.—From a contemporary engraving of one of the tapestries which hung in the old House of Lords until its destruction by fire in 1834. They were done to the order of the Earl of Nottingham, Lord High Admiral, but were not put up until 1650	347
THE DEFEAT OF THE ARMADA.—From a broadside issued on the occasion of Elizabeth going to the Thanksgiving at St. Paul's for the victory. It quaintly depicts the English fireships drifting into the Spanish Fleet, and the Queen on the shore and bodies of pikemen ready to repel any landing	349
QUEEN ELIZABETH IN HER ARMADA THANKSGIVING ROBES.—From a miniature in the Victoria and Albert Museum executed in 1616	350
ELIZABETHAN ARMOUR.—A very typical suit of fighting armour from the brass of Humphrey Brewster, Wrentham Church, Suffolk	353
SIR WALTER RALEIGH.—From the engraving by Houbraken	354
JAMES DOUGLAS, FOURTH EARL OF MORTON.—From a painting at Dalmahoy	355
ROBERT CECIL.—After the engraving by Elstrak	358
THE FUNERAL HEARSE OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.—Taken from a series of drawings of the great funeral procession by William Camden. Clarenceux King-at-Arms, and a famous antiquarian and historian. He published his <i>Britannia</i> in 1586, and his <i>History of the Reign of Elizabeth</i> in 1615	361
ARMOUR PRESENTED TO HENRY VIII. BY THE EMPEROR MAXIMILIAN.—In the Tower of London	364
THE <i>HARRY GRACE À DIEU</i> , BUILT BY HENRY VIII. IN 1513.—From a drawing of 1546 in the Pepysian Library, Cambridge	365
AN ELIZABETHAN FAMILY.—From a monumental brass, dated 1584, of the Day family at Little Bradley Church, Suffolk	366
A CUT FROM THE GREAT BIBLE OF 1539.—Depicting manna falling in the wilderness. This splendid folio Bible, carried out by order of Henry VIII. under the direction of Thomas Cromwell and Miles Coverdale, was the first official translation. The printing was begun in Paris in 1538, but was stopped by the Inquisition, and the printers and their presses transferred to London. The second edition of 1540, called Cranmer's Bible, was the "Byble apoynted to the use of the churches"	368
THE TWO SHEPHERDS.—From a broadside by Hans Sachs satirising the papal church on the text of the Gospel of St. John x. 1, 4, 12. Christ stands by the door, while the Pope "climbeth up some other way" and sits on the roof pointing out the wrong way to the Christian flock. One of the learned doctors of the Church is looking out over the entrance to watch the proceedings of the Good Shepherd	369
AT THE MARKET, 1603.—From a broadside	373
WEAVING IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.—From one of the early editions of Erasmus's <i>Praise of Folly</i>	374
EASTCHEAP MARKET, ABOUT 1598.—From a drawing in the British Museum. Stow says that this flesh-market was kept for serving the east part of the City, being afterwards removed to Leadenhall. Eastcheap was swallowed up in the London Bridge improvements in William IV.'s reign. Westcheap became Cheapside	376
SIXTEENTH-CENTURY MENDICANTS.—From Barclay's <i>Ship of Fools</i> before referred to (page 327)	377
A CUT FROM THE FIRST EDITION OF SPENSER'S <i>SHEPHEARD'S CALENDAR</i> .—The only known copy of this edition is in the British Museum	379
SHAKESPEARE.—From the Droeshout portrait. Mr. Spielmann and other leading authorities conclude that of all the swarms of Shakespeare portraits, fabrications and others, only two—the engraving by Droeshout affixed to the First Folio of 1623, and the bust at Holy Trinity Church, Stratford-on-Avon—can be accepted as authentic likenesses	381
A MUSKETEER OF 1603.—From an engraving in Skelton's <i>Armour</i>	384

	PAGE
JAMES I.—From the engraving by J. Smith after the painting by Vandyck	387
THE GUNPOWDER PLOT CONSPIRATORS.—From an engraving by C. Van der Passe, showing the eight principal conspirators	388
HENRY FREDERICK, PRINCE OF WALES, DIED 1612.—From Michael Drayton's <i>Poly-Olbion</i> , a monumental work published in thirty "Songs" or books between 1612 and 1622. It was, the poet says, "a Herculean toil," and covered every point then of topographical or antiquarian interest in Great Britain	392
SIR FRANCIS BACON, VISCOUNT ST. ALBAN.—After the contemporary engraving by William Marshall	395
GEORGE VILLIERS, DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.—From an engraving after the portrait by Mierevelt	398
A CAVALIER OF 1620	400
AN INFANTRYMAN OF 1625.—Two engravings from Skelton's <i>Armour</i>	402
CHARLES I.—From a miniature painting by Matthew Snelling, 1647, in the Victoria and Albert Museum. Drawn on paper prepared with a thin coating of plaster	405
WESTMINSTER IN THE TIME OF CHARLES I.—From a print by Hollar, 1641	407
ARCHBISHOP LAUD.—After the portrait by Vandyck	408
A LADY IN HER CHAIR.—From an album of MS. drawings, dated between 1603 and 1638, in the British Museum. She is evidently a lady of rank	409
THE OLD STAR CHAMBER.—Pulled down after the burning of the old Houses of Parliament in 1834	411
A PIKEMAN, 1635.—From Skelton's <i>Armour</i>	412
CHEAPSIDE AND THE CROSS IN 1638.—From La Serres' <i>Entrée Royale de la Règne Mère du Roy</i> , an account of the entry of Marie de Medicis, mother of the Queen of Charles, into London. The Cross was destroyed in 1643 by the Parliamentarians as an object of superstition	414
PLAN AND VIEW OF EDINBURGH IN THE EARLY SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.—From a contemporary print	416
A NEWSPAPER HEADING OF 1641	426
THE CHURCH MILITANT: A BISHOP OF 1642.—From a large caricature of the year of the Royalist judges, the warlike prelates, and the ruffing cavaliers. The prelate satirised is Archbishop William of York, who garrisoned Conway for the king	427
REVERSE OF £3 PIECE OF CHARLES I. STRUCK AT OXFORD, 1643	430
COIN PORTRAIT OF CHARLES I. ON £3 PIECE OF 1643.—Reverse and obverse of a fine coin struck at Oxford, one of the provincial mints of the king during the Civil War. The reverse bears the "Declaration" of September 1643, to the effect that the king would preserve the Protestant Religion, the Laws of England, and the Liberty of Parliament. Besides £3 in gold, £1 and 10s. pieces in silver were also struck at Oxford	431
A CUIRASSIER.—From Skelton's <i>Armour</i>	435
THE CAVALIER AS "ENGLAND'S WOLF."—From a broadside of 1646 speaking of "England's Wolfe, with Eagles-claws: as the cruell impieties of blood-thirsty royalists and blasphemous antiparliamentarians under that inhuman Prince Rupert, Digby, and the rest"	436
THE TRIAL OF CHARLES I.—From a print in Nalson's <i>Journal of the . . . Tryal of King Charles I.</i> , 1684. The original inscription under this print ends: "The pageant of this mock tribunal is thus presented to your view by an eye-and-ear witness of what he saw and heard there"	441
THE EXECUTION OF CHARLES I. IN WHITEHALL (<i>January 30, 1649</i>).—From a print of the year. It shows the windows of the Banqueting Hall through one of which Charles stepped on to the execution stage	442
THE WARRANT FOR THE EXECUTION OF CHARLES I.—From the original document in the House of Lords	443
THE SCOTS KEEP THEIR YOUNG KING'S NOSE TO THE GRINDSTONE.—From a broadside of 1651, ridiculing the conditions (including the Covenant) which the Presbyterians exacted from the young Prince Charles before they offered him the crown in Scotland after the death of Montrose in 1650. Jack Presbyter holds the king's nose down, while the Scots, personified as Jockie, turn the grindstone. Underneath are the lines:— "Come to the grindstone, Charles, 'tis now too late To recolect—'tis presbyterian fate."	443
OLIVER CROMWELL.—After a miniature by Samuel Cooper, perhaps the greatest miniature painter who ever lived. This miniature is in the collection of the Duke of Buccleuch	450
CROMWELL EJECTING THE RUMP, 1653.—A Dutch print in the British Museum. Cromwell, supported by Strickland and Cooper, is saying to the members: "Begone, you rogues, you have sate long enough!" On either side, in Dutch and English, is the inscription "This House is to let"	453
THE GREAT SEAL OF THE COMMONWEALTH, 1651.	455-456
A DINNER-PARTY UNDER THE PROTECTORATE.—From the English edition of the <i>Janua Linguarum reserata</i> of Comenius, a famous writer on education, published in 1631. The salt-cellar, making the division of rank at the table, is particularly noticeable	459
RICHARD CROMWELL.—After a miniature painting by Samuel Cooper, the master miniaturist, 1664	463

	PAGE
UNITE, OR SOVEREIGN, OF THE COMMONWEALTH, 1660.—These coins, which alone among English coins have their legends in English, are of a markedly simple type. The sovereign of James I. was first called a "unite," partly because they were intended to circulate on both sides of the border	464
CHARLES II.—From the engraving by Vanderbanc	468
EDMUND HYDE, EARL CLARENDON.—From an engraving after the portrait by David Loggan, an exquisite drawing in pencil on vellum. Loggan died in 1700	470
A VIEW OF LONDON AT THE TIME OF THE GREAT FIRE.—From a print by Visscher. Taken from Bankside, Southwark	473
SOUTHWARK, LONDON BRIDGE, THE CITY AND THE TOWER, IN 1666.—From Visscher's <i>General View of London</i> , a long, finely-engraved panoramic print	475
AN ENGLISH SHIP OF WAR, <i>TEMP.</i> CHARLES II.—From a medal. A type of the ship for which Pepys, as Secretary to the Admiralty, was responsible	478
"DR. OATES DISCOVERETH THE PLOT TO YE KING AND COUNCIL."—From one of a series of playing cards of 1684 in the British Museum	480
CONTEMPORARY MEDAL OF THE GODFREY MURDER.—One of several medals struck during the general frenzy of the "Popish Plot" following on the murder of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey. Supernatural events were associated with Godfrey's death, and he is represented as walking after he was dead and, on reverse of the medal, as carrying his own head	481
ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL, MARQUIS OF ARGYLL.—From the painting by George Jamesone	485
JAMES II.—After the engraved portrait by Giffart	510
THE SEVEN BISHOPS.—From a medal struck in honour of the petitioning Bishops; in the British Museum. On the obverse is Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury. The Bishop of London is included, though he was not a petitioner	497
THE EMBARKATION OF WILLIAM OF ORANGE FOR ENGLAND, 1688.—After an old print	500
MEDAL COMMEMORATING THE FLIGHT OF JAMES II.	503
WILLIAM III.	505
QUEEN MARY II.—After the painting by Sir Godfrey Kneller	506
LONDONDERRY, ABOUT 1680.—From an original drawing of the time in the British Museum	510
MEDAL COMMEMORATIVE OF THE BATTLE OF THE BOYNE.—William is shown crossing the Boyne at the head of his troops	512
THE PARLIAMENT HOUSE, EDINBURGH.—From an engraving by Gordon of Rothiemay about 1650. The Parliament House was completed in 1640, and in it the Assemblies of the Estates of Scotland were held until the dissolution of the Parliament by the Act of Union in 1707	515
THE FLEET PRISON.—Used for defendants committed by order of the Star Chamber and later, and more notoriously, for debtors. It was rebuilt after the Great Fire, but was destroyed in the Gordon Riots of 1780. It was situated in Farringdon Street. From a print of 1691	521
JOHN SMITH AT THIRTY-SEVEN.—One of the most successful of early English colonial administrators. He was head and one of the founders of the Colony of Virginia, which owed much of its prosperity to his efforts. From his <i>General History of Virginia</i> , 1624	532
THE OLD EAST INDIA HOUSE.—Drawn from an old print by Herbert Railton	537
A FIRST-RATE MAN-OF-WAR OF 1680.—From a print of that year	541
THE OLD MERCER'S HALL, WHERE THE BANK OF ENGLAND WAS FIRST ESTABLISHED.—The Bank, founded in 1694, was carried on in the Mercer's Hall until 1734, when it removed to its present site in Threadneedle Street	542
A BEDROOM PARTY OF 1631.—From a print by Abraham Bosse. An illustration of domestic manners in the seventeenth century	544
JOHN MILTON	545
JOHN DRYDEN.—From the engraving after Kneller's portrait	546
HEAD-PIECE FROM THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, 1662	548
QUEEN ANNE.—After the painting by Sir Godfrey Kneller	550
JOHN CHURCHILL, DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH.—After the painting by Van der Werff	552
THE ALLIED FORCES GOING INTO ACTION AT RAMILLIES.—From a medal struck to commemorate the victory	561
A MEDAL CELEBRATING THE FRENCH DEFEAT AT OUDENARDE.—The obverse represents Marlborough and Eugene as Castor and Pollux, while the reverse gives a view of the town and of the battle	562
QUEEN ANNE CLIPPING THE WINGS OF THE GALLIC COCK.—A contemporary caricature celebrating the eclipse of Louis XIV. in the War of the Spanish Succession	563

	PAGE
A HIGH CHURCH CARICATURE ON THE SACHEVERELL PROSECUTION, 1710.—Entitled "Like coachman, like cause, or what we must expect if Low Church becomes uppermost." Cromwell rides in the carriage, with the devil driving; Hoadley is postilion	565
A HACKNEY COACH, ABOUT 1710.—Hackney coaches were first established in London in 1625. About the time of the Sheriff's table of fares from which the cut is taken there were over 700 in London	569
GEORGE I.—From the painting by Kneller in the National Portrait Gallery	571
A CARICATURE OF THE DAY ON THE SOUTH SEA COMPANY, 1720	579
SIR ROBERT WALPOLE.—From the painting by J. B. Vanloo, a French painter who worked in England from 1737 to 1742. The painting is in the National Portrait Gallery	582
QUEEN CAROLINE, CONSORT OF GEORGE II.	584
GEORGE II.—After the painting by R. E. Pine	587
COSTUME OF THE EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.—A group taken from Nicholl's <i>View of Hampden Court</i>	588
A SATIRE ON WALPOLE AND HIS ADMINISTRATION, ABOUT 1738.—From a print in the British Museum. The composition includes Walpole, who is waving away Captain Jenkins's complaint about his severed ear (p. 592), a Frenchman offering jewels to Walpole's wife, a courtier ejecting a man with a petition against the "Spanish depredations," a dog destroying the Merchants' Complaint, and a financier pouring gold through a gridiron into the Sinking Fund	590
THE HOUSE OF COMMONS IN 1742.—From a fine drawing by H. F. Gravelot, a French artist, who did much English book-illustration in the middle of the eighteenth century. Engraved by W. J. White. Sir Robert Walpole is addressing the House	595
THE DESPAIRING FRENCHMAN AT LOUISBOURG.—From a drawing by Boitard, a French caricaturist, of the blockade of Louisbourg, on the St. Lawrence, in 1745	596
EUROPEAN SOVEREIGNS AT MARKET, 1748.—A satire on the re-arrangements following the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle. The King of France sells hostages, George II. turnips from Hanover (Hanover was nicknamed "Turnip Garden"), the Stadtholder gin, and the Kings of Sweden and Sardinia their soldiers as mercenaries	597
LORD CLIVE IN LATER YEARS.—After the painting by Gainsborough, about 1773	607
GENERAL JAMES WOLFE	626
SURAJ UD-DAULAH, NAWAB OF BENGAL.—From a contemporary group-painting of the Nawab by Kettle, belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society	630
GEORGE III. IN 1767.—From the painting by Allan Ramsay in the National Portrait Gallery	636
A SATIRE OF 1762 ON BUTE AND HIS ADMINISTRATION.—From an etching by the Marquis Townshend, who became Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in 1767. He was one of the keenest critics of the blundering government of Bute, and, deriding Hogarth, who was a supporter of the Government, signs himself "Oh! Garth"	639
WILLIAM PITT, EARL OF CHATHAM.—From the painting by Richard Brompton	648
A VIEW OF BOSTON IN NEW ENGLAND AND BRITISH SHIPS OF WAR LANDING THEIR TROOPS.—From a print "engraved, printed, and sold by Paul Revere, Boston," 1768. This was the first demonstration of force by the home Government	651
WILKES ASSURING GEORGE III. THAT HE HAD NEVER BEEN A WILKITE.—From the caricature by Gillray. After his contests with the Government and the House of Commons, Wilkes rose to various offices, and in 1774 became Lord Mayor of London. The caricature is based on his remark to the king, concerning his legal adviser, "Ah, sir! he was a Wilkite, which I never was"	653
GEORGE WASHINGTON.—After the painting by Trumbull	661
AN AMERICAN TWENTY-DOLLAR BILL PRIOR TO THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE	662
THE FIRST TWENTY-FOUR SIGNATURES TO THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE	664
GIBRALTAR BEFORE THE GREAT SIEGE OF 1780.—From a print by Coquart	670
AN AMERICAN GENERAL.—From Barnard's <i>History of England, 1790</i>	672
ADMIRAL SIR GEORGE RODNEY.—After the painting by Sir Joshua Reynolds	673
ASAF UD-DAULAH, WAZIR OF OUDH.—Taken from an engraving of a contemporary painting by Horne belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society	681
WARREN HASTINGS.—After the portrait, made late in Hastings's life, by Sir Thomas Lawrence	682
LORD NORTH	683
"ENGLAND MADE ODIOUS, OR THE FRENCH DRESSERS."—A caricature on Shelburne and Fox at the time of the arrangement of the Treaty of Versailles (1783), which was exceedingly unpopular	685
THE IRISH PARLIAMENT HOUSE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.—Now the Bank of Ireland. The building was commenced in 1729, but was not brought to its present state until 1805	690

HENRY FLOOD.—From a contemporary drawing by J. Comerford. Flood entered the Irish Parliament in 1759, at the age of twenty-seven, and became a minister of the Crown in 1775. According to Lecky he was "beyond all comparison the greatest popular orator that his country had yet produced" and "a master of parliamentary tactics" 693

A TYPICAL "STRIP" FARM OR OPEN FIELD.—A plan of "strip" holdings at Laxton, Northants, which continued to be farmed in the old way until the end of the nineteenth century. See the note on the illustration on page 256 696

AN OLD HAND WEAVER AT HIS LOOM.—From the *Universal Magazine*, 1747 698

THE CANAL AQUEDUCT OVER THE IRWELL.—One of the successful canal schemes of the Duke of Bridgewater and his engineer, James Brindley. The canal crossed the Irwell at Barton, Lancashire, at a height of 40 feet. From a print issued in 1793 699

ADAM SMITH.—From the medallion portrait in enamel by James Tassie, a famous gem engraver and enameller 701

DR. JOHNSON.—From an engraving by Finden 703

ALEXANDER POPE.—From a crayon drawing in the Bodleian Library 703

AN "EXQUISITE" OF 1720 704

HENRY FIELDING.—By Hogarth, from the 1772 edition of Fielding's *Works* 705

THE RIGHT HON. WILLIAM PITT.—Pitt entered Parliament two years after the death of his father, the Earl of Chatham, and became Prime Minister three years later at the age of twenty-five. After the portrait by Gainsborough 708

"THE RAREE SHOW."—A caricature by Gillray published in 1797, when there were loud complaints of the burden of taxation and against Pitt's foreign policy. Pitt is represented as a showman picking John Bull's pocket while his attention is occupied with the show 709

PITT AVERTING THE PARTITION OF TURKEY BY CATHERINE OF RUSSIA.—An adaptation of a scene from the *Taming of the Shrew* (Act v. Sc. 2) to the British intervention between Russia and Turkey. Austria and France support Catherine, while Prussia and Holland back Pitt 713

EDMUND BURKE.—After the painting by Romney 715

"BLOOD ON THUNDER."—Chancellor Thurlow, sometimes called the "Thunderer," was a firm supporter of Warren Hastings during his impeachment. Gillray seized the opportunity for this caricature, published in 1788, called "Blood on Thunder fording the Red Sea," representing Hastings carried on Thurlow's shoulders through a sea of blood strewn with Hindu corpses 718

TIPPU SULTAN OF MYSORE.—From an Oriental painting at Apsley House which belonged to the Duke of Wellington 720

LORD CORNWALLIS 721

NAPOLEON BUONAPARTE.—From the unfinished painting by David of Buonaparte as a young officer 726

"THE GREATEST GENERAL OF THE AGE—GENERAL COMPLAINT."—From a caricature of 1796 by Woodward 727

"A MODEL OFFICER."—From Rowlandson's caricature published in 1796, under the title "Anything will do for an Officer," when dissatisfaction was rife at the state of the army and at the purchase system in particular 728

ADMIRAL DUNCAN.—After the portrait by Hoppner 729

"GRANDFATHER" GEORGE WITH THE PRINCESS CHARLOTTE.—From a print by Woodward which appeared at the birth of a daughter to the Princess of Wales in 1796. It was entitled "Grandpapa in his Glory," one of many satires of the day on the homely habits of George III. 730

SERINGAPATAM, TIPPUS'S CAPITAL, STORMED IN 1799.—Taken from a view in Home's *Mysore*, Madras, 1794 736

GEORGE III.—After the painting by Sir William Beechev, representing the king in an admiral's uniform 743

THE DOUBLE-HEADED GOVERNMENT.—A French caricature of the alliance of Pitt and Fox. From Jaime's *Musée de la Caricature* 745

LORD NELSON.—After the painting by Sir William Beechey, R.A. 747

ADMIRAL LORD COLLINGWOOD.—After an engraving by Charles Turner, A.R.A. 748

THE EMPEROR NAPOLEON.—After the painting by Delaroche 752

SIR JOHN MOORE.—From an engraving after a sketch portrait 755

BADAJOZ AND ITS CITADEL, FROM THE NORTH BANK OF THE RIVER GUADIANA.—From a view taken in 1813 760

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.—After the painting by Sir Thomas Lawrence, P.S.A. 768

THE CHÂTEAU OF HOUGOUMONT AFTER THE BATTLE.—From a drawing by S. Wharton made in 1815 772

LORD CASTLEREAGH.—After the portrait by Lawrence 775

CATO STREET, THE SCENE OF THE CONSPIRACY OF 1820.—From a contemporary drawing 780

	PAGE
GEORGE CANNING.—After the portrait by Lawrence	783
GEORGE IV.—From a sketch made at Ascot Races, 1828	788
WILLIAM IV.	790
BOMBAY FORT, ABOUT 1825.—From a drawing by William Westall, A.R.A.	797
THE EXTENDED DRESS OF 1789	802
“ROYAL AFFABILITY.”—Gillray rarely let pass an opportunity of caricaturing George III. ; here he pictures him walking with the queen in the neighbourhood of his Windsor farm and accosting a labourer	804
“FARMER” GEORGE.—Another of Gillray’s prints. The king was known generally by this title	805
THE FIRST STEAMBOAT, THE <i>COMET</i> , ON THE CLYDE.—From a print of 1812	807
STEPHENSON’S LOCOMOTIVE, THE “ROCKET”	808
ROBERT BURNS.—From the portrait by Nasmyth	809
SIR WALTER SCOTT.—After the painting by Raeburn	811
LORD SHAFTESBURY.—From the portrait by Millais	817
QUEEN VICTORIA IN 1837.—After a painting by W. C. Ross	820
SIR ROBERT PEEL MOVING THE REPEAL OF THE CORN LAWS (<i>January</i> 1846).—From a sketch made in the House of Commons	825
LORD JOHN RUSSELL.—From a drawing in the “Maclise Portrait Gallery”	827
THE MONSTER CHARTIST MEETING ON KENNINGTON COMMON (<i>April</i> 10, 1848).—From a print in the <i>Illustrated London News</i> of 1848, made after a daguerrotype	828
DANIEL O’CONNELL.—After a painting by T. Garrick	833
GOLD-SEEKERS AT BATHURST, WESTERN AUSTRALIA, ON THEIR WAY TO THE FIELDS AT OPHIR.—From a print published at Sydney, N.S.W., in 1851	839
PORT NATAL IN 1852	843
DOST MOHAMMED	847
OPEN COACHES ON THE MANCHESTER AND LIVERPOOL RAILWAY.—From a print of 1831	852
ROBERT OWEN	853
DR. PUSEY.—From a photograph	855
THE EARL OF ABERDEEN.—From a sketch made in the House of Lords in 1854	857
THE BRITISH FORCES MARCHING TO THE ATTACK AT THE BATTLE OF THE ALMA.—From a sketch by a lieutenant of a ship stationed in the river during the battle	860
LORD RAGLAN.—From a drawing made by Edward Armitage, R.A., in 1854	861
PORT AND TOWN OF SEVASTOPOL, SHOWING THE FORTS, IN 1854.—The port is a bay four miles long and one mile wide at the entrance, and having also a military harbour one and a half miles long, which is landlocked. The principal forts, Fort Constantine and Fort Alexander, are seen on the left and right of the drawing. The town was bombarded from the sea and from hills behind that could be occupied. Yet so well were the defences arranged that it sustained a siege of eleven months	862
NANA SAHIB.—From a sketch made in India in 1857	868
SIR JOHN LAWRENCE	869
THE MEMORIAL WELL AT CAWNPORE	870
SIR HENRY HAVELOCK.—After the portrait by Frederick Goodall, R.A.	871
QUEEN VICTORIA IN 1857.—From a pastel painting by Alexander Blaikley	873
BENJAMIN DISRAELI.—From an early portrait in the “Maclise Portrait Gallery”	874
THE CAPTURE OF THE NORTH FORT AT PIHO, 1860.—From a sketch made on the spot	877
LORD PALMERSTON.—From a photograph	879
THE <i>ALABAMA</i> —From a sketch by Charles W. Wyllie	882
CHARLES DARWIN.—From a medallion by Alphonse Legros	889
MR. GLADSTONE IN 1869.—From a photograph	895
W. E. FORSTER.—From a photograph by Elliot & Fry	897
THE BRITISH RESIDENCY, KABUL, AFTER THE RISING OF 1879	906

SIR FREDERICK (LORD) ROBERTS IN 1880.—From a photograph	907
CETEWAYO	910
THE MONUMENT AT PAARDEKRAAL, KRUGERSDORP, WHERE THE BOERS PROCLAIMED THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE TRANSVAAL IN 1880	912
MAJUBA HILL	913
C. S. PARNELL.—From a photograph	914
ARABI PASHA	915
OSMAN DIGNA, LEADER OF THE MAHDI'S FORCES.—From a photograph	916
GENERAL GORDON.—From a photograph	917
MR. A. J. BALFOUR.—An early portrait by Lafayette, Dublin	922
LORD SALISBURY.—From a photograph by Russell & Sons	923
MR. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN.—From a drawing by W. Hodgson, 1895	930
THE SURRENDER OF GENERAL CRONJE AT PAARDEBERG.—From a photograph by R. Thiele, by per- mission of the <i>Graphic</i>	937
THE PALACE OF THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL OF THE SUDAN AT KHARTUM	941
QUEEN VICTORIA.—From a photograph by Bassano	943
ALFRED, LORD TENNYSON.—After the painting by G. F. Watts	947
KING EDWARD VII.—After a photograph by Lafayette, Dublin	949
MR. JOHN MORLEY in 1894	957
KING GEORGE V.—After a photograph by Lafayette	960

LIST OF MAPS

** The starred maps have been taken, by the kind permission of the Cambridge University Press, from their School History of England (by the same author).*

	PAGE
*SAXON ENGLAND	13
THE BATTLE OF SENLAC	37
*ENGLAND AND THE LOWLANDS OF SCOTLAND UNDER NORMANS AND PLANTAGENETS.—Covering English history from the Conquest to the later part of the fifteenth century	52
EUROPE, ABOUT 1200	95
*THE BATTLEFIELDS OF ENGLISH AND SCOTS IN THE THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH CENTURIES	135
THE BATTLE OF BANNOCKBURN	143
THE BATTLE OF CREÇY	157
*FRANCE AND THE ANGEVIN DOMINION	162
ENGLAND IN THE REIGN OF EDWARD III.	168
DISPOSITION OF ENGLISH AND FRENCH FORCES AT AGINCOURT	196
*IRELAND UNDER THE TUDORS	258
THE BATTLE OF FLODDEN	264
*ENGLAND AND THE LOWLANDS OF SCOTLAND IN TUDOR AND STUART TIMES	285
DRAKE'S VOYAGE ROUND THE WORLD, 1577-1580	336
*THE LOW COUNTRIES AND PICARDY IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY	343
EUROPEAN POWERS IN 1610	393
ROYALIST AND ROUNDHEAD IN THE CIVIL WAR	439
THE SEDGEMOOR CAMPAIGN, 1685	493
THE BATTLE OF BLENHEIM	553
THE CAMPAIGNS OF MARLBOROUGH	564
THE MARCH OF THE JACOBITES	599
A CONTEMPORARY PLAN OF THE BATTLE OF CULLODEN	601
THE PRUSSIAN AREA OF THE SEVEN YEARS' WAR	619
THE SIEGE OF QUEBEC	627
THE BATTLE OF PLASSEY.—From a plan published in 176	633
NORTH AMERICA	644
THE WEST INDIES, THE SCENE OF ENGLISH AND FRENCH NAVAL OPERATIONS, 1778-1779	669
INDIA AND THE BRITISH DOMINION IN 1785	677
EUROPE, 1789-1794	712
THE BATTLE OF THE NILE IN ABOUKIR BAY (<i>August 1, 1798</i>)	732
*THE BATTLE OF TRAFALGAR	749
*THE SPANISH PENINSULA, SHOWING THE AREA AND CENTRES OF THE WAR OF 1808-1813	757
THE WATERLOO CAMPAIGN	769
*WATERLOO: THE OPPOSING ARMIES	770

LIST OF MAPS

xxxii

	PAGE
WATERLOO: THE CRISIS	773
INDIA IN THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY	795
THE DOMINION OF CANADA	836
AUSTRALIA AND TASMANIA	838
NEW ZEALAND	840
SOUTH AFRICA	842
THE CRIMEAN PENINSULA	859
INDIA IN 1857	865
THE TERRACE MOUNTAIN RANGES OF SOUTH AFRICA	935
EGYPT AND THE SUDAN	942
BRITISH POSSESSIONS IN AFRICA, 1903	957
THE BRITISH EMPIRE TO-DAY	963

GENEALOGICAL TABLES

	PAGE
THE FAMILY OF ALFRED THE GREAT	10
WESSEX KINGS OF ENGLAND	23
THE LATER LINE OF ALFRED	32
THE NORMAN LINE	67
THE SCOTS KINGS	78
THE BLOOD ROYAL OF ALFRED	81
FOUR GENERATIONS OF PLANTAGENETS	84
THE SCOTTISH CROWN 1291	133
THE LANCASTERS	146
THE FRENCH CROWN	153
THE BRUCES AND STEWARTS	185
THE HOUSES OF YORK AND LANCASTER	194
THE BEAUFORTS AND STAFFORDS	202
DESCENDANTS OF JOHN OF GAUNT	241
DESCENDANTS OF RICHARD OF YORK	242
DESCENDANTS OF HENRY VII.	346
THE SUCCESSION AFTER CHARLES II	482
THE SPANISH SUCCESSION	526
THE FRENCH SUCCESSION	576
THE HANOVERIANS	584
THE AUSTRIAN SUCCESSION	593

LIST OF PLATES

QUEEN ELIZABETH From the painting attributed to Marcus Gheeraedts in the National Portrait Gallery.	<i>Frontispiece</i>
ST. DUNSTAN, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY From a late twelfth century MS. in the British Museum.	FACING PAGE 26
KEEP OF CASTLE RISING, BUILT BETWEEN 1140 AND 1150 The architectural design of a Norman keep, as distinguished from the commoner "shell-keep," was of a fairly obvious kind, consisting of a quadrangular tower surrounded by a water-filled moat or a deep ditch. As it was upon the solidity of their walls that the early castles depended for their capacity to withstand assault, and not upon cleverly contrived fortifications, they were built with walls of enormous thickness (sometimes as much as 25 feet at the bottom and 10 feet at the top), regard being had to the comparatively small dimensions of the building as a whole. One small doorway, defended by a drawbridge and portcullis, gave admission.	70
EFFIGIES OF HENRY II. AND HIS QUEEN ELEANOR Originally with other royal tombs in the nave of Fontevault Abbey, these and two other royal effigies (those of Richard I. and his queen) were the only royal tombs in the Abbey that escaped destruction at the Revolution. Henry's effigy is of sandstone; that of Eleanor of wood.	82
DRAWINGS FROM AN EARLY THIRTEENTH CENTURY MS. BY MATTHEW PARIS Paris's <i>Chronicles</i> give a more vivid impression of his age than the writings of any other English chronicler; for a portion of the reign of Henry III. he is our only source of information. Paris was the chief figure in the remarkable school of MS. scribes and illuminators which was centred at St. Albans in the thirteenth century. As an historiographer and draughtsman he brought his Abbey wide fame. The drawings given are taken from a kind of commonplace book containing Lives of the Offas, stories of the Abbots of St. Albans, and documents and other material for his great <i>Histories</i> . The text has considerable corrections in Paris's own hand, and if the drawings are not certainly his, they were made under his directions, and perhaps from his sketches.	104
ENGLISH LIFE IN THE EARLY FOURTEENTH CENTURY These drawings from the beautiful psalter made for Sir Geoffrey Luttrell (who died in 1345) are examples of some of the finest English MS. illumination. In the upper half the household is preparing a great feast, John de Brigford, the cook, being seen in the right-hand top corner and the family bag-pipe player, who patrolled the table during the feast, immediately beneath him. Below, corn in the sheaf is being stacked, beaten with the flail, and an old woman brings a sack of threshed corn to the miller.	164
JOHN BALL HARANGUING A CROWD OF REBELS From an illumination in a fifteenth century MS. of Sir John Froissart's <i>Chronicles of England</i> . Ball is addressing Wat Tyler and his insurgents in a market-place of rather an imaginary kind. Froissart's writings were greatly appreciated by his own age (he died about 1410), and many copies of his <i>Chronicles</i> were made and illuminated in France.	176

- THE COURT OF KING'S BENCH UNDER HENRY VI. 250
- One of four illuminations taken from an abridgment of English law of the time of Henry VI. Below the five judges are the King's Coroner and Attorney, and the Masters of the Court; standing on a table two ushers are swearing in the jury; at the bar a prisoner stands in custody of a tip-staff and in the foreground other prisoners wait their trial. The illuminations are in the Library of the Inner Temple.
- QUEEN ANNE BOLEYN AND THE LADY MARY, AFTERWARDS QUEEN MARY 286
- Two of the famous collection of eighty-seven drawings by Holbein at Windsor Castle. Holbein displayed to an extraordinary degree a power for seizing the character of his sitter and rendering the features without flattery; and while, in his paintings, he spared no labour or finish, he never lost thereby any resemblance or expression. The drawings, made between his arrival in England in 1528 and his death in 1543 (he was portrait painter to Henry VIII. after 1537) are sketches for paintings that still exist or have been lost.
- THE ENCAMPMENT OF THE ENGLISH FORCES NEAR PORTSMOUTH, 1545 294
- Taken from an engraving of one of the fresco paintings executed at Cowdray Castle about 1550 and destroyed by fire in 1793. This and other important paintings of the same date were fortunately engraved by the Society of Antiquaries shortly before the fire.
- THE ENGLISH FIRE-SHIPS SENT INTO THE SPANISH ARMADA AT ANCHOR
OFF CALAIS 348
- From an engraving of one of a series of tapestries executed to the order of the Earl of Nottingham (Lord Howard of Effingham), Lord High Admiral, which were destroyed with the old House of Lords in the fire of 1834.
- CHARLES I. 398
- From the original painting by Van Dyck at Windsor. The equerry standing beside the king is M. St. Antoine who was sent over by Henry IV. of France.
- "THE TRUE MANNER OF THE TRYAL" AND OF "THE EXECUTION OF
THOMAS, EARLE OF STRAFFORD" 424
- Two fine etchings by Wenceslaus Hollar, 1641. In the trial picture the "knights, citizens and burgesses of the howse of Commons" are massed on either side, with "earles" in two rows in front of them; Strafford stands in a gown and hood in a dock in the centre of the foreground with the Lieutenant of the Tower beside him. In the background is the King's seat of state (empty—the King and Queen are in a kind of Royal box behind), immediately in front of which sits the Lord High Steward, the Earl of Arundel, having the Judges and Barons of the Exchequer and the Masters of the Chancery grouped in front of him. In the execution scene Strafford has his head on the block, and round him are standing the Primate of Ireland, the Sheriffs of London, and his kindred and friends. The view gives an interesting picture of the Tower in the seventeenth century.
- THE HOUSE OF COMMONS ABOUT THE MIDDLE OF THE SEVENTEENTH
CENTURY 444
- From a Dutch print engraved, probably, in 1649; one of a set of three setting forth "The manner in which the British sovereign assembles his Parliament," "The manner and order of sitting of the lower house, or commons, which consists of knights, gentlemen and burgesses," and of the sitting of the Lords. The interest in English parliamentary methods aroused on the Continent during the struggle of the King and the Parliament called forth many prints of this kind.

LIST OF PLATES

XXXV

FACING PAGE

THE ATTACK ON CHATHAM BY THE DUTCH IN 1667 472

The burning of the dockyard at Chatham and of ships of the line lying in the Medway by the Dutch under De Ruyter in June, 1667, was one of the most remarkable incidents in the remarkable wars with the Dutch in the seventeenth century. The balance of the advantage during 1666 lay with the Dutch, and in spite of an English victory at Terschelling, the King's neglect of the navy (only a light naval force was kept at sea to damage Dutch trade) rendered it impossible to oppose any considerable force to De Ruyter's powerful fleet, which easily forced the entrance to the Thames and the Medway and threw London into a panic.

THE LANDING OF WILLIAM III. AT BRIXHAM, TORBAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1688 500

From a painting by an unknown artist at Hampton Court Palace. Every detail of the landing as described by Macaulay is shown. The original of the print reproduced on p. 500 is a companion painting, also at Hampton Court.

THE BATTLE OF BLENHEIM (OR HOCHSTAEDT), AUGUST 13, 1704 554

From a print by John van Huchtenburgh, a Dutch painter whose work was much admired by Prince Eugene and William III., by whose choice he was commissioned to depict the battles of Marlborough's wars. A reference to the map on p. 553 will render clear the position of the opposing armies. On the left is the Danube, on the banks of which the village of Blenheim in flames is seen, and Tallard's troops in flight, pursued by the English.

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS UNDER SIR ROBERT WALPOLE'S ADMINISTRATION 582

From an engraving of the painting by Hogarth and his father-in-law, Sir James Thornhill. Walpole stands to the left of the Speaker, Arthur Onslow.

A VIEW OF THE TAKING OF QUEBEC, SEPTEMBER 13, 1759 628

From a print published in the same year "shewing the manner of debarking the English Forces and of the resolute scrambling of the Light Infantry up a woody precipice to dislodge the Captain's post which defended a small entrenched path through which the troops were to pass; also a view of the signal victory obtained over the French regulars, Canadians and Indians, which produced the surrender of Quebec."

PART OF A PANORAMIC VIEW OF BOSTON AND THE COUNTRY ROUND AT THE TIME OF THE BATTLE OF BUNKER'S HILL 662

Taken from the original water-colour drawing made by a lieutenant of the British army directly after the battle. The upper part looks towards Cambridge and shows some of the American works; the lower shows, on the right, the ruins of Charlestown and Bunker's Hill (4), part of North Boston being in the foreground. The latter view covers the area of the battle.

HORATIO, VISCOUNT NELSON 732

After the painting by Hoppner in the state apartments of St. James's Palace, where the finest of his portraits are collected.

GEORGE IV. AND HIS TRAIN AT HIS CORONATION IN 1821 782

From one of a series of paintings by Stephanoff made by the king's order. This was the last of the coronations at which the utmost pomp and display, regardless of expense, was shown. The coronation of George IV., an unpopular monarch, cost £243,000, while that of his successor cost only a little over £45,000, and that of Queen Victoria about £70,000.

	FACING PAGE
GREAT COLLINS STREET, MELBOURNE, IN 1857 AND 1912	838
From a book of views of Victoria published in 1857 and from a photograph lent by the courtesy of the Agent-General for Victoria.	
BOMBAY FROM MALABAR HILL IN 1800 AND IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY	872
From a print published in 1800 and from a photograph.	
WINNIPEG IN 1870 AND IN 1912	888
The early view is from an original painting, made in 1870, lent by the Canadian Department of the Interior and, contrasted with the modern view, gives an idea of the extraordinary development of the city.	

A HISTORY OF THE BRITISH NATION

BOOK I NATION MAKING

CHAPTER I FROM CÆSAR TO ALFRED

I

CELTIC BRITAIN AND THE ROMAN OCCUPATION

THE British Isles first come in contact with the general current of history in the year 55 B.C. In that year Julius Cæsar, then engaged in the subjugation of Gaul, thought fit to cross the Channel with a military force, doubtless in the hope of finding that he could add to his resources for the achievement of his personal empire. He spent only a short time in the island, and returned again the next year with larger forces. But he found the prospect less promising than he had anticipated; and having no wish to extend the boundaries of the Roman dominion except as a means to more important ends, he again retired without making any serious attempt at subjugation; and for the next hundred years the Romans left Britain alone.

But nearly three centuries before Julius Cæsar the Greek voyager, Pytheas of Massilia, had visited the British coast and had spoken of its inhabitants by the name of Pretanes, which, according to the best authorities, is a Celtic term meaning the "painted people," and of this term the later title of *Britanni* was probably a corruption. There can be no doubt that they were the same race who, at the coming of Julius Cæsar, were in the habit of painting or possibly tattooing themselves with woad.

It is generally agreed that the dominant races and languages were Celtic, akin to those of Gaul. Further it is tolerably clear that there were two or perhaps three waves of Celtic invasion, since two Celtic stocks at least can be definitely distinguished. The first, called the Goidelic or Gaelic, found before them non-Aryan races commonly named Iberian, who were partly driven by them into the more inaccessible parts of the islands, and

partly absorbed by them. The second wave is called Brythonic—the Pre-*tan*es of Pytheas, and the *Britanni* of the Romans, who treated their Goidelic kinsmen very much as these had treated the Iberians. In language, at least, there was a very marked distinction between these two waves. In effect the Goidels or Gaels were driven into Ireland, the isles, and the highlands of Scotland; while the Brythons occupied England and Wales and the Scottish lowlands. The Gaelic of Scotland and the Erse of Ireland descend from the Goidelic dialect, while the Welsh, the old Cornish, and the Breton tongues descend from the Brythonic. The third wave was also Brythonic in character, and seems to have been merely an overflow from the continent of Celts nearly akin to the preceding wave, who occupied only the southern part of England. When Cæsar visited England the last wave represented the highest stage of civilisation so far achieved, while the rest of the Brythons represented a stage intermediate between that of the latest comers and the Gaels. We shall now use the term Briton for the non-Gaelic Celts in general.

It was not till the year A.D. 43 that the Roman Emperor Claudius resolved to add Britain to the Roman Empire. In the meantime there had been a not inconsiderable intercourse between the southern Britons and the Roman world; and the Romans learnt a great deal more of the geography than had been known to them in Cæsar's day. The Roman conquest, of course, bore no sort of resemblance to the previous conquests. It was very much more analogous to the British conquest of India, which began seventeen hundred years later. It was a military occupation, in which the conquering race established military centres and military roads, imposed taxes, and took upon itself the organisation of government without either extirpating or enslaving the natives. The advance was gradual. Within the first decade the Roman supremacy was established up to a line drawn from the Severn to the Wash. In the eighties the more northern tribes of the Brigantes up to the Solway were subdued; and the Roman Governor Agricola carried his arms successfully as far probably as the Tay.

But though the Roman legions marched through Scotland no practical conquest was effected. Agricola routed the highlanders, but that did not mean that they were in any sense brought to subjection. In fact, Agricola had hardly left the country when even the Brigantes in the north of England were again in revolt, showing that the chastisement inflicted upon them had only broken them for a time. They were, however, repressed not long afterwards. From the last years of the first century Britain, south of the Humber and the Mersey, was well under control; and when Hadrian's Wall was built in A.D. 121 and the year following, from Solway to the Tyne, the Romans commanded the north up to that line. Twenty years later the boundary was carried farther to the wall of Antoninus from Clydemouth to the Firth of Forth. But the Roman stations beyond Hadrian's Wall appear never to have been more than garrisons planted in a hostile country, military outposts which prevented the northern tribes from gathering in force. On



The Wall of Hadrian near Housesteads (the Roman Borcovicus), Northumberland.
[From a photograph by permission of Dr. Thomas Ashby, of the British School at Rome.]

the whole we may take it that from about the middle of the second century the *Pax Romana* reigned over the land south of Hadrian's Wall so long as the Roman occupation endured, but that north of that line the Romans merely planted garrisons to hold hostile tribes in check.

Early in the third century the Emperor Severus conducted in person a great campaign in Scotland, in which his troops suffered terribly, though the natives could not stand against them; but immediately after his death the Romans again fell back behind Hadrian's Wall, now strengthened by the Wall of Severus.

The whole story of the Roman activity beyond the Solway is curiously suggestive of the operations of British troops on the north-west frontier of India; while in Roman Britain, south of the Tyne and Solway, the Roman legions preserved peace and the Roman officials conducted the government, as do the British in India. And the Roman legions, like the British regiments, largely consisted of levies drawn from the natives. The country was superficially Romanised, adopting a degree of Roman manners and Roman culture. On the whole, it would seem that during the third century Britain flourished and waxed wealthy, its shores unmolested by foes from over the sea, while the unromanised tribes of the north were held securely back by the forts of the Roman wall.

But at the end of the third century and the beginning of the fourth Teutonic sea-rovers begin to put in an appearance. Tribes of the Saxons and the Franks took to the sea and to miscellaneous piracy. Here appears the picturesque figure of Carausius, who was appointed by the Emperor Maximian, the colleague of Diocletian, to the command for the suppression of the pirates. The operations of Carausius were successful, but were directed to serving his own ambitions; in fact he set himself up as an independent emperor; and it seems quite possible that he would have succeeded in maintaining that position had he not been assassinated. His successor Allectus went down before Constantius Chlorus, the father of Constantine the Great who transformed Christianity from being the religion of a persecuted sect into the dominant creed of the Roman Empire; and the Roman supremacy was again established. Roman Britain continued to prosper and was Christianised like the rest of the Roman Empire. But the Roman Empire itself was now on the verge of being shattered by the Teutonic advance; and in the year A.D. 410 the Roman legions were recalled, and the province of Britain was cut adrift and left to shift for itself.

Fifty years before the Roman evacuation new names appear for the races outside the Roman sphere which were beginning to surge against the Roman barriers in Britain as elsewhere. We hear of the Picts and Scots and the Attacotti, who, acting sometimes in conjunction with the Saxon rovers, began to descend upon the coasts of Britain or dash themselves against the Roman wall and even to burst through. "Picts" and "Attacotti" must be taken as merely new names for the northern peoples hitherto classed together as Caledonians. The Scots, on the other hand, were

certainly Gaelic tribes from the north of Ireland, who were presently to establish themselves in what is now Argyle, and from the kingdom there set up were to extend their name over the whole northern region. But we have now reached the point when the character of these peoples outside Roman Britain calls for further consideration.

It has been laid down as a general proposition that the Scottish highlands were occupied by Goidelic Celts, Gaels; and it may further be laid down that Galloway, roughly speaking the triangle between the Firths of Clyde and Solway, was also mainly occupied by Gaels, not by Brythons, whatever may have been the case with the eastern lowlands. Presently we shall find Argyle and the Isles in possession of colonies of Scots from Ireland. The name of the Attacotti will disappear; but who were the Picts who apparently held sway over the greater part of the country? The ethnological experts are very much at variance on the subject. On the one side are those who urged that they were simply Goidelic Celts; on the other side are those who do not recognise them as Aryans at all; while a third, but now wholly discredited, theory attributed to them a Teutonic origin. A detailed examination of the question is here impracticable; but perhaps the strongest argument in favour of the non-Aryan theory is the indubitable prevalence among them of the tracing of hereditary descent through the mother instead of through the father, a practice which is affirmed to be non-Aryan. At the same time, although among the Aryan races in historic times descent was always traced through the father, there are indications that this had not always been the case; and it is quite conceivable that in one branch of the great Aryan family the other system may have proved victorious. The very inconclusive evidence seems to point to the language of the Picts being Gaelic, mainly because Gaelic was certainly the language which survived, and there is no definite indication that another tongue was spoken. On the whole the presumption is distinctly in favour of the Gaelic theory, in spite of the difference between the Pictish law of succession and that which prevailed among the Aryan peoples at large, including the rest of the Celts, Gaelic as well as Brythonic.

The position then in the British Islands at the time of the Roman evacuation may be thus summarised. Ireland had not been touched by the Romans, and was wholly Celtic, apart from the survival of an Iberian element. What we now call Scotland was wholly Celtic, unless it is after all true that the Picts were not Aryans at all. Neither Ireland nor Scotland was as yet Christianised, and Scotland, too, had been untouched by Roman ideas and Roman culture, and had never really been brought under Roman domination. On the other hand, the greater part of the larger island, practically corresponding to what we now call England and Wales, had been under Roman dominion for more than three hundred years; there was probably an actual Roman element in the upper classes; there was a considerable infusion of Roman culture in the towns which had grown up at the Roman centres; Celtic customs had been in some degree modified

by contact with Roman law ; but still the Britons were the least Romanised of all the Western peoples who had come under the Roman sway, as may be most definitely seen in the fact that the Roman language disappeared, whereas in Spain and in Gaul, as well as in Italy, Latin had been so thoroughly adopted that it prevailed even over the Teutonic conquerors.

II

THE ENGLISH CONQUEST

In A.D. 410 the Roman legions were withdrawn. In the course of the next century and a half the Jutes, Angles, and Saxons had made themselves masters of the main part of the greater island between the Forth and the Channel, with the exception of the western regions ; for in the west the Celtic dominions still stretched in an unbroken line from north to south. Some years were still to elapse before the west Saxons in the south finally split the Celts of Devon and Cornwall from the Celts of Wales after the battle of Deorham ; and it was not till 613 that the Angles of the North severed Wales from Cumbria or Strathclyde after the battle of Chester.

For the most part the history of the conquest is obscure and legendary. The only record in any sense contemporary is that of the Briton Gildas, about the middle of the sixth century ; and he is exceedingly untrustworthy except as concerns what came directly under his own personal cognisance. Otherwise we have to rely on later compilations, a so-called *History of the Britons*, written about the end of the seventh century, and edited about the beginning of the ninth century by Nennius ; the invaluable work of the Venerable Bede, who was born in 673 ; and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, compiled under the auspices of Alfred the Great at the end of the ninth century. Bede and the Chroniclers did the best they could with their materials ; but trustworthy history does not emerge until the closing years of the sixth century, at least as far as details are concerned.

The traditional story is that Roman Britain went to pieces after the withdrawal of the legions, overwhelmed by the incursions of the Picts and Scots. In 449 a southern kinglet, Vortigern, called in to his aid the Jute pirate chieftains Hengist and Horsa, who, having come to rescue, remained to conquer, and were followed by successive swarms of their kinsmen from Denmark, Schleswig, and Holland. The helpless Britons who had forgotten the art of war were exterminated or fled before them ; though surprising legends gathered about a British king named Arthur, who, in his time, smote the invaders. King Arthur is the hero who appears in the *History of the Britons*, whereas, according to Gildas, the victor who gave a great check to the invaders was Ambrosius Aurelianus. As Gildas himself was probably born before the battle of Mount Badon, the great victory which he attributes to Aurelianus, it may at least be assumed that his statement is tolerably correct.

Very little value is to be attached to the *History of the Britons*, although

King Arthur may, on the whole, be accepted as having been a real chief, who performed real deeds of prowess. Still, between Gildas, who represents the Britons in the middle of the sixth century, Bede, who was a careful and critical historian, and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, which stands broadly for Bede modified by Wessex tradition, we can arrive at a tolerably consistent account of the Anglo-Saxon Conquest. But before we follow the story of the conquest we may consider the character of the invading hordes.

The group of tribes known by the three names Saxons, Angles, and Jutes all belonged to the Teutonic stock; the Jutes perhaps being nearer akin to the Gothic and Scandinavian branch than to the German. It is doubtful whether there was any real distinction between Angles and Saxons other than the designation of the territory from which they started. They, at any rate, were thoroughly German, and there is no legitimate ground for doubting that their development while still on the European Continent was on the lines depicted in the *Germania* of Tacitus. The basis of the German community was kinship, whether real or fictitious; that is to say, the tribe regarded itself as an aggregate of families having a common ancestry. The tribesmen were freemen, which meant that they owned the soil of their settlements; that they had the right to carry arms, and the right of attending the assemblies, local or tribal, which were the courts of justice and the parliaments of the village, the district, the tribe, and the tribal federation. Kingship was an institution which was apparently only beginning to develop sporadically among the frontier tribes in the time of Tacitus. Normally there was no king, but there was a recognised aristocracy of high-born families, from among whom a war-lord was appointed with the approval of the tribal assembly when the tribe went to war. The tendency, however, was for the war-lord to retain his authority when the war was over; and next, for the office itself to become hereditary in the family, though without recognition of the rule of primogeniture. The German had two main occupations, fighting and agriculture. Instead of concentrating in cities, like the Aryans of the Mediterranean regions, the tribes were collections of agricultural communities; and besides the free tribesmen there was a subject or servile population, mainly consisting of captive foes or their offspring, who had no rights and no property of their own. It is matter of dispute whether in the fifth century the land occupied by each community was already looked upon as the permanent property of the individual households or was regarded as the common property of the community, the individual family being entitled only to the produce of that portion annually allotted to it.

Now in the fifth century the tribes from the east were pressing upon the western tribes, and the western tribes were pressing upon the barriers of the Roman Empire. We have already seen that those who lived by the sea were starting upon a career of freebooting and piracy, even as early as the end of the third century, and that Saxons were joining with Picts

and Scots in raiding Roman Britain in the latter half of the fourth century. Up to this time and for some while longer they were satisfied with raiding for booty, and did not begin to attempt territorial conquest across the sea—precisely as happened with the Danes and Norsemen four centuries afterwards. But it would seem that even in the earlier half of the fifth century the need for expansion on the one hand, and the pressure from the east on the other, impelled adventurous spirits to seek not only booty but new lands to settle in. This migratory movement, however, was not that of a consolidated nation, or at first even of consolidated tribes, but of adventurers who as war-lords gathered kindred spirits to their standards, and set forth to carve out new dominions for themselves in lands which offered a tempting prey to the spoiler.

Such a land was Britain after the Roman evacuation. The idea that the Britons had wholly forgotten all that pertains to the art of war under the Roman dominion is not tenable, for the legions in the country were largely recruited from the Britons themselves. But the withdrawal of the Romans left the country without any centralised government. It fell back on the traditional Celtic system of petty principalities, generally incapable of consistent united action, and thus it became a prey to the invader. There is no reason to throw over the tradition which brings Hengist and Horsa to Kent as the hired allies of a British chief, prince, or king. When the growing anarchy had revealed itself, it was natural that the new comers should have taken up the idea of making themselves masters of the soil and calling fresh volunteers to their aid.


Now, as to the course of the conquest, there is a considerable difference between the Anglo-Saxon tradition, as it survived in Wessex to be written down in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in the ninth century, and the British tradition current in the middle of the sixth century as set forth by Gildas little more than a hundred years after the conquest began. The Chronicle describes a very gradual conquest effected by successive hosts of invaders who established a footing at different points along the whole coast line at various dates through a long series of years. Gildas describes, on the other hand, a sudden storm devastating the country from end to end. Yet the two stories can be reasonably reconciled in a manner which accords with such evidence as excavation gives us. Probably there was a storm which swept over the whole east and south in the latter half of the fifth century, in the course of which the Roman cities were permanently ruined. The force of the flood was broken by a rally of the Britons and the great victory of Ambrosius Aurelianus at Mount Badon, which appears to have taken place at some date between 493 and 516. The wave rolled back, but the territory was only partially reoccupied, the British being incapable of a constructive reorganisation; and there followed the more systematic organisation and advance of the kingdoms set up by the Teutonic invaders on the coasts from the Forth to the Isle of Wight.

Now we may conveniently apply the name English which ultimately

predominated to the whole group of the Teutonic invaders, Jutes, Angles, and Saxons. Saxons and Jutes entered upon the new land by way of the coast of Essex, the Thames, Kent, Sussex, and Hampshire; while the Angles established themselves along the east coast above Essex up to the estuary of the Forth. From these bases they drove their way inland, sometimes as independent units, sometimes recognising a common war-lord. No confidence can be placed in the names attributed to the legendary leaders of the various bands. It is probable that even Cerdic, the legendary ancestor of the House of Wessex, is mythical. But when we have reached the second half of the sixth century we find a number of fairly distinguishable English states definitely in being. In the south are the kingdoms of Kent and Sussex, while Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, like Kent itself, seem to have been occupied by Jutes. North of the Thames mouth lay the East Saxons, to the west of them the Middle Saxons (Middlesex); and we must place the nucleus of the West Saxon kingdom Wessex to the westward, upon the Thames valley, in preference to supposing that their advance was made from Hampshire or Dorsetshire. North as far as the Wash was East Anglia with the Lindiswaras (Lindsey) between the Wash and the Humber, and inland the Middle Angles and the Mercians. And north again from Humber to Tees was the Angle


kingdom of Deira, and from Tees to Forth that of Bernicia. The whole of the west was still occupied by British principalities or, beyond the Solway, by Gaels, Picts, and Scots; while between Celts and English lay the still debatable land which half a century before had been devastated but not permanently held by the English.

By common consent of all the old authorities it was the practice of the English to extirpate the Britons; that is to say, very few of them were spared to become slaves, though doubtless the women were not exterminated with such ruthlessness as the men. In the light of modern inquiry it has been maintained that sundry characteristics of the Anglo-Saxon social system point not to extermination but to the establishment of a servile population retained to cultivate the soil for the benefit of their Teutonic masters. On the other hand, it is claimed that these English institutions can reasonably be explained as developments having their origin in a free society. Moreover, the indubitable truth remains that throughout the English kingdoms practically every trace of the Celtic or Latin languages and the established Christianity disappeared altogether; and the conquerors



Saxon spear-heads.

were influenced by them no more than Europeans have been by the language or religion of primitive races in Australia, Africa, and America. But it is a conspicuous fact that in every other portion of the Roman Empire, however completely overrun by Teutons, the language and religion of the conquered dominated those of the conquerors. Where Goths or Vandals, Franks, Burgundians, or Lombards ruled as masters over Latinised Celtic peoples the Celtic and Latin elements ultimately predominated, and



Saxon arrow-heads.

France, Spain, and Italy have remained Latin nations. Outside of the British Isles, wherever the Teuton has amalgamated with a conquered race in historic times, he has to all intents and purposes ceased to be a Teuton; and it is a commonplace that even in Ireland the Norwegian and Norman conquerors became thoroughly Hibernicised, even as the Norsemen became Gaelicised in the Hebrides. In view of this it seems incredible that any large proportion of the conquered Britons should have survived among the Teutonic conquerors during the fifth and sixth centuries without giving them even a tincture of Latinity or Christianity, even though we must admit that the Latinising of the Britons had only been of a very superficial character.

It will be seen that nothing which at all corresponds to what is called the Heptarchy in England—a name which applies to the division of the country into seven substantial states—was the outcome of the English conquest. The varying mutations and absorptions of the many petty kingdoms did result in a sevenfold division in the course of the seventh century, at the time when Theodore of Tarsus organised the English episcopate; but there was no time when England could be regarded as being made up definitely of seven kingdoms with permanently recognised boundaries.

Even more vague was the division of the regions still held by the Celts, who were either already Christians at the time of the English invasion, or became very generally Christianised during the fifth and sixth centuries. After the battles of Deorham and Chester the Celts south of the Solway were in three separated districts—the south-western peninsula called Damnonia, Wales, and Cumbria, between the Mersey and the Solway. This last, with the northern district west of the Clyde, later formed vaguely the kingdom of Strathclyde. The Scots were established in Dalriada, which is roughly Argyle and the southern isles, and the Pictish kingdom covered the rest of the highlands. It is probable that the Celts between the wall of Hadrian and the Forth, who had never been Latinised, held their own against, or combined with, the Angle invaders to a much greater extent than to the south of the Tyne.

III

THE RIVAL KINGDOMS


Gildas, who wrote his book between 550 and 560, had very little knowledge of the English kingdoms, though he has much to say of the anarchy prevailing among the Britons. But from about this time Bede and the writers of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle had more substantial records to deal with. The great King Æthelbert of Kent succeeded to the throne in 565, when Ceawlin, the first definitely historical figure in the Wessex records, was king of the West Saxons. Deira and Bernicia were still separate, but were to be united as Northumbria in 588 under Æthelric. The era of final conquest was now setting in. Ceawlin at the moment was the most powerful of the southern kings; and after giving a check to Æthelbert of Kent and subjecting some of the Saxons on the north of the Thames to his sway, he turned his arms against the Britons, drove his way westward at the head of a force not so much of subjects as of confederates, and finally separated Damnonia from Wales by his great victory at Deorham, a few miles from Bath. Thenceforth Saxons and Angles occupied the whole country as far west as the Severn valley, though the power was already departing from the crown of Wessex before Ceawlin died in 593. Æthelbert of Kent waxed great as Wessex weakened, and the eastern kingdoms acknowledged his supremacy as far north as the Humber. Æthelfrith, King of United Northumbria after Æthelric, extended the Northumbrian dominion in the north, and in 613 shattered the allied forces of the Christian Celts at the battle of Chester, having ten years earlier utterly routed Aidan, the king of the Scots of Dalriada, who had gathered a large confederate army in the hope of crushing his rising power.

But Christianity had already obtained a footing among the southern English. The Britons never attempted missionary work among the conquerors. The Irish, Christianised in the fifth century, spread Christianity among the Celts of Scotland, and the contact with them first brought Christianity among the Angles of the north; but it was the mission of Augustine, organised by Gregory the Great himself, which introduced in the south the Latin Christianity which, in the course of the seventh century, dominated all England.

Augustine and his monks were well received by Æthelbert of Kent on their landing in 597; for Æthelbert's wife was already a Christian, being the daughter of one of the Merovingian kings of the Franks. The English seem nowhere to have had any very fervid attachment to their old paganism; there was never anything in the nature of a persecution of Christians. Christianity spread steadily and unglorified by martyrdoms. Unfortunately

it did nothing towards reconciling the Britons and the English, because there were divergencies on what seem to us extremely trivial points of practice between the Welsh and the Latin churches, and both sides obstinately refused to make any concessions.

As supremacy passed from Wessex when Ceawlin grew old, so it passed from Kent when Æthelbert grew old. After his death in 616 Redwald of East Anglia enjoyed a temporary leadership, and even overthrew the Northumbrian conqueror, Æthelfrith, four years after the battle of Chester. He placed on the throne of Northumbria Edwin, the cousin of Æthelfrith, who had been ousted by Æthelric from the throne of Deira.



Saxon knives.

Redwald died next year, and Edwin, now master of Northumbria, became the supreme king. Edwin was converted to Christianity, vanquished the kings who ventured to resist him, and appears to have enforced law and order to an unprecedented extent throughout the whole of his dominion, which extended north to Edinburgh or Edwin's borough.

But there was one of the sub-kings in the midlands, Penda of Mercia, who was staunch to paganism, and was ready to defy the Northumbrian if opportunity offered. The Christian Welsh had no scruple in allying themselves with the old heathen, and Edwin was overthrown by Penda at the great battle of Heathfield.

Penda's Welsh allies ravaged Northumbria more mercilessly than Penda himself. The Northumbrians, however, rallied under Oswald, a son of Æthelfrith, and avenged Heathfield upon the Welsh at the battle of Hexham. Oswald partly recovered Edwin's supremacy over the island, but he never brought Penda to submission; and he, like his predecessor, was overthrown by the Mercian at Maserfeld in 642. After that the effective supremacy all over the island belonged to Penda until his death. It is a little confusing to find Oswald's brother Oswy ruling in Bernicia, while an Oswin of Edwin's line ruled in Deira. However, at last Oswy took heart of grace, defied Penda, and overthrew him at the battle of Winwaed, recovered the crown of Deira, and again established a general Northumbrian overlordship, though Penda had succeeded in consolidating the central kingdom of Mercia which remained in permanent rivalry with Northumbria.

Penda himself was very nearly the last of the pagans, and his son Wulfhere was a Christian. Oswy's reign in Northumbria is especially notable on account of the synod held at Whitby in 664, nine years after the



Saxon England from the 7th to the 10th centuries.

victory of Winwaed. Both Oswy and his predecessor Oswald had become Christians when they were dwelling among the Scots during the exile of their house. Hence Northumbrian Christianity was under the influence of the Celtic church. The outcome, however, of the open discussion held at the synod at Whitby was that Oswy resolved to conform to the Latin in preference to the Celtic practices ; and this very much simplified the process,

carried out under the Archbishop Theodore of Tarsus, of establishing the Latin ecclesiastical organisation under one primate all over England. The six principal kings of Northumbria, Mercia, East Anglia, Essex, Wessex, and Kent had at first a bishop apiece; though Theodore divided each of the kingdoms into a larger number of dioceses, and Sussex, which had hitherto remained in pagan isolation, was brought into line with the rest. There is no sufficient ground for the tradition which attributes to Theodore the introduction of the ecclesiastical parish; but it is notable that the idea of English unity as one church preceded and helped to prepare the way for the idea of English political unity, which did not really take root until the days of Alfred.

Oswy had extended some sort of ascendancy over the Celtic dominion of Strathclyde, which marched with the western border of Northumbria from the Forth to the Mersey. But in 685, fourteen years after his death, Egfrith of Northumbria developed a too ambitious scheme of conquering the Pictish kingdom beyond the Forth. There he was enticed into the mountains, and his army was cut to pieces at the battle of Nechtansmere, a blow from which Northumbria never recovered. By the opening of the eighth century the centre of greatest power was becoming established in Mercia.

England during this century achieved a foremost place as a home of learning and culture. During its first half flourished the Venerable Bede, the most learned man of his time, historian, scholar, and saint; and about the year of his death was born Alcuin, who in matters intellectual became the chosen counsellor of the mighty emperor whom we call Charlemagne. But England was not a happy realm; because nowhere within its borders was to be found a dominion with a strong central government organised on a permanent basis. The different kingdoms were in rivalry with each other, besides being perpetually rent by civil broils, from the absence of any fixed law of succession except that which required that the king should be of the blood royal. There was occasionally a strong and capable king in one or other of the greater kingdoms whose reign is marked by the expansion of his own realm.

Thus, about the beginning of the eighth century, Ine of Wessex drove the Celtic boundary in the southern peninsula fairly back into Devon. This king is also celebrated for that codification of the customs of Wessex known as the Dooms or Laws of Ine. Mercia had remained on terms of what may be called mutual toleration with Northumbria, but after Ine's death Æthelbald of Mercia challenged the temporary Wessex supremacy in the south, and made himself supreme from the English Channel to the Humber. Turning to the north he tried but failed to master Northumbria, which was still strong enough to defend itself, though not to retaliate upon the southern dominion. Then Mercia itself began to fall to pieces even before the old king Æthelbald was himself assassinated; but its power was restored by the great King Offa, who shortly afterwards seized the throne,

and, after setting the affairs of Mercia in order, proceeded to make himself supreme in England.

Offa's reign began in 758 and lasted till 796. He drove Wessex back south of the line of the Thames and Severn mouth and pressed the Welsh back far west of the Severn, marking the new boundary between Britons and English by the great line of Offa's Dyke from Chester to the Bristol Channel. Europe recognised him as the lord of England, and he treated as an equal with Charles the Great, King of the Franks, who had not yet revived the Western Empire and assumed the Imperial crown. But apparently he did not care to trouble himself with the subjection of Northumbria, which, throughout his reign, was in a state of miserable chaos, a term which also applies generally to the Pictish and Scottish dominions and to Strathclyde with its diverse population of Gaels and Britons.

The last years of Offa saw the first attack upon the English shores by a new enemy, the Danes or Northmen from over the sea, whose appearance marks the arrival of the third stage of our history after the Roman evacuation.



Penny of Offa of Mercia, A.D. 757-796.

IV

WESSEX AND THE DANES

In 793 and 794 for the first time Danish longships swooped down upon the monastery of Lindisfarne and the monastery of Jarrow to slaughter and plunder. Somewhere about the same time three pirate crews landed in Dorsetshire and slew the reeve of the shire. But forty years passed before their raiding began in earnest. In the interval a strong man had arisen in Wessex; and Egbert had wrested from Mercia the English supremacy which was to remain with his house permanently, or at least with little intermission, until the Norman seized the sceptre. Egbert, who claimed kinship with both the royal houses of Wessex and Kent, had only recently returned from exile in the land of the Franks when the Witan or Council of Wessex called him to the throne. An efficient king, Coenwulf, was ruling in Mercia, and Egbert made no attempt to challenge his overlordship. But when Coenwulf was succeeded in 822 by his brother Ceolwulf anarchy once more began to set in in Mercia, and the crown was usurped by Beornwulf.

Still Egbert bided his time, nor was he himself the actual aggressor. It would seem that Beornwulf, who had secured the Mercian kingship, invaded Wessex when Egbert was engaged on a campaign in Damnonia. Egbert, returning, inflicted upon him an overwhelming defeat at Ellandune

in Wiltshire. Egbert was prompt to follow up his victory. Kent joyfully hailed him as overlord in place of the alien from Mercia. The king of Essex submitted to him, and on his death Essex was simply absorbed into Wessex. The same fate befell Sussex. East Anglia recovered the independence which it had lost to the Mercians, killed Beornwulf in battle, and allied itself with Egbert; and in 829 Egbert appears to have had no difficulty in making himself master of Mercia. The alliance with East Anglia was soon converted into the subordination of that kingdom, and even the Northumbrian king made formal submission to Egbert as "Bretwalda," the supreme lord of the whole land—a title applied to various earlier kings from Æthelbert to Offa.

Thus when the Danes reappeared in 834, having left the land in peace for forty years, Egbert was undisputed lord of all England, with probably a firmer grip of his dominion than any of his predecessors in the supremacy, with the possible exception of Offa. Let us turn then to an examination of the new invaders.

Northmen is the term applied inclusively to the whole group which, at a later stage, separates into two groups of Danes and Norsemen. The Northmen belonged to the Scandinavian division of the Teutonic race, of which the Goths were the first representatives who had come into touch with Christendom. They occupied Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, and parts of the southern and eastern Baltic coast. They no more formed a united power than the Angles and Saxons of the fifth century, to whose institutions their own bore a marked resemblance. Until the close of the eighth century they had not adopted an aggressive line; and it is not improbable that they were roused into doing so by the aggressive movement of the Franks under Charles the Great against the Saxon nation on the continent. From fighting each other, the petty chiefs turned to raiding the coasts of the great aggressor on the west; and we can hardly avoid seeing a resemblance between their sudden expansion as a maritime power and the English maritime expansion in the days of Elizabeth. They began to take long voyages across the open sea instead of confining themselves to coasting operations; and when they did so they found they could go where they liked, because with their improved seamanship they developed naval tactics before which western fleets were powerless.

The movement began with the Danes at the end of the eighth century; and it appears to have stopped, so far as they were concerned, because they fell back into a condition of prolonged internal warfare, which did not come to an end till their comparative consolidation about 830. Hence, during this time they left the English and Frankish coasts alone. Meanwhile, however, their Norwegian kinsmen followed a new direction; and, passing round the north of the British Isles, harried the coasts of Scotland and Ireland, the latter country suffering horribly from their ravages while England was still enjoying immunity. But about 830 the Danes were at work again, and from this time Danes and Norsemen, sometimes but not

always distinguished by their victims, swept the seas, stormed along the coasts, and swarmed up the estuaries of Western Europe.

The Vikings, as they were called, which probably means "warriors," were at first merely bands of adventurers following the banner of some famous warrior or high-born leader, and their object was simply plunder. Worshipers of the old gods, they had no touch of Christianity. When we hear of the "kings" who led them when they came, not in small companies but in great fleets, we must recognise that the king was simply a war-lord; not the king over a territory, but only over the warriors who followed his banner.

In 834 a fleet of the Northmen attacked the Rhine mouth, and a detachment of them ravaged the island of Sheppey. Two or three years later the operation was repeated, and this time a detachment



The gold ring of Æthelwulf.

landed at Charmouth in Dorsetshire, where, after a stubborn fight with Ecgbert, they remained actually masters of the field, but had been too roughly handled to attempt to hold their position. In 838 they came to Cornwall, and, in alliance with the Cornishmen, moved upon Wessex, but were put to utter route by Ecgbert at Hengston Down.

Next year Ecgbert died. His eldest son Æthelwulf succeeded him as suzerain of England and king of Wessex, a younger son, Æthelstan, being made sub-king of Essex and Kent and Sussex. During the next few years the Danes made perpetual invasions in force on the east coast and the south coast, and also on the Frankish dominion beyond the English Channel, passing round Finisterre, and in 848 capturing and sacking Bordeaux. Sometimes they were beaten off; but usually they routed the levies brought against them, and only retired when they had obtained a satisfactory amount of plunder. By this time they were habitually working not in small detachments but in great combined fleets, numbering sometimes as many as six hundred vessels. In 851, however, they met with an overwhelming repulse at the hands of Æthelwulf and his son Æthelbald at Aclea, either Ockley in Surrey or Oakley near Basingstoke. Probably it was not till 855 that the Danes for the first time wintered in England, the first step to a Danish settlement; the Chronicle refers this event both to 851 and 855, but the defeat at Aclea makes the earlier date improbable.

Two years later Æthelwulf died and was followed on the throne by four of his sons in succession—Æthelbald, who reigned till 860; Æthelbert, who reigned for the next six years; Æthelred (866–871), and, finally, Alfred the Great.

The Danish invasions slackened, and we only hear of them once between 856 and 865, when they again wintered in Thanet. On this one occasion

they met with a sharp reverse. But 865 was the opening year of a continuous onslaught. In 866 they ravaged East Anglia, and in 867 fell on Northumbria, where they remained permanently and before long were indisputable masters of the country. In 868 they struck into Mercia, though they made terms and retired again ; and in 870 they overwhelmed East Anglia and killed its last king, St. Edmund. Then in 871 opened the great attack upon Wessex, led by two kings, Halfdan and Bagsceg, and five jarls or nobles. Against them marched Æthelred and his younger brother Alfred. The spring and summer witnessed a series of desperate battles, Danes and Saxons alternately getting the better in combats which were indecisive. Even the great Saxon victory of Ashdown only meant that the Danes were forced back into their fortified camp at Reading, whence, in spite of the fact that one of the kings and all the five jarls had been slain, they were strong enough to issue again a fortnight later and defeat Æthelred at Basing. This success was repeated two months later, and was followed immediately by the death of Æthelred and the election by the Witan of Alfred in preference to the very youthful son of the dead king.

V

ALFRED THE GREAT

Heavy Danish reinforcements had come up either before or after the battle of Basing, and the king was defeated in his first engagement with them at Wilton. Both sides must have suffered tremendous losses during this "year of battles," and Alfred was reduced to buying a short respite—a dangerous policy but one at the moment inevitable. For the next four years the Danes devoted their attention to Mercia and Northumbria. The latter was completely subjugated by the Northmen, and thenceforward Northumbria was as much Danish or Norse as Anglian ; for although the Danes did not exterminate they took possession of as much of the land as they chose, though they do not appear to have settled to any extent in the old Bernicia.

But half the Danes left Northumbria to the other half and for the time being dominated East Anglia and Mercia ; and these, recruited by fresh Viking bands, again in 876 turned to the invasion of Wessex.

Meanwhile Alfred had been making use of the time allowed him. He had started the nucleus of a navy which should be able to challenge the invaders on the element which they regarded as their own ; and we may presume that he had also been reorganising the military forces of Wessex after the destructive struggle of 871. When the Danes struck they struck hard, suddenly, and without warning, burst across Wessex, and seized and fortified a strong position on the Dorsetshire coast, where they could be joined by their kinsmen from Ireland. Alfred, however, blockaded

them on the land side with a force which they did not choose to engage. The Danes agreed to accept what may be called a ransom as before, but did not keep faith ; a large force, being well mounted, broke through the English lines by night and hurried to Exeter, where they fortified themselves. Alfred could carry neither of the Danish posts, nor could he concentrate before one of them, since that would have left Wessex to be devastated by the other.


In the spring, however, the Vikings in Dorset took to the sea, meaning to join the force at Exeter ;

but the fleet was fortunately annihilated by a storm. Hence the army at Exeter, a sufficiently formidable force in itself, offered after some delay to retire, and was permitted to do so without reluctance. However they only withdrew into Mercia, where they had

allowed an English ealdorman to enjoy the title of a sub-king. They now deprived him of half his territory, as much, that is, as lay beyond Watling-street, the great road running from London to Chester ; and just as the army had before divided, one half remaining in Northumbria and settling it, while the other half abode in the south and prepared for further conquest, so now a considerable proportion of the army seems to have turned to the business of settlement ; while the balance, led by Guthrum, prepared to renew the war in Wessex in conjunction with a force from over the Irish Sea.

Again the move was made suddenly and without warning, this time in the dead of winter, when no one was dreaming of military movements. So effective was it that Alfred himself had to take refuge in the marsh-surrounded isle of Athelney ; and it was some months before he could concentrate a force which could again take the field against the main Danish army. A desperate battle followed at Ethandune or Edington, when Alfred's victory was decisive. Guthrum made terms, and this time the terms were honourably kept. He himself embraced Christianity with many of his followers, and withdrew all claim to that part of Mercia south-west of Watling-street ; and it was agreed that the Danes should remain undisturbed in the settled district beyond, henceforth known as the Danelagh. This was the Peace of Chippenham or Wedmore, 878, which left Alfred free to organise his kingdom. The agreement, with some modification, was confirmed some years later in 886, when the Danes had broken out in spite of their pledges and Alfred had struck some hard blows in return, including the capture of London and its transference to Wessex.

THE FAMILY OF ALFRED THE GREAT



Still Alfred had not yet done with the Danes. It must be borne in mind that ever since the middle of the century the Danish forces in England had merely formed a portion of the organised host of Northmen, who had ceased to be mere desultory raiders and had set out upon a career of conquest on the south no less than on the north of the Channel. Alfred's arrangements with Guthrum effected a settlement only as far as concerned the Danes in England. But the great army met with a severe check on the continent at the hand of the Emperor Arnulf, and, as a consequence, it again turned its attention to England in 892, in conjunction with the great Viking Hasting. By this time, however, Alfred's organisation of Wessex had been completed. The Danes of the Danelagh gave not much active help to their kinsfolk beyond providing them a friendly reception in their own territory. Alfred's newly created fleet proved a satisfactory match for its opponents, and most of the hard fighting was done in Mercia. In fact, the Danish host now found that the king of Wessex was not



Drinking and Minstrelsy among the Saxons.

fighting desperately at bay, but was consistently the victor. At any rate they were fairly beaten out of Alfred's own dominion, and either went home or joined their kinsmen in the Danelagh.

In the last year of the century, 900, King Alfred died ; but his work was accomplished. He had saved Wessex from the Danes, and the saving of Wessex was the saving of England. No monarch has left a name more glorious ; perhaps he is the only triumphant ruler of whom no man has ever ventured to speak in dispraise.

Whatsoever can be accounted the work of a king—as a leader in battle, as an organiser of victory, as an administrator, a legislator, a judge, as a teacher, as an exemplar, in a word as the father of his people—that work was done by Alfred in the face of tremendous difficulties, including personal ill-health, with unsurpassed wisdom and skill. He was happy in successors, who were well fitted to complete what he perforce left unfinished. He supplied the world with a new type, because the pre-eminence of his virtue was only the counterpart of the pre-eminence of his genius. No other man perhaps has been at once so good and so great. An admirable captain in the field, he organised the military system and the military methods of the

Saxons, making possible the triumphs of his children and his children's children. He created a navy, the only one which successfully challenged the sea-rovers on their own element. His codification of the Law gave it a permanent shape. He inspired every man who worked under him with his own enthusiasm for justice and mercy. He made his court the centre of the intellectual light, of the best culture and learning of the day, in order that it might irradiate his people. Charlemagne himself was not a more zealous educator. Never, perhaps, have there been combined in one man such lofty idealism and such practical common-sense. The English nation has habitually refrained from fastening complimentary titles upon its monarchs ; but it has rightly made him the one exception, and claimed for him the name of *the Great*.

Before passing on to the next stage, it will be well to give brief attention to the North, where the Danes appear not to have settled in Bernicia—at least north of the Tyne in the district which came to be known as Lothian ; but the Norsemen constantly threatened to make permanent settlements on the west—in Cumbria and the Isles—and there to establish a Norwegian kingdom. Of the Celtic North we have seen that there were three main divisions—Pictland, Dalriada or Scot-land, and Strathclyde. Matters so fell out that about the middle of the ninth century the heir to the kingdom of the Scots was also, by the Pictish law of succession through the female, heir to the kingdom of the Picts. Thus very much as some seven and a half centuries later the crowns of England and Scotland were united not by conquest, but by the recognised laws of succession, so at this time were the kingdoms of the Scots and Picts permanently united. As a natural consequence the king, Kenneth M'Alpine, a Scot on his father's side, was regarded as a Scot by the world at large, and he and his successors were known as kings of Scotland. It was not, however, till some time later that the Strathclyde kingdom came under the same dominion.

CHAPTER II

KINGS OF THE ENGLISH

I

ALFRED'S SUCCESSORS

WHEN King Alfred died England south of the Tyne was divided into two parts, the line passing diagonally from Chester to the Thames estuary below London. Alfred's treaty with the Danes had simply recognised the facts. Where the Danes were already masters they were allowed to remain masters ; the king had better work to do in organising his half of the country than in embarking upon an impracticable attempt to reconquer the Danelagh. For it must be borne in mind that the north and east had never owned the overlordship of Wessex till forty years before Alfred's accession. In East Anglia the Saxon dynasty had no stronghold, and the last sub-king, St. Edmund, had apparently been chosen by the men of East Anglia from the old line, not appointed by the king of Wessex from Ecgbert's line. The Angles might not love the Danes, but after all the Danes were little more alien than the Wessex folk. Finally, if there was any sort of submission of the Danelagh to Alfred's sovereignty it was of a merely formal character. The "Frith" or agreement with Guthrum manifestly aimed at discouraging intercourse between the Saxon kingdom and the Danelagh, probably because such intercourse was regarded as more likely to bring about hostilities than to increase amity.

Alfred's own kingdom included a large part of Mercia and was under the government of an ealdorman, Æthelred, who may have belonged to the house of Offa, and who had to wife Alfred's very remarkable daughter Æthelflæd, who, after her husband's death, was known as the Lady of Mercia. Alfred's successor on the throne of Wessex was Edward, called the Elder. The relations between Wessex and the Danelagh were doomed not to be permanent, for it was always a difficult matter to keep the Danes from aggressive movement. Hence the reign of Edward was largely taken up with the establishment of a real supremacy over the greater part of the Danelagh, a policy which was practically forced upon the Saxon king and was carried out with great efficiency by the energetic co-operation of the Lady of Mercia, who, like Edward himself, must have inherited her father's military talents and his capacity for inspiring enthusiastic devotion. The great feature of the campaigning was the appropriation of the system


borrowed from the Danes themselves—of establishing fortified posts or *burhs* either at strategic points or where villages had already begun to develop into important towns.

The conquest, however, did not mean the expulsion of the Danes, but little more than their effective acceptance of the supremacy of the Saxon king. Mercia, like Wessex, was parcelled out into shires; but beyond Watling-street the shire was the district appertaining to a Danish military centre such as Leicester or Derby; and it would appear that south of Watling-street the shire was the district appertaining to one of Æthelflaed's boroughs. There was no longer an "ealdorman of Mercia"; but the shires did not get an ealdorman apiece; and in the Danelagh the name of earl replaced that of ealdorman, the earl being apparently in most cases a Danish jarl.

About the year 921, when Æthelflaed died, the absorption of Mercia and East Anglia was completed; and before Edward's death, probably in 924, the kings of Wales and of the North had "taken him to father and lord"; among them Constantine, the grandson of Kenneth M'Alpine, king of the Scots and Picts. This so-called submission was put forward as the starting-point of the claim to the suzerainty of Scotland made some centuries later by Edward I. of England. There is no really adequate ground for doubting that it actually took place, though the technical sufficiency of the evidence can fairly be challenged, since the only real authority for it, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, attributes the event to the year 924, and makes Ragnold of Northumbria a party to it, whereas Ragnold died in 921 according to other authorities. However the chances are that the chronicler was guilty only of some inaccuracy of detail; but Professor Freeman's view that from this time forward the sovereignty of the kings of England over Scotland was "an essential part of the public law of Britain" cannot hold water. There was no more permanence in such a submission, if submission it can be called, than in the submission of Wessex to Offa of Mercia. Public law was not crystallised, and no one at the time would have dreamed of supposing that Scotland had placed itself permanently under the supremacy of England.

Edward was succeeded in 924 by Æthelstan, another great ruler and soldier. In his day the North sought to throw off its allegiance; and the Norsemen from Ireland, under a leader named Anlaf or Olaf, joined with the king of Scots and the people of Strathclyde to challenge the monarch who claimed to be king of all Britain. The forces of the allies were put to utter rout in the great fight at Brunanburh, which is probably to be placed some-

WESSEX KINGS OF ENGLAND



where to the north of the Solway. The battle is commemorated in a fine Saxon war-song—

Clave through the shield-wall the brood of King Edward,
 Hewed the war-linden with blades hammer-wrought ;
 Low lay the foe there, the Scots folk, the ship-folk,
 Death doomed they fell.
 Thick lay the heroes there scattered by javelins
 O'er the shield smitten, the men of the North,
 Folk too of Scotland weary, war-sated.
 Forth the West Saxons in warrior bands
 The live-long day
 Followed the feet of the folk of the foemen ;
 Hewed they the flying folk, thrust through their backs amain ;
 Sharp were their swords.
 Hard was the hand-play the Mercians refused not
 To one of the warriors wending with Anlaf.

Æthelstan's victory was complete, and his supremacy was not again challenged. Meagre as are the chroniclers, we can see how mighty a king he was in the eyes of contemporaries. One of his sisters married the king of the West Franks ; another married Hugh the Great, the father of Hugh Capet, whose dynasty displaced that of the descendants of Charlemagne. Another was the wife of Otto the Great, the restorer of the Holy Roman Empire, and two more were wedded to kings. It may be remarked in parenthesis that a sister of Edward the Elder and of the Lady of Mercia was the wife of Baldwin II. of Flanders and the ancestress of Matilda, the wife of William the Conqueror.

Æthelstan's successor was his very much younger half-brother Edmund, called the "Deed-doer," who, boy though he was, had shared the glories of Brunanburh. But his life, ended by the dagger of an assassin, was too short to enable him to fulfil its promise. In his brief reign a northern insurrection necessitated the infliction of a sharp chastisement ; and it is recorded that he gave a portion of Strathclyde to Malcolm, King of Scots, "on condition that he should be his fellow-worker both on sea and on land," which looks much more like an alliance than a submission on the part of the Scottish king. It is exceedingly probable that about this time the Norsemen from the West (not the Danes of the Danelagh) had made themselves masters of Cumberland and Westmoreland, which are crowded with place-names of Norse not Danish origin, and that this Scottish alliance was made in order to check the danger from the Norsemen.

Edmund himself was not five and twenty when he was assassinated ; and his two small boys Edwy and Edgar were passed by in favour of the last of the sons of Edward the Elder, Eadred, who displayed the family capacity and vigour, and at last succeeded in bringing the turbulent Danes of Northumbria to submission. But his reign was little longer than his brother's ; and on his death Edwy, though only fifteen, was not a second time passed over. Edwy's story is obscure. The young king chose to

marry his cousin, a girl named Ælfgifu, he having fallen into the toils of her ambitious mother Æthelgifu, though the pair were not wedded till some time after Edwy's accession. Ugly stories were canvassed about the dame's influence on the boy, who kicked against the decent control of the counsellors, lay and clerical, in whom his uncles had trusted; as a boy very well might do who had fallen under the influence of a foolish and designing woman. Edwy played the prodigal, while his mother-in-law struck vindictively at her enemies. The result was that Northumbria was in a very short time in revolt, and elected the younger brother Edgar king.



A group of Saxon soldiers about A.D. 1000.

Edwy had to give way and submit to a division of the kingdom which allowed him to reign in Wessex. But five years after his accession he was dead and Edgar was lord of all England.

Both Edmund and Eadred had reposed much confidence in Dunstan, Abbot of Glastonbury, who was prominent among those who had set themselves against Æthelgifu. The chroniclers are all on the side of the clerics, and it is likely enough that the other party have not received fair play at their hands. But there is no warrant for assuming that their tale was a mere partisan clerical invention. The outcome of the whole disastrous business was that Dunstan, who had been exiled by Edwy, became Edgar's principal counsellor, and probably the real ruler of the kingdom. In 960 he became

Archbishop of Canterbury, and was primate and first minister for eighteen years.

Edgar himself ruled till 975, and his reign was a period of consistent prosperity ; he had no opportunities for displaying his capacities as a warrior. The most interesting traditions concerning him personally are that of his state procession on the river Dee, when his barge was rowed by eight vassal kings, and that which ascribes to him the creation of a great fleet of six hundred and forty sail which annually patrolled the seas from corner to corner of the island.



Edgar making an offering.

[From a charter granted by the king in 966.]

The chroniclers concerned themselves rather with the ecclesiastical activities of Dunstan, who was an energetic reformer, and set himself to improving the morals of the clergy on the approved lines of enforcing celibacy and the general rigour of monastic discipline. Though Edgar had ruled all England for sixteen years he was but thirty when he died in 975. In spite of sundry imputations against his

morals the quiet which prevailed throughout his reign bears witness to his capacity ; for those were not days in which a feeble monarch had much chance of peace ; even his exceedingly capable uncles and father had had to fight hard to enforce their dominion.

No sooner was Edgar dead than troubles began. He was succeeded by Edward, his son by his first wife, a boy of thirteen ; but he left also Æthelred, a boy of seven, the son of his second wife Ælfthryth, who also survived him and was determined to place her boy on the throne. Within three years the young king was murdered by the retainers of Ælfthryth. In those three years dissension and disorganisation among the magnates had reached such a pitch that no attempt was made to avenge Edward's death, and his half-brother was immediately crowned, though miraculous properties were attributed to the body of the murdered king, who became known to posterity as Edward the Martyr.

Little enough cause had Æthelred to thank his mother for the crime which placed him on the throne and secured to the man "evil of counsel," the "Redeless," the "Unready," the execration of his contemporaries and the contempt of posterity. But it was not until he was grown up that the



ST. DUNSTAN, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

From a twelfth century MS. in the British Museum.

unhappy king proved himself the evil genius of his country. While he was a boy there was still a decent semblance of government ; but when he was old enough to choose his own advisers he always collected the worst available. Of Alfred a hundred years before it has been said that every word and every act of his seems to have been about the best that could have been said or done at the time. Æthelred invariably did the worst things that he could do. When the time demanded action he was passive ; but if an opportunity occurred for being destructively active he never missed it. *Quem deus vult perdere, prius dementat* ; it is as though Æthelred had been stricken with mental and moral blindness as the penalty for the crime which placed him on the throne. For eight and thirty years he was more or less king of England, and most of those years are a sort of nightmare.


For after leaving England in peace for more than three-quarters of a century the Danes from overseas again began to trouble the land. Vikings who had attempted to harry England since the days of the Great Alfred had invariably received such severe lessons that they were in no haste to repeat their experiments. Now in 980 and the two following years raiders appeared on the coasts. Encouraged by success, they came again in 988. These appear, indeed, to have been merely movements as much Norse as Danish, emanating from Ireland. But enough had been done to make it known among the rovers that organised attack would no longer be met by organised national defence. In the first four years of the last decade of the century the coasts were repeatedly ravaged by the great Viking Olaf Tryggvesen, who was subsequently converted to Christianity and became king of Norway. When the Norsemen landed they found no one to face them but the militia or fyrd of the shire where they happened to make their descent, hastily summoned together, who fought against them now and again stoutly enough. Æthelred had already begun the disastrous practice of buying the raiders off, when Olaf found an ally in Sweyn, the son of Harald Bluetooth, King of Denmark. Their onslaught in 994 produced the second great payment of ransom ; and although there was now a brief interval, the story from 997 onwards is practically a record of perpetual invasions and occasional ransoms, each one larger than the last, diversified here and there by a stubborn fight and more frequently by ignominious disasters, brought about, according to the chronicler, by the flagrant treachery of one or another of Æthelred's favourites, among whom looms portentous the arch-traitor, Eadric Streona.

Perhaps of all Æthelred's performances the most outrageous was the massacre of the Danes upon St. Brice's Day in the year 1002. It is certainly impossible to accept the traditional assertion that a literal massacre of all the Danes in the kingdom was carried out by the orders of the king, but something of the kind certainly occurred in Wessex. The Danes in the Danelagh seem to have played their part quite as energetically as their neighbours in fighting the raiders. But the practical effect was to bring down Sweyn himself, now king of Denmark and of Norway as well, with the

whole Danish host. Still it was not till some years later that Sweyn seems to have made up his mind to eject or slay Æthelred and make himself king of England.

Meanwhile Æthelred's incompetence had been made more manifest than ever; for though the extortion of a huge ransom in 1007 made him turn desperately to an attempt more or less successful to construct a large fleet, the fleet, when built, was so hopelessly mismanaged that it served no useful purpose whatever. At last in 1013, when Sweyn again came into the Humber with a mighty host, the Danes of the Danelagh made up their minds to offer him the crown of England. Sweyn marched through the country, Æthelred fled across the seas, and Sweyn was acknowledged king. But a few days later the Dane died suddenly, leaving his son Knut, popularly known as Canute, to claim the succession.

Then for a brief moment appeared on the scene a national hero,



An Anglo-Saxon bed and its appurtenances (about A.D. 1000).

[From Ælfric's paraphrase of Genesis.]

Edmund Ironside, Æthelred's son, a prince who seemed fitted to revive the older glories of his house. While the young Knut was making ready to enforce his claim, Æthelred returned, showing no sign of any intention of changing his old evil courses. Where Æthelred's direct influence could be felt Edmund could do nothing; but the North was ready to follow a bold leader, having before yielded in sheer despair over Æthelred's incompetence. The South was helpless. Æthelred's death in 1016 came too late. Edmund made a splendid stand against Knut; but sheer treachery brought about his defeat at the battle of Assandun. Even then Knut realised that with such an antagonist victory was by no means certain, and a treaty was made dividing the kingdom on the old lines of the treaty of Wedmore, though the southern portion of the Danelagh went to Edmund's share. But the heroic prince was not destined to be a second Alfred. The treaty had hardly been concluded when he died, being then but five and twenty, while his rival was only twenty-one. It was perhaps


inevitable that Edmund's death should have been attributed to foul play on the part of Knut, who succeeded to the entire kingdom without opposition.

II

FROM KNUT TO THE CONQUEST

At the moment when Knut made himself king of England his character appeared to be that of a bloodthirsty and treacherous tyrant. His Christianity was exceedingly fresh, since his father, Sweyn, had been savagely hostile to a faith of which he had some superstitious dread. But once on the throne the young king curbed his barbaric instincts; only once in his later years did he allow anger to lead him to a foul crime, the sacrilegious murder of his cousin, Jarl Ulf. We may be in doubt how far his merits were due to policy and how far to a regenerate spirit, but their effect was entirely beneficial to England.

At the first Knut found an excuse for killing Edwy, the full brother of Edmund Ironside. He did not venture on the murder of Edmund's children whom he sent out of the country to Olaf, King of Sweden, who in turn passed the boys on to Stephen of Hungary, who brought them up. One of them became



Knut and Emma, his Queen.
[From Knut's Book of Grants.]

the father of Edgar the Atheling, of whom we shall hear again. Next, Knut married Emma of Normandy, the second wife and now the widow of Æthelred, although, she was several years older than he. Possibly she may have learnt to detest Æthelred so thoroughly that she was willing to have the two sons she had borne to him overlooked; at any rate she left them to be bred up in Normandy, and accepted the hand of the Danish king of England on condition that if she had a son by him that son should be his heir. Knut had not succeeded to the Danish throne, as he had an elder brother, Harald; but Harald's early death made him king of Denmark as well as of England; and in the course of his reign he also recovered Norway, which his father had won from Olaf Tryggveson, but which had broken away from Harald, and was ruled by another not less famous Olaf "the Thick," a stout warrior and energetic Christian, who

was ultimately canonised. Thus Knut was in his day the lord of a Scandinavian empire—the first king of England with a great continental dominion, though there were many after him. But, as happened often enough in early days, the empire depended upon the man who had made it, and broke up as soon as he himself was gone.

But Knut the politic meant England to be the basis of his empire ; and he resolved to depend not on a tributary state but on a loyal nation. Therefore after he had once made the weight of his hand and the firmness of his seat to be thoroughly felt, he set himself to the good governance of his realm. The traitors who had sought to curry favour with him by false dealing with Edmund met the stern doom they deserved. The king levied a tremendous ransom from the country in his first year ; but he used it to pay off the Danish host and sent it home, retaining only forty ships, whose crews provided his own *huscarles* or bodyguard. Nor did he rob his English subjects to provide land for his Danish followers, though for a very few of them he found sufficient provision in the forfeited estates of the traitors. As, in later days, Norman kings pledged themselves to observe the “good laws of King Edward the Confessor,” so Knut pledged himself to observe the good laws of King Edgar. But perhaps the most important change which he introduced was the principle of dividing the country into great earldoms, provinces much larger than the old ealdormanships. Although the smaller earldoms were not abolished, the four or five great earls were magnates with much more power than had even been possessed by single ealdorman. Especially notable among the new earls was Godwin, a Saxon of apparently obscure lineage, whom Knut wedded to a kinswoman of his own, and to whom he presently transferred the earldom of Wessex, which at first he had retained in his own hands.

Knut is the subject of much picturesque anecdote which is too familiar for repetition here. His rule was strong, firm, and just, and the country prospered ; but the events of most lasting importance connected with it belong also to the history of Scotland.

The Scots king, Kenneth, together with his kinsman, the king of Strathclyde, was in that crew of kings who rowed King Edgar on the Dee ; but his successor, Malcolm II., recognised no allegiance to Æthelred the Redeless. In one great raid upon Bernicia he had been beaten off with heavy loss, in 1006 ; but one of Knut's early misdeeds was the slaying of Earl Uhtred of Northumbria, who had been the victor in that battle. In 1018 Malcolm again came down on Bernicia and won an overwhelming victory at Carham, the result of which was that Uhtred's brother Eadwulf ceded to him all Lothian ; that is to say, Bernicia between the Tweed and the Forth ; and from this time the Tweed formed the Scottish border. That fact was not altered by a northern expedition of Knut's, on which occasion Malcolm declined to fight and made submission, but retained Lothian. The submission, of course, counted precisely as long as a king of England was able to enforce it.

When Knut died in 1035, being even then not more than forty years of age, his empire went to pieces. Harthacnut, his son by Emma, became king of Denmark; two illegitimate sons, Sweyn and Harold, called Hare-foot, whose mother was an English woman, became kings of Norway and England respectively, though Harold's claim was disputed by Earl Godwin in favour of Harthacnut. Alfred, the younger son of Emma and Æthelred, came from Normandy to Wessex, which had just professed allegiance to Harthacnut; but there he was treacherously seized and blinded and shortly afterwards died, almost certainly with the connivance of Earl Godwin. But Harthacnut was too much engaged in a vain attempt to dispute Sweyn's position in Norway to assert his title in England; and Wessex presently recognised Harold.

Harold, of whom the chroniclers have nothing good to relate, died in 1040, and Harthacnut, after some negotiation, was accepted as king of England. But he lived to do evil for something less than two years. His half-brother Edward, the only surviving son of Æthelred and Emma, was elected king immediately upon the death of Harthacnut, while Denmark passed to the nephews of Knut.

Edward had spent nearly the whole of his life in Normandy, and he loved all things Norman. Also he was a religious devotee. The pious endowment of the Church supplied his principal conception of the duties of kingship, the things of the world and of the flesh being all contemptible.


His court became the home of Norman parasites, lay and ecclesiastical, on whom he bestowed honours and benefices with a lavish hand. The government of the country fell mainly to the three great earls, Godwin of Wessex, Leofric of Mercia, and the Danish Siward of Northumbria, who, in the North, stood comparatively remote from the intrigues and rivalries of the South. Of the three, Godwin, the former ally of the king's mother, had from the outset the most influence with the king himself, whom he persuaded to marry his daughter Edith, or, more correctly, Ealdgyth; who accepted the situation, although the marriage was merely nominal, the king having taken a vow of chastity. Also he obtained considerable though minor earldoms for his two eldest sons Sweyn and Harold. Had Harold been Godwin's



An English monarch of the 11th century.

only son the great earl would probably soon have ruled unchallenged ; but Sweyn and the third son Tostig were lawless ruffians, and Godwin would not cut them adrift. Sweyn got himself deservedly outlawed for carrying off the fair abbess of the nunnery at Leominster. He was apparently on the point of being recalled when he murdered Earl Beorn, who had opposed his inlawing ; to the intense disgust of Earl Harold. Even then Godwin was weak enough to sue for and obtain his eldest son's pardon. But his influence broke down over an ecclesiastical

THE LATER LINE OF ALFRED



quarrel with the king, when the earl persuaded the chapter of Canterbury to elect a kinsman of his own to the Archbishopric without consulting the king, who had chosen for that office the Norman Robert of Jumièges.

While the quarrel was in progress Eustace, Count of Boulogne, the king's brother-in-law, came to Dover on his way to visit Edward. A brawl broke out between the count's

retinue and the Dover folk, with the result that after some sharp fighting the count and his party were ejected. Eustace appealed to Edward, who promptly ordered Godwin to inflict condign punishment on the people of Dover. Edward's predilection for foreigners was bitterly resented, and Godwin refused flatly. Practically he defied the king, but he soon found that defiance was premature ; that the North was against him, and even Wessex was half-hearted. The result was that he and his sons, who had been prepared to stand by their father at all costs, took to flight to Flanders or Ireland and were outlawed.

It was soon evident that the fall of Godwin in 1051 meant the triumph of the king's foreign favourites, though Harold's earldom was given to Ælfgar, son of Leofric. It was at this time that the young Duke William of Normandy visited England and, according to his own statement, was promised the succession by King Edward. But Godwin's eclipse was only temporary. In 1052 he and his sons returned to the coast of Wessex and found the country disposed to rise in their support. The king would not fight, though he might have done so ; and while negotiations were pending there was a rapid and somewhat ignominious exodus of the aliens.

It was no part of Godwin's policy to press his advantage unduly. His pose was that of the true patriot ; and he made no attempt to injure his rivals. He did not even seek once more to restore Sweyn, who never returned to England. But from this time forth Godwin himself, and after him his son Harold, held supreme influence with the king. In fact Godwin sur-

vived his success only a few months. For thirteen years Harold was the king's chief minister, making it his aim to avoid friction with the two great houses of Leofric and Siward. On succeeding to the earldom of Wessex he allowed Ælfgar to be reinstated in his own previous earldom of East Anglia, which had been transferred to Leofric's son during the eclipse of the house of Godwin.


These years are of special interest in Scotland, because it was about this time that Malcolm Canmore, the son of King Duncan, recovered the Scottish throne by overthrowing Macbeth. All the kings of Scotland since Malcolm himself and all the kings of England since the accession of Henry II. descend from Malcolm and his English wife Margaret, the grandchild of Edmund Ironside. The historical facts do not bear much resemblance to the story which Shakespeare extracted from Holinshed. King Malcolm II., the victor of Carham, was a vigorous ruler, who was resolved that his grandson Duncan, who had already succeeded to the kingdom of Strathclyde, should succeed him also on the Scottish throne in accordance with the custom of most civilised nations; whereas, according to the Pictish custom, Duncan was outside the Scottish succession, and the heir of the Scottish throne was the infant son not of Macbeth himself, but of his wife Gruach, who was a widow when he married her. In the interests of the infant, Macbeth challenged Duncan's succession, killed him, very possibly in fair fight, and then held the throne nominally on behalf of his step-child. Duncan himself was but a young man; his infant children, Malcolm and Donalbain, were carried out of the kingdom and placed in charge of Earl Siward of Northumbria, whose daughter had been Duncan's queen. Malcolm abode with his grandfather for fourteen years; and then in 1054 Siward and his sons marched into Scotland with the youth to overthrow Macbeth, who was defeated but not overthrown at the battle of Dunsinane. It was not till three years later that Malcolm succeeded in killing him at the battle of Lumphanan.

If we reckon old Siward the Dane as an Englishman we may say that Malcolm was half Celt and half English; in fact he was half Celt and half Dane, for Siward was pure Dane. But Malcolm, owing to his training, was more a Northumbrian than a Scot; he married a princess of the house of Wessex; and, consequently, hereafter we find Scottish Northumbria or Lothian becoming the real seat of power of the house of Malcolm, while the Anglo-Danish element in the northern kingdom is politically predominant. But Malcolm himself left to posterity a nickname which was not Saxon but Gaelic, Ceanmohr, corrupted into Canmore, "Big-head."



Seal of Edward the Confessor.

Siward's death a year after the battle of Dunsinane wrought trouble in England, for King Edward made Harold's brother Tostig Earl of Northumbria instead of Waltheof, the son of Siward's old age. It is fairly obvious that Harold himself was always anxious to effect a reconciliation between his own house and that of Leofric of Mercia, but there was no love lost between the two families; and Ælfgar, Earl of East Anglia, Leofric's son, opposed the bestowal of Northumbria on Tostig. For no adequate reason assigned, he was outlawed immediately afterwards, though



Taking toll for merchandise.
[From a Saxon Psalter.]

no attack was made on Leofric himself, whose wife was the famous Lady Godiva. Ælfgar went off to Ireland, whence he started to play the Viking, and then joined forces with King Griffith of North Wales; and together they proceeded to harry the marches. Harold had to hurry to the West, where he offered peace and pardon to Ælfgar; the offer was accepted, so there was once more peace between the houses of Leofric and Godwin. After that Harold and Leofric between them brought King Griffith to submission, and made him take an oath of loyalty as Edward's

vassal, which had the usual value. Next year Leofric died, and Ælfgar succeeded to the Mercian earldom, while East Anglia with a portion of Wessex, surrendered by Harold himself, provided earldoms for two of Harold's brothers.

Then came a new quarrel in 1058 between Ælfgar and Harold; Ælfgar was again outlawed, returned to his alliance with Griffith of Wales, and gave him his daughter Ealdgyth in marriage. Again Harold offered him pardon and peace, and he was restored to his earldom; and again Harold turned to chastise Griffith, who in 1063 was killed by his own people. Two years later Harold endeavoured to cement his own alliance with the house of Leofric, then represented by Edwin and Morkere, the sons of Leofric, by marrying their sister Ealdgyth, the widow of the Welsh king. Ælfgar himself had died in the interval and was succeeded in Mercia by his elder son Edwin.

In the interval also, probably in 1064, occurred Harold's involuntary and disastrous visit to Normandy. For some reason unknown he had taken ship, and was wrecked on the territory of Guy of Ponthieu, a vassal of William Duke of Normandy. William made Guy hand over his captive, and then, as a condition of release, required that Harold should take the oath of allegiance to him and should swear to do his best to secure him the succession to the English throne. With death or permanent captivity

in a dungeon as the probable alternatives, Harold took the oath, which, according to tradition, was made the more awful by having been unconsciously sworn upon sundry particularly sacred relics. Seeing that the election of the king of England lay entirely with the Witan, the extent of the obligation involved is problematical, even apart from the question whether oaths taken under such circumstances are to be held binding. At any rate William or his supporters felt it necessary to make a great point of the peculiar sanctity which had been imparted to the oath by the trick of concealing the sacred relics from Harold when he took it.

Having taken the oath, whatever it was worth, Harold returned to England to find that his brother Tostig had been so playing the tyrant in Northumbria that the folk of that earldom drove him out and elected in his place Morkere, the younger son of Ælfgar, and brother of Edwin now Earl of Mercia. Harold refused to back up his ill-conditioned brother, as he had refused to back up Sweyn; Tostig was dismissed into exile, and Morkere was confirmed in the earldom of Northumbria. Finally Harold, as already noted, married Ealdgyth, the sister of the two Leofricsons. For the third time he had the opportunity of crushing the rival house, which, technically at least, was guilty of fomenting rebellion; and for the third time he chose to seek instead peace and reconciliation.

But now King Edward himself was dying. The one Englishman manifestly fit to succeed him on the English throne was Earl Harold. The sole representative of the blood royal was young Edgar the Ætheling, whose father, Edward, the son of Edmund Ironside, had returned with him from Hungary to England some years before, only to die himself within a few months. The whole principle of succession had been turned upside down by the interlude of the Danish kings; and the Witan no longer felt itself bound to choose the one representative of the house of Cerdic when it was obvious that a strong

man was needed on the throne and the Ætheling was a mere boy. Whatever promises Edward the Confessor may have made to William, he undoubtedly himself nominated Harold as his successor. The day after Edward's death Harold was unanimously elected by the Witan, and was crowned by the Archbishop of York, because there were doubts as to the validity of the position of Stigand, the Archbishop of Canterbury.

But, if there was no direct opposition in England, Harold had to reckon with the jealousy of the young earls of the North, and with at least three possible claimants on the continent. There was no doubt at all that the



From an Anglo-Saxon Psalter.



A Saxon slinger.

Duke of Normandy would strike for the crown of England, although he had no conceivable title except the alleged promises of Edward the Confessor and Harold, neither of whom had any power of bestowing the crown whatever. Then there was Sweyn of Denmark, Knut's nephew; and there was at least a possibility that Harald Hardraada of Norway might grasp at a crown which rested so insecurely on its wearer's head. Harold himself was king by election only, without any hereditary title; and he had nothing to trust to but his own abilities and the loyalty of the nation to his

person. The Danelagh was quite as likely as not to declare for the king of Denmark if once the question were seriously raised; and in the meantime the exiled Tostig was intriguing on all sides against the brother who had allowed him to be banished for his crimes.

Harold threw himself vigorously into the work of organisation in right kingly wise, and of preparations for naval defence. No less energetic was the Duke of Normandy, who gathered to his standard by degrees not only all his own vassals, but every adventurous baron and knight in




The King upon his throne.

[From an 11th century Book of Prayers.]

Western Europe who could be enticed by promises of land and loot. Also he took care to obtain the blessing of the Pope on an expedition directed against the perjured blasphemer who occupied the throne of England, and who was, moreover, in league with an Archbishop of Canterbury whose appointment in the Pope's eyes had been uncanonical. For Stigand had obtained the archiepiscopal pallium from a Pope who had been ejected from the chair of St. Peter and was not recognised by his successors. Sweyn of Denmark looked on, but hesitated to act. Tostig tried some raiding in Northumbria on his own account, but was driven off by Edwin and Morkere; whereupon he sailed north and presently joined forces with Harald of Norway, who had taken the seas with a great fleet.

Meanwhile Harold the king had manned his fleet in the South, waiting and watching for the imminent attack of the Norman duke. But the winds blew out of the North and the Norman did not start. The supplies of the fleet ran short, the ships were becoming damaged, and at last when Harold

had to send them round to the Thames to refit, they were caught in a gale and so badly battered as to be useless. At this moment came news from the North that Harald Hardraada was on the coast. With all the forces he could gather on the way and the best of his Wessex troops, Harold dashed to York, where he found that Hardraada and Tostig had already routed Edwin and Morkere and the levies of their earldoms. At Stamford Bridge, a few miles from York, he brought the Norsemen to bay; and there was fought a desperate battle, in which Hardraada and Tostig were both slain and the Norsemen were put utterly to rout. The Norse Chronicle is magnificent but wildly imaginative in its account of the great fight; the




Plan of the battle of Senlac and the surrounding country.
[From Creasy's "Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World."]

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle tells how at the last a single mighty Norseman held the bridge while his comrades retreated, until he was thrust through from a boat below.

The danger from Norway was over, but meanwhile the winds had changed. The Norman had put to sea, and within a week of the great fight of Stamford Bridge the news reached Harold of his landing at Pevensey. South again raced Harold at full speed, reaching London upon the tenth day after the fight, far faster than Edwin and Morkere could move with the Northern levies, whether they were loyal or not, considering how they had already suffered at the hands of the Norsemen. With all speed Harold collected whatever troops he could draw together and hurried down to Sussex, where the Norman was wasting the land; resolved to give battle rather than follow the more prudent policy of devastating

the land before him and forcing William to pursue him and fight at a disadvantage.

He took his stand on the hill of Senlac, lining the whole ridge. On the morrow William attempted to storm his position by direct frontal attack, since a flank movement was not practicable. The foot soldiers could not break the line; then William hurled his mailed horsemen against the English shield wall. The English held their ground. The horsemen on the left wing broke and swept back down the slope, the half drilled English burst from their lines and rushed in pursuit. William saw his opportunity, flung another detachment of cavalry upon the pursuers, and broke in upon the now unguarded flank. But still the English held their ground against charge after charge, till at last the Normans on the right fell back in feigned flight. The English thought the victory was won,



Senlac : Harold receives an arrow in his eye and dies.

[From the Bayeux Tapestry.]

and poured down upon them, except the valiant disciplined body of Harold's huscarles, who still stood in their ranks. The rest had no chance when the Normans turned and charged again upon them. The huscarles fought on stubbornly against odds now overwhelming, till William brought forward his archers, bidding them shoot so that their arrows should drop from above upon the stubborn Saxons. Harold's eye, says tradition, was pierced by an arrow; but he, his brothers, and the huscarles fought and fell to the last man round the royal standard. So perished the last English king of the old English.

III

THE ANGLO-SAXON SYSTEM

In reconstructing the early social and political system of the English we have to find bridges whereby we can connect what we know of the primitive Germans with what we know of the Saxons from the legal codes

which have been preserved and by historical references from which definite inferences can be drawn.

Now, at the stage when we have clear and trustworthy indications of an established system in England, which is not until after the establishment of Christianity, we find in the first place that kingship is universal, that the kingly office is hereditary, but that the succession invariably leaves a certain right of choice exercised by a council known as the Witan or Witenagemot. Usually the choice lies among sons and brothers of the deceased king; but it appears to have been considered legitimate on sufficient grounds to go further afield among those who could claim to represent the blood royal. It was a matter of primary necessity that the king should be himself a reasonably competent person, and obviously inefficient candidates were necessarily excluded. Thus Alfred succeeded Æthelred in Essex, although Æthelred left two young sons, and Eadred was preferred before the sons of Edmund.

In the next place we find a nobility, not limited to a few families of high descent, though these appear to have formed an element in it, but entered primarily as a reward of service; though rank once attained tended to remain with the descendants. This aristocracy falls into two ranks, in which, theoretically, descent, except in the royal family, is not concerned—the king's lieutenants or ealdormen, along with the bishops, and the *thegnhood*, who may be called the gentry. Below these were the great mass of the free *ceorls*, who held the greater part of the soil; and at the bottom of the scale were the actual *theows* or slaves, few in number in the East, but comparatively numerous on the Welsh marches, from which, incidentally, it may be inferred that in the later stages of conquest, immediately preceding the introduction of Christianity or accompanying it, the Britons were enslaved rather than extirpated.

The constitution of the King's Council or Witan is much debated, as also are its powers. It is quite clear that the Witan, whatever its constitution, did control the succession and choose the new ruler on the demise of the king. It is also clear that whenever a king promulgated laws the code was prefaced by statement that it was issued after consultation with and approval of the Witan. We may be confident that no king would venture to introduce marked innovations without first securing the acquiescence of that body. The Witan, which was thus formally consulted, seems generally to have consisted of the bishops and ealdormen *ex officio*, and some other nominated members. On the other hand, when the Witan assembled to make choice of a king it would appear that the freemen at large were entitled to put in an appearance and take their share in the proceedings. In fact it looks as if the king under ordinary circumstances acted on his own responsibility, but in questionable matters disarmed possible opposition by taking the council, so to speak, into partnership and securing the agreement of the magnates of the realm; while the magnates, when the king died, in their turn took the freemen into partnership by admitting them

to ratify the choice of the new monarch. On these occasions the Witan stands as a survival of the ancient assembly of the *tribe in arms*; though, as a matter of fact, it had degenerated into an assembly of the magnates and the free population in the neighbourhood where the assembly was held.

In all this we can see an absolutely plain evolution from the ancient tribal system as depicted by Tacitus. When joint action was undertaken by the tribes, the war-lord was chosen by the tribal assembly; and the elected war-lord developed by degrees into the hereditary monarch. The war-lord had his council of the heads of the clans or great family groups within the tribe, who, in the later stage, were displaced by the ealdormen, who were the heads not of clans but of districts, as clan organisation yielded to district organisation; and the organisation of the Church involved the



The King presiding over the Witan.

[From an 11th century MS. illumination.]

admission of the ecclesiastical heads to this group. Schemes of primary importance were submitted for ratification to the tribal assembly, which normally merely signified its acquiescence by the clashing of arms, but was capable of expressing a disapprobation of which judicious leaders would take due heed. But expansion meant that the tribal assembly expanded also into a national assembly, which was unwieldy and impracticable. It was entirely undesirable that the freemen should be expected or indeed should be willing to gather from all parts of the country to attend such an assembly; so for ordinary purposes the national assembly ceased to exist, because no one except the magnates would take the trouble to attend it, and it survived only in a very mutilated form for royal elections and not much besides.

Now the primitive organisation was definitely tribal, resting on kinship, having as its basis the family, rising to the group of families forming the clan, the group of clans forming the tribe, and the group of tribes forming what for want of a better term we must call the nation. Where a tribe


migrated bodily the tribal system would remain in full force. When it took possession of its new territory it occupied the soil in groups of households who were all closely akin to each other; and the aristocracy—those, that is, who enjoyed a general prestige, formed the inner council, and provided the war-lords—were the chief families of the clans, the families which were regarded as most directly representing the real or hypothetical common ancestor. But migration was not necessarily a tribal act. It might be merely the movement of a restless group of adventurers who, as volunteers, joined the standard of a leader bent on roving exploits. In such cases the tribal or clan system would break down, and kinship would be only the occasional, not the invariable, basis of the settlements of the conquered country; while prestige would attach not to the hereditary clan chiefs, but to the warriors who achieved distinction and who were admitted to the personal companionship of the war-lord, his “comrades” (*gesiths*) and “servants” (*thegns*). The English invasion partook of both characters. The hosts were sometimes mixed bands of adventurers, and were sometimes tribal; while even the mixed bands might sometimes comprise whole clans or substantial groups of kinsfolk.

Consequently on the new soil it would be natural to find both principles at work, and that expectation seems to be in full accordance with the state of things which emerges when the conquest is completed. Place names repeatedly mark obvious groups of kinsfolk, family names, as in practically all cases such as Billington, Wellington, and the like, where the suffix *ing* is to be found; but in other places the *ham*, *tun*, or *wick* has a personal name which rather implies that the settlement was not that of a family group.

And in like manner the local magnates, though occasionally claiming high descent, had generally lost the character of clan-chiefs. The clan-chiefs had been displaced by the king's thegns, the men whom the war-lord had honoured, or their descendants. The ealdorman appointed by the king to represent him in the provinces as his territory expanded was no longer an ealdorman in right of his position in the clan but in right of appointment as a minister of the state; and his position was not hereditary, though there was an inevitable tendency to the retention of the office in the same family whenever it was capable of providing a competent successor. As kingdoms grew they were parcelled out into districts which, in Wessex, were called shires, each under the king's representative, the ealdorman, and the king's shire-reeve or bailiff, who was primarily concerned with the king's financial business. There is good ground for holding that the Wessex shires corresponded to the minor principalities which were absorbed by the king of Wessex. The ealdorman was a sort of lieutenant-governor and commander of the military forces of the shire, while the reeve was the king's financial agent and at the same time a sort of vice-lieutenant-governor. At a later stage, when the ealdorman became the earl and in Latin the *comes*, the sheriff was in Latin the *vice-comes*.

NATION MAKING

State policy, war, peace, and legislation belonged to the king and the council. Legislation, however, was not, as in modern times, a matter habitually engaging the central government. The law meant established customs, conditions, and conventions. Conditions changed slowly, and legislation meant merely the adaptation of customs to changed conditions; therefore it was very rarely required. When Christianity was introduced Æthelbert of Kent had to modify the existing code so that it might square with Christian ideas. Again variations of custom were introduced locally, so that from time to time it became necessary to codify customs and impose a degree of uniformity. Hence come the codes or "dooms" of successive kings; and when such codes were issued the kings took the opportunity of



The King and his Thegns.
[From a MS. in the Bodleian Library, Oxford.]


introducing such modifications of their own as were likely to be generally approved. Such almost exclusively was the character of legislation under the Saxon kings.

Apart from high policy and legislation the business of government lay with the local authority, and the local authority was the local assembly of freemen. The local unit was the *tun* or township, the village, the group of households whose members occupied the surrounding land, and settled such of their affairs as required settlement in the town's meeting. The townships were grouped in *hundreds*, a term which probably originated in days when the normal village contained ten households or thereabouts, and ten villages or thereabouts, making up approximately a hundred households, were grouped together for military purposes and for the common settlement of their affairs. So the freemen of the hundred assembled periodically in the hundred-moot to arrange common action and administer justice. Similarly, to deal with the larger matters whereby the whole district or shire was

affected, the freemen of the shire gathered periodically to the shire-moot to perform functions which had originally been discharged by the tribal assembly.

Justice was administered in these "folk-moots" or popular meetings, each under the presidency of its reeve—town-reeve, hundred-reeve, or shire-reeve. Primarily it appears that the whole body were judges. At a later stage, when the number of households in the hundred had very much increased, a kind of representation took the place of the general assembly of all freemen. The principal landholders were expected to attend, and from each township the parish priest, the reeve, and the four "best men," as well as those who were personally concerned in any questions arising. Further, it seems to have become customary for a sort of committee of twelve to act as judges in place of the whole body; and probably it is to this custom, already established by the time of Alfred, that we must attribute the tradition that Alfred himself invented Trial by Jury. On the other hand, it is also likely, though not certain, that the prestige attaching to the person of the reeve of the court gave him a practical authority, which gradually made him in effect a superior magistrate; and that out of the jurisdiction thus acquired by him grew the jurisdiction of the lord of the manor.

The "dooms" of the kings are mainly concerned with crimes of violence, or at least injury to person or property. The penalty was habitually in the form of a fine—the *weregild* payable as compensation to the injured person or his relations by the wrong-doer or his kinsmen, and the *wite* payable to the crown. By the end of the ninth century the amount of the fine was assessed precisely according to the rank of the injured person, and there was an elaborate scale of payments according to the injury. Thus the ordinary free ceorl got more compensation for the loss of an eye than for an injury to his hand; but the thegn got bigger compensation than the ceorl for a like injury. As a general principle the wrong-doer was personally responsible for paying a proportion of the fine, and his kinsmen were responsible for seeing that the balance was paid, the Saxon



Saxon tower of Sompting Church, Sussex.

system, as already noted, being primarily based on the idea of kinship. But the system of kinship did not apply universally to all settlements even at the outset, and did so less and less as time went on; hence, at a later stage, the joint responsibility of the kinsfolk gave place to the joint responsibility of the district or group of householders which formed a *tithing*. The whole system of the weregild appears to have been invented in order to get rid of the old system of the blood feud. When, under primitive conditions, one member of a kinship, called a *maegth*, was injured, the whole family took the matter up and avenged it on the *maegth* to which the injurer belonged, and so retaliation was endless. The point of the weregild was that, when the fine had been paid, the feud was ended and further retaliation was not regarded as justifiable, but became, as it were, a breach of the king's peace. Here, again, what Alfred and his successors did was to systematise the conflicting practices which had grown up in different parts of their realm.

There is perhaps nothing in which our modern ideas stand in more marked contrast to those of early times than the administration of justice. For us the point of first importance is that no man shall suffer if there is any reasonable shadow of a doubt of his guilt. In the medieval view it was more important that the crime should somehow be punished than that the innocent should escape; hence the doctrines of common local or family responsibility. But still more curious is the change in the conception of evidence; our insistence on positive proof is so marked that merely circumstantial evidence has to be extraordinarily strong before it is allowed to carry weight. But apart from cases where the criminal was taken practically red-handed, the evidence which satisfied our forefathers was hard swearing not so much to facts as to character. The accused, when the evidence as to facts was not obviously conclusive, was held guilty unless he could support his own oath of innocence by producing substantial "witnesses" to his character; and the value of their oaths was assessed according to their social position. The final appeal of the accused was to the justice of Heaven, the "ordeal" which found its later counterpart among the Normans in the Wager of Battle on the hypothesis that God would defend the right and give victory to the innocent. For anything like our modern sifting of evidence there was no machinery whatever.

The whole system of land settlement and land tenure is a matter of much controversy. The primary type of settlement with which we must start is that of the group of households planted together and forming a *tun* or township. To the township was allotted a sufficient area of land, of which only a part was at once taken up for cultivation and meadow land, while the remainder was waste land and common property. The land brought under cultivation was allotted to the different households in strips of an acre or half an acre, each household originally receiving altogether a hide of a hundred and twenty acres; that is usually one hundred and twenty strips, for the half acre was probably a later subdivision. But the strips of each household were not contiguous. Supposing there were ten households,

each household had one strip in each group of ten strips, the strips being separated merely by balks or ridges. They were worked in common by the labour and the plough-teams of the whole community, though each household took the produce of its own strips. This is what is called the Open Field System.

As far as this system is concerned, the expansion of the population would find its needs met partly by taking in more of the waste land and partly by the planting of new settlements, since for some centuries there was much more land available than could be brought under the plough. But individuals were also allotted more than a single equal share—more than the individual household could work. In the later stages the possession of five hides of land entitled a man to claim rank as a thegn. Moreover, whole



A Saxon banquet at a round table.

estates were allotted to the king, which he, in his turn, could bestow upon others, or could apply to ecclesiastical endowment. How were these larger estates worked, unless a large subject population had been preserved which was set to labour upon them in a more or less servile character? The difficulty of believing that any large proportion of Britons was thus preserved, except on the Welsh marches, has already been dwelt upon; although there is strong reason for supposing that the class in Kent called *laets* did fall under this category. The riddle in fact is not solved. But it seems reasonable to suppose that where a large estate was granted there would be many members of large households who would be willing to become in a way tenants of the great landholder in preference to accumulating upon their own household "hide." The thegn, therefore, would plant his estate with workers, dividing it up among them in the same way as in the free-land community, but reserving to himself a share of the strips, the occupiers of the rest holding their strips on condition of cultivating his strips for him.

Whether or no this be on the whole a correct account of the course of development, what we do find in the later times is that in most villages, though not in all, the villagers were bound, according to the size of their holdings, to render a fixed amount of service in cultivating the lands of the lord, the tenure of their own holdings being conditional only on the rendering of this service. The enormous majority of these occupiers of the soil did not forfeit their political freedom and their political rights merely because they held their land on condition of service; and they remained in their




A Saxon gleeman, 11th century.

own eyes and in those of every one else free ceorls. The expansion of households and the movements of population also led to the subdivision of the original hide, so that by the eleventh century at least the ceorl's normal holding was thirty acres. It must be added that there was also an actually servile population—to be accounted for partly by slaves originally brought with them by the invaders, partly by descent from the Briton women who were spared, and partly by captives taken in early wars between the English themselves and between English and Britons. Actual slaves, however, never formed more than a small proportion of the population.

Broadly speaking, then, we have these divisions: thegns and great landowners who held estates which were partly demesne lands—that is, reserved to themselves—and were partly occupied by tenants who had to cultivate the demesne land and also, as a rule, to make some sort of payment in kind—fowls or pigs or grain. Next there were the free ceorls who had no great estates, but occupied their holdings under the original free tenure, owing service to no man. Next there were the free ceorls who occupied their holdings on condition of service to the lord—holdings which might be anything from five acres or even less up to one hundred and twenty, but were most commonly either thirty or fifteen acres. And last there were the theows or the serfs who, if they had a plot of land at all, held it merely by grace of their owner. Land which any one had acquired by grant or written agreement was known as *boc-land*; while land which was held simply by customary tenure was known as *folc-land*.

The village aimed at being self-sufficing—at producing for itself all that its inhabitants required. Commerce consisted practically in the exchange of superfluities for goods of which there happened to be a deficiency. Each village supplied its own necessary artisans—the smith, the thatcher, or the carpenter—who was paid primarily not for the job, but for doing whatever turned up to be done in the village, by having a holding allotted to him, or being freed from his share in the common work of tillage, a system which gradually gave way to payment by the job. Payment was ordinarily made in kind, since there was very little money available, just as commerce was conducted by barter, not by money pay-

ments. In the same way when the lord wanted extra work done which was not in the bargain he made payments in kind to the workmen, which were only beginning to be to a small extent replaced by payments in cash in the eleventh century. Towns in the modern sense, large aggregates of populations mainly taken up with the business of making and exchanging goods, had hardly come into existence, though there were a few places like London which formed exceptions to the rule. Here and there where traffic accumulated, as at bridges and fords, cross roads and shrines to which pilgrims congregated, there were larger communities; and when in the days of Alfred and his sons fortified points were established either for strategic reasons or for the protection of places which had already acquired some importance, there the population tended to increase, attracted by the



The old English burh, or fortified place.

[From a MS. in the Bodleian Library.]


greater security. Hence the borough of later days got its name from having been at first a *burh* or fortified place. But the population even of the borough was mainly occupied with agriculture; and in the days of the English conquest the mere idea of a town was so foreign to English conceptions that practically all the towns which had grown up during the Roman occupation were not preserved by the conquerors, but were destroyed and not rebuilt.

The English had the character of sea-rovers like the Northmen after them, when they first invaded Britain. But they ceased to pay attention to the sea. Not being in any sense commercially minded, they sought no intercourse with the peoples across the channel; and they only began to be seamen again when King Alfred perceived that a strong navy provides the most effective defence for an island. In fact, until the Danish incursions, the idea of national defence hardly presented itself. When a king went to war with his neighbour he called the freemen in general to arms, all

freemen being liable to serve in the *fyrð*, the *fyrð* being summoned by shires which, probably in Wessex where the system arose, originally corresponded to sub-kingdoms. When the *fyrð* was summoned, the ceorl put on his armour and marched to the field with his sword on his thigh, and probably with his scythe fixed endwise on a pole. Hence the bill of later days was merely an adaptation of the scythe transformed into a spear. When the fighting was over he went home and turned his bill into a scythe again. And he always objected to being summoned anywhere outside his

own shire. Alfred reorganised the *fyrð*, so that only a portion of the freemen were summoned at one time, and the ordinary agricultural operations could still be carried on while the force was in the field.

Saxon and Dane alike fought on foot; but the Danes taught the English the advantage of preparing entrenched and palisaded positions. In 871, the "year of battles," the Danes saved themselves from destruction by falling back to their entrenchments when defeated in the field, and against their palisades the Saxon hurled himself in vain. It was in imitation of the Danes that Alfred and his offspring created the fortified posts into which garrisons could be thrown, as it was from the Danes that Alfred learned to build improved ships of war. The Danes were also made formidable through their appreciation of the usefulness of rapid movement. They made it their first business on landing to sweep



Anglo-Saxon spears, &c.

in every horse they could lay hands on. But they used horses for transit not for fighting; possibly for pursuit and flight, but not for charging in the field. The incapacity of the English in general for grasping the uses of cavalry were largely responsible for the overthrow at Hastings. They had no cavalry, and the only way to pursue a flying foe was to break their own line and rush forward from behind their shield-wall or palisade;—authorities are not in agreement as to whether their position at Hastings was actually palisaded. William the Norman finally won the day by anticipating the methods of Edward I. in attacking an infantry which proved impenetrable to unaided cavalry charges. He combined artillery with cavalry, and his bowmen made breaches in the enemy's ranks into which his horsemen could penetrate. But the might of the bow was only perfected after more than two centuries, and even then the English, and the English alone, possessed it in perfection. At Hastings the Norman used only the short bow, an instrument infinitely less powerful than the later long-bow, though it served its purpose against troops which had no cavalry to drive the archers

out of range, and no archers of their own. For two hundred years after Hastings no foot-soldiery seem again to have stood against the charge of mailclad horsemen.

Of the early English literature little needs to be said, for little enough has been preserved. Early writers wrote for the most part in Latin; in the vernacular there is practically nothing before Alfred except the ancient song of Beowulf, which dates from pagan times, and the poem of Caedmon, written about 670, based upon the Book of Genesis. Under Alfred's direction began the compilation of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, a work of much historical value, which has also the credit of preserving the fine lay of the battle of Brunanburh, of which some lines have been quoted. Alfred also deserves gratitude for translating and editing standard historical and philosophical works of his own time. But the great king's own high ideals of education scarcely took any very deep root; and perhaps the early eighth century, when Bede flourished at Jarrow, was the only time at which the English stood in the front rank of their contemporaries as a nation among whom culture and learning flourished.



In the stocks, 11th century.

CHAPTER III

THE NORMANS

I

THE CONQUEROR

HAROLD'S efforts had failed to make a united nation of the English. Wessex and East Anglia, which had known Harold himself as earl, were loyal to him; Mercia and Northumbria were ill-disposed to the house of Godwin, and the young earls, both of them of the house of Leofric, were either jealous of Harold or too lacking in vigour and decision to throw themselves whole-heartedly into a struggle against the Norman. It was Harold, not they, who saved the North from Hardraada, but they left him to defend the South from the Norman entirely with the levies from Wessex and East Anglia. It was not the national army which William had beaten at Senlac. Nor would even a national army have been likely to prove successful against the invader, because the English nation refused to recognise that the conduct of war was a scientific operation. It relied entirely on hard hitting, and declined to adopt new methods. Nor were the men who formed the fyrd adequately trained even in their own methods; Harold's disciplined huscarles alone stood in their ranks when the temptation to charge became strong. It seems as if Harold was the one man in England with a head on his shoulders, and that he came to grief through not realising the extreme stupidity of his countrymen.

After Hastings a solid party of those who knew that they had forfeited all prospect of favour at the hands of the Norman were eager to maintain resistance, and they succeeded in persuading the Witan at London to elect young Edgar the Ætheling king. But neither the boy himself nor any one near him was competent to organise a fresh defence. And there was another section who had already despaired of offering any effective resistance to the Conqueror, and were resolved to try and make their peace with him at any price. Sickness prevented the Conqueror and his army from moving at once; but the delay that a strong man might have used for vigorous reorganisation only gave the English time to grow more jealous and suspicious of each other. When William did move he did not march straight upon London, but struck across the Thames at Wallingford, thus interposing his army between the South and any possible succours from the North. Edgar, sundry bishops, the Londoners, and all the leading

men who were still in the South, came in and made submission, offering William the crown, which was duly set on his head at Westminster on Christmas Day.

William intended to reign not as conqueror but as lawfully elected king, though he had to satisfy his followers. He would act according to law himself and would compel his followers to do so ; but that did not prevent him from interpreting the law as best suited him. And it suited him to claim that Wessex and East Anglia had been in rebellion against him as their lawful sovereign, and that there was merely a difference of degree between those who had fought against him in arms and those who had failed to fight for him. Consequently all lands in Wessex and East Anglia were forfeited ; the less "guilty" of the English were then permitted to recover possession at a price, receiving their lands back as tenants from the king ; but most of the land was not restored to the English proprietors, but was distributed among the adventurers and barons in William's train, always as property of his own granted to them on feudal tenure.

The royal estates William appropriated. Edwin and Morkere and Waltheof, the son of Siward of Northumbria, who held the earldom of Huntingdon, were not deprived of their earldoms, but were kept by William in attendance on himself ; and he now considered the position sufficiently secure to warrant his withdrawal to Normandy, there to set matters in order. He left his half-brother Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, in charge south of the Thames, and William Fitz-Osbern in charge of the country north of the Thames up to the Tees.

But the Frenchmen, as William's followers were inclusively termed, behaved after the fashion of the time as masters of a conquered country ; insurrection flamed up in the West. Within the year William was back again. Submission was prompt when William marched upon Exeter, but Northumbria and Mercia chose to declare for the Ætheling. Again William's approach was met by submission. He bestowed a contemptuous pardon on Edwin and Morkere, while the Ætheling took flight to Malcolm Canmore in Scotland, where that long-headed ruler gave him an asylum, but at the same time was at pains to secure what would now be called an *entente* between himself and the Conqueror, to whom it is also possible that he rendered some very indefinite homage.

But as soon as William's back was turned Northumbria again broke



Great seal of William I.

NATION MAKING

into revolt and was again reduced to immediate submission by the rapidity with which William reappeared in the North. Then in the late summer Sweyn of Denmark took his turn and sent a great mixed fleet to the Humber, whereupon Northumbria and the Fen country again rose and



England and the Lowlands under Normans and Plantagenets.

cut up the garrisons which William had left. This new northern insurrection and invasion gave the signal for sporadic insurrections all over the country. Again William sped to the North, drove the Danes into the district of Holderness, where he could not attack them without a fleet, and then proceeded to lay Yorkshire desolate. Twenty years afterwards, if the case of one district may be regarded as a fair sample, three-fourths of the Yorkshire villages were uninhabited, and the remainder had only a fraction of

their former population. In the winter—we are still in the year 1069—William ravaged westwards to Chester and Shrewsbury, and in the meanwhile the Danes came out of Holderness and sacked Peterborough, after which they made up their minds that there was no hope of a conquest and took their departure.

The last struggle of resistance was left to the half mythical hero, Hereward the Wake, who formed his “camp of refuge” at Ely, whence he struck right and left at the Normans, and where he held out until the end of 1071. The traditions concerning him are faithfully embodied in Charles Kingsley’s novel which bears his name.

The conquest may be said to have been completed in 1072, when William marched into Scotland and again obtained a submission from Malcolm Canmore, whose recent marriage to the Ætheling’s sister Margaret was a somewhat serious menace to the peace at least of Northumbria. The astute Scot dismissed Edgar himself from



Normans at dinner.

[From the Bayeux Tapestry.]

Scotland, at the same time counselling him to make his peace with William and become his man—advice which the Ætheling subsequently took and never had reason to repent. But Malcolm at the same time got for himself a grant of lands in England for which he did homage; and Scottish historians have always claimed that whatever homage was thenceforth rendered by a king of Scots to the English king, with one exception, was rendered not for the Scottish crown but for those lands south of the Tweed.

The long series of insurrections and their suppression meant the extension to all England of the principles which had been adopted in Wessex. Wherever there was a rising, lands were confiscated and bestowed upon Frenchmen, while only a few of the English were reinstated. Confiscations did not apply to the holdings of the ceorls, who remained in occupation, holding from the new French lord or the reinstated Saxon lord theoretically on the same terms as before. The new lords were not permitted to build castles at large; the Norman “keeps” were constructed by licence of the king. The effect of the piecemeal process of conquest and confiscation was that in each new region the lands were distributed among a number of Frenchmen; so that, although one man might be lord of a great amount of territory, his several domains were scattered up and down the country instead of forming one large unit. Single estates in many cases corresponded to shires and formed earldoms; but no earldom was great enough to give the earl a chance of standing to the king in any such relation as the

great feudatories of France, such as the Duke of Normandy himself, bore to the French king.

The fact may or may not have been due to deliberate policy on the part of the Conqueror; it is quite sufficiently accounted for as the natural outcome of the way in which the confiscations were carried out; but the practical effect was to secure the crown against the absorption of excessive power by any one vassal. The position of the crown was further fortified by its right of control over the marriages of vassals, so that the king could prevent a dangerous accumulation of estates by the marriage of a great baron to a neighbouring heiress. The earls on the Welsh and Scottish marches were necessarily granted large powers because those regions were open to attack from Scotch and Welsh; but they would have had to act together in order to have any chance of resisting the Crown; and the power of every earl was checked by the power of the sheriff who, though frequently he was a great baron, held his office entirely at the king's pleasure.


This situation was not altogether pleasing to the great Norman barons; and when there was a rising in 1075 it was an insurrection not of the English but of the Norman barons, the Earls of Hereford and Norfolk, who inveigled Waltheof into their conspiracy. Their grievances, as might have been expected, were connected with the prohibition of a marriage between the two families and the interference of sheriffs with what the earls regarded as their rights. But Waltheof was an incompetent conspirator; his conscience got the better of him, and he revealed the plot to Lanfranc, the Archbishop of Canterbury, then acting as justiciar while the king was abroad. The attempted insurrection collapsed, the English shire levies obeying the call of the government; as they habitually did when the Crown appealed to them against the barons, who were their immediate oppressors. The execution of Waltheof removed the last of the Saxon earls, since Edwin and Morkere had blotted themselves out in the days when Hereward was holding his camp of refuge at Ely; and there was no other attempt on the part of the barons to set William at defiance. When in 1082 the king's half brother, Odo of Bayeux, began to form ambitious projects of his own, even although they were not ostensibly directed against the king, William threw him into prison and no one ventured to espouse the cause of the bishop.

Once again danger threatened the realm in 1086, when Knut of Denmark, Sweyn's successor, designed a great invasion. The assassination of Knut completely exploded the project; but the danger had forced unusual preparations on William, who gathered a great folc-moot at Salisbury, where all the landowners were required to take the oath of allegiance to the king, whether they were tenants-in-chief holding directly from him or held land from other overlords. The principle was implied that allegiance to the king overrides allegiance to a vassal of the king.

It is of fundamental importance to realise that in theory the system of the government of England was continuous and was not changed by the

Norman Conquest. The old institutions remained. The Witan and the various folc-moots remained. The fyrd remained. The ceorls occupied the land on the same tenure as before. The relations of the Church to the Crown and the Papacy were theoretically unchanged. But it is no less necessary to realise that in actual practice the changes brought about by the conquest were enormous.

At the root of these was the fact that the native magnates in Church and State were entirely displaced by foreigners. Nearly every great landowner or ecclesiastic was a foreigner, who interpreted his position and his powers in accordance with the ideas to which he was accustomed. They were foreigners, moreover, who looked upon the English as a conquered and inferior population; and the conquered population had no practical means of redress, whatever brutalities might be inflicted upon them. Commonly enough they sought redress by taking the law into their own hands, thereby bringing down upon themselves increased brutality at the



Arches in the nave of St. Alban's Abbey Church.

[Built by Abbot Paul between 1077 and 1093.]

hands of the lawless, and inviting severity at the hands of the government and of those officials whose business it was to enforce the law. Hence arose the one piece of legislation which formally distinguished between Saxon and Norman. An especially heavy penalty was imposed for the slaying of a Norman; and if the slayer were not discovered the hundred was liable for the whole fine. A hundred years later Richard Fitz-Neal explained in his *Dialogue on the Exchequer* that a murdered man was assumed to be a

Norman unless proof was forthcoming that he was not; and by that time the presumption was that any one outside the class of villeins had some Norman blood in his veins, because inter-marriage had become the general practice, and the two races outside the villein class were indistinguishable. But at the outset the effect must have been to intensify the sense of race antagonism.

Otherwise the legislative innovation felt most grievously by the English was the Forest Law, which introduced unheard-of penalties, especially that of blinding for the slaying of deer. William "loved the tall deer as he had been their father." Great tracts, notably the New Forest, were converted into game preserves, and villages and churches were desolated if they fell within the regions appropriated by the Crown to hunting. Domesday Book shows clearly enough that the actual desolation was much less than later tradition made it out to have been; the real popular grievance was that hunting was forbidden where before it had been free, and poaching was savagely penalised. It is rather curious to observe by the way that William all but abolished the death penalty, though, on the other hand, a repulsive system of mutilation was substituted for it.

The last flame of the English resistance to the Conqueror was stamped out five years after he seized the throne. No long time elapsed before the insurrection of Roger Fitz-Osbern of Hereford and Ralph Guader of Norfolk—the latter apparently of mixed English and Breton descent, though he fought on William's side at Hastings—taught the barons once for all the futility of defying King William, the more emphatically because his own presence was not required for their suppression. Administration during his absence was largely in the hands of Archbishop Lanfranc, for William himself was frequently occupied in Normandy, owing partly to dissensions with his eldest son Robert and with his nominal suzerain, the king of France.

It was while engaged in a war in Maine that the Conqueror met his death from internal injuries caused by the stumble of his horse. Normandy he left to Robert with whom he had become reconciled. To the English succession he commended his second son William. To the third son Henry, the only one born after his accession in England, he left only five thousand pounds, in the confident conviction that he could take very good care of himself. "A very wise man was King William," says the contemporary English chronicler, "and very mighty; of a power and dignity greater than any that went before him. Mild he was to the good men who loved God, and beyond measure harsh to the men who gainsaid his will. Thrice every year he wore his crown as often as he was in England; and then were with him all the great men all over England, archbishops and bishops, abbots and earls, thegns and knights. Also he was a very stark man and cruel, so that none durst do anything against his will. Not to be forgotten is the good peace that he made in this land; so that a man who in himself was aught might go over his realm with his bosom full of gold

unhurt. Nor durst any man slay another, had he done ever so great evil to the other. Surely in his time men had great hardships and many injuries. Castles he caused to be made and poor men to be greatly oppressed. He fell into covetousness and altogether loved greediness. The great men bewailed and the poor men murmured thereat; but so stark was he that he recked not of the hatred of them all; but they must wholly follow the king's will if they would live or have land or property or even his peace."

II


WILLIAM AND THE CHURCH

When the Duke of Normandy claimed the crown of England he obtained the papal blessing for his enterprise from Pope Alexander II., under the guiding influence of Hildebrand, who himself succeeded to the papacy as Gregory VII. in 1073. Hildebrand was the incarnation of that papal policy which claimed for the Vicar of Christ a supremacy over all temporal rulers; for the voice of Christ's Church an authority to which all merely temporal authority must submit; and for the whole clerical order, Christ's ordained ministers, a position independent of the secular state and separated from its jurisdiction. The remoteness of England had at all times kept the clergy of England from feeling themselves practically amenable to the discipline of Rome; and the Conqueror secured the papal favour partly because it was certain that the insular separateness of the Church of England would be broken down by the infusion of a large Latin element, and by the introduction in high places of French and Italian clergy bred within the sphere of the Roman influence.

This was one practical effect of the Conquest. Vacant bishoprics and abbeys were filled up with the foreign clergy, who enforced the stricter discipline on which Hildebrand and the whole of his school insisted. The uncanonical Archbishop Stigand was deposed from the see of Canterbury, and the reorganisation of the Church was entrusted to his successor, Lanfranc of Pavia, whom William had made abbot of Caen eight years before. William and Lanfranc understood each other thoroughly; and neither the king nor the archbishop had the slightest intention of surrendering to Rome a jot of their own authority in England. Whatever Hildebrand may have expected, the papal demand that William should acknowledge himself as holding England as a fief of Rome met with courteous but unqualified rejection. William would admit of no question that the king was supreme in his own dominion, and that no man, lay or clerical, should appeal against his authority to any other authority whatever. Such duty as his predecessors on the English throne owed to the Pope he too would pay, but nothing more.

Gregory launched thunderbolts against every one who should be con-

cerned in what was called Lay Investiture, a subject which continued to be a burning question until well into the twelfth century; but William was supported by Lanfranc in maintaining the right of the king of England to control important ecclesiastical appointments. Gregory insisted on the celibacy of the clergy, secular as well as monastic. But whereas all monks



An aisle in the Chapel of St. John, Tower of London.
[Built by William the Conqueror.]

were under an express vow of celibacy, the clergy outside the "regulars" or monastic orders were under no such vow, and their marriage was merely forbidden as a matter of discipline. Hence the prohibition had been very commonly disregarded. Therefore, in spite of Gregory, all marriages already contracted by the clergy were in England recognised as valid, though no marriages contracted after the papal decree were to be recognised. One substantial change, however, was made by William and Lanfranc, in the complete separation of the ecclesiastical from the secular courts of justice, probably in 1076; and in the same way somewhat earlier was instituted the practice that the clergy assembled at the Great Council should deliberate apart for the framing of ecclesiastical legislation. In other words, the principle of differentiation between clergy and laity, of emphasising the

distinction between them, which was an essential part of Hildebrand's policy, was accepted and acted upon by William and Lanfranc without setting Church and State in antagonism, but with the effect in later years of bringing whatever antagonism there was between Church and State into more marked relief.

III

ENGLAND AND THE CONQUEST

In point of law the Norman conquest was supposed to have made no change in the government of England. The old institutions remained in force. The king ruled, taking counsel with his Witan. The freemen still assembled in the shire-moot and the hundred-moot for the conduct of local affairs. The ealdorman of early days, the earl, by his Latin title the *comes*, was still the chief man of his earldom, which was again reduced to the proportions of a shire. The king's financial officer, shire-reeve, or sheriff was still the Crown's principal agent in the shire, discharging also certain administrative functions which justified his Latin title of *vice-comes*. The Crown still descended by election of the Witan from among the royal family, though it was a new dynasty which occupied that position, since throughout the eleventh century the exclusive title of the house of Wessex had been persistently ignored. Still as of old the freeman was bound at the summons of the sheriff to attend the gathering of the fyrd in arms, and still the thegn, the holder of comparatively extensive lands, was bound to bring to the field a following in due proportion. Still, as before, the soil was tilled on the Open Field System mainly by occupiers bound to render some sort of agricultural service to a large landholder to whose demesne or private holding their holdings were in some sort attached; and still for a time most of these occupiers were politically free men, though they did not hold their land by a free tenure.

But in substance a very great change had been effected, which is illustrated by the character of the Witan. We have seen that under the Saxon kings the name of the Witan appears to have been applied both to a sort of inner council consisting of the chief officers of the realm, lay and ecclesiastical, together with some other persons called in by the king; and also to a general assembly, the relic of the old tribal or national assembly, at which all freemen were entitled to appear, although very few thought it worth while to do so. It appears, though it is by no means clear, that this double character of the Witan was reproduced in two forms of council—the *magnum concilium*, great council or council of magnates, and the *commune concilium*, or general assembly of tenants-in-chief, a term which we shall examine later. But in less than ten years after the battle of Hastings practically every one of the magnates was a Norman, not an Englishman, interested in strengthening his own class against the hostility of the natives; and the same principle applied to the assembly of the tenants-in-chief, although these included a proportion of English. The *magnum concilium* was summoned for general purposes of deliberation, while the *commune concilium* was called together only when it was desirable that a particular operation or a parti-

cular policy should be ratified ostensibly by the nation. Such an occasion was the moot of Salisbury in 1086.

Now, not only were the old native magnates replaced by magnates who were foreigners, brought up in different traditions and wholly out of sympathy with the native population, but the actual powers of the magnates were greatly extended. Under the new system they exercised a much larger personal jurisdiction than before. How far this was conscious innovation, the deliberate introduction of Norman practices, and how far it was an un-

conscious interpretation of English customs in the light of Norman practices, it is impossible to say with certainty. In practice it is probable that the official presidents of the folc-moots of the hundred and the shire had exercised an authority which could without any great difficulty be translated into an independent jurisdiction; but the actual result now was that a vast amount of actual jurisdiction was transferred from the folc-moots to the local magnates, the lords of the manor, who, in the great majority of cases, were Normans. The



A Norman bed.

law previously referred to concerning the murder of Normans shows how the conquering race, a handful planted among a hostile population, felt it necessary to make special regulations for their own protection, and it is natural that they should have found means to evade the jurisdiction of native popular tribunals, more or less as the British in India insist on a similar security for themselves. But consciously or unconsciously the innovation was enormous, while it pretended to be at the most an adaptation of the existing system.

It used to be assumed as a commonplace of history that the Normans introduced feudalism into England. At last there came a reaction, and we were taught that feudalism in England was already so far advanced that the Normans merely gave a slight extra impetus to its complete development. As a matter of fact the advocates of these contradictory doctrines did not mean quite the same thing by feudalism, or at least they concentrated their attention on different aspects of it. The basis of feudalism was the doctrine that the whole land was the property of the king and that the individual landowner was not in the full sense an owner, but held his land as a tenant of the king, by the grant of the king, on recognised conditions of military service. Where this had not been the case originally, when the landowner had been there before the king, before the land had formed a part of the king's dominion, the same position had been arrived at by the process of Commendation; that is, the landowner had done homage to the king and become the king's man, himself surrendering his land to the king and then receiving it back on condition of military service. In either case the




Tending the sheep.



Cutting timber.



Cutting grass for hay.



Throwing the hawk.

Scenes in English out-door life in the 11th century.

[From a Saxon Calendar in the British Museum.]

practical result was the same. Every inch of the land within the king's dominion was the king's property, and was held from him by the landowner as his vassal on the recognised conditions of military service, carrying with them corresponding obligations on the king of protecting his vassal.

The same thing applied to the minor landholder who had either received his land by a grant from the greater landowner originally or had become his vassal by commendation. Finally, the small occupiers held their land not on conditions of military service, but of agricultural service or some equivalent, still with the corresponding obligation of protection; either by grants from the owner, or by commendation. Thus every inch of the soil was held on condition of military or other service either by a vassal of the king or a vassal's vassal, except what was retained by the king as his own estate.

Now, after the Norman conquest all this was literally true in England. The king had assumed the ownership of the entire soil. He assumed that it was forfeited to him by rebellion; and whether he distributed it among his Norman followers or graciously reinstated the English occupiers, it was on condition of homage and under feudal tenure. But before the conquest it had not been true. There was no theory that all the land was the king's land and had been granted by him on conditions of military tenure. Under the feudal system when the king wanted an army to take the field he summoned his vassals to attend his standard in accordance with their feudal obligation. Under the Saxon system he summoned the freemen of the shire to attend the fyrd. But, on the other hand, the process of commendation had long been active. Although the larger landholders did not hold from the king theoretically, except where the king had granted part of his estates as *bochland*, the small occupier habitually became the man of some bigger man than himself, rendering him service in order to enjoy his protection. But the theory that the whole of the land was the king's land held by the landowner as his vassal on feudal tenure did not as a legal theory exist before the conquest.

Of this there is one consequence of great importance. When the Norman wanted an army in the field he could raise one by summoning the feudal levies. But he could also attain his purpose by summoning the fyrd of the shires, and calling the freemen to arms without the peculiar limitations on the terms of service recognised under the law of feudal tenure, of which the elaborate details had hitherto been practically unknown in England.

If the feudalism introduced by the Norman conquest was something exceedingly different from feudalism so far as it had already developed in England, it differed also from the feudalism of the continent in a manner which had very important political results. On the continent a king's personal vassals or feudatories were few; each of them had an estate which might be called a province. The province was parcelled out among the vassals of the feudatory and his vassal's vassals; and in each case the vassal did homage and owed allegiance to his own immediate overlord,

but not necessarily to his overlord's overlord ; therefore the feudatory who defied his overlord or "suzerain" could take the field with an army of his own vassals, who were sworn to serve him even against his suzerain. But in England, as we have seen, the country was not parcelled out into a few great provinces but into many comparatively small earldoms and lesser estates ; and, further, the smaller landowners for the most part held direct from the king. They were tenants-in-chief, *i.e.* with no overlord intervening between them and the king himself. The result was that there was no feudatory who could bring a large army of his own into the field under any circumstances ; and beyond this, from the Moot of Salisbury onward the king always required that his vassal's vassals should pay direct homage to him as well as to his overlord, the obligation to him overriding that to the immediate overlord.

Thus on the continent the moral responsibility for rebellion lay upon the great feudatory himself alone ; the oath of his vassals required them to follow him. But in England the moral responsibility rested on each individual ; his oath bound him to the king's service in priority to that of his overlord. The moral justification on the continent for the individual was that he had obeyed his overlord's summons as in duty bound ; the only possible justification for the individual in England was that the king had forfeited his allegiance by breaking the feudal compact on his own side ; whether negatively by failure to do right by his vassal or positively by making illegal demands upon him. Hence the central government in England was at all times very much stronger than in the continental states.

Both before and after the Norman conquest the king was expected under ordinary circumstances to live "of his own" ; that is to say, to pay all the expenses of government as well as what we should call his personal expenses out of his own regular revenues. Those revenues were drawn partly from his personal estates. These estates were always being reduced by grants to individuals, by way of reward, or to the Church. On the other hand, they were increased by forfeitures when a vassal indulged in open treason or persistently refused to carry out his feudal obligations. Also they were increased by "escheat" ; that is, when a vassal died leaving no heir with a legal claim to inherit, his estates reverted to the Crown. The next source of royal revenue was in the fees or dues payable by vassals upon various occasions. Thus, when death caused an estate to change hands the heir had to pay fees to his overlord upon taking up his inheritance ; and there were further dues payable while the heir was a minor and in connection with the marriage of heiresses. These were always payable by the vassal to his overlord, and, consequently, to the king in connection with the estate of every-tenant-in-chief. The terms tenant-in-chief and baron appear primarily to have been practically interchangeable ; and in this wide sense of the term baron the old thegnhood was in effect absorbed, since the thegns or those who took their places and lands were all tenants-in-chief, holding from the king. Finally, as regular revenue, the Crown claimed judicial

finer and various local dues in the shape of tolls, the price paid for local privileges.


But beyond these the Crown had a special claim to what was in theory a war tax, the tax on land called the *danegeld*. This was the name originally given to the tax which Æthelred raised by the advice of his Witan in order to pay his ever-increasing ransoms to the Danes. As ransom it was raised for the last time by Knut in his first year, when he doubled the greatest of the previous exactions and finally paid off the Danish host. But from that time the *danegeld* was levied by the kings, nominally as a war tax and apparently at their pleasure; and in it the Conqueror and his son William II. found an exceedingly productive source of revenue. But however mercilessly the Conqueror might exact every penny which could be got out of the land, he wished to do it scientifically and with an even hand; and it was with this object in view that he instituted that great survey of the country which was recorded in *Domesday Book* and the documents connected therewith in 1086, being the report of the commission which had been employed upon the work for some time previously.

Domesday Book was compiled with the object of ascertaining precisely the taxable value of the land all over the country. It does not include the northern counties, partly because of the greater difficulty of dealing with those wilder regions, and partly because William himself had so harried them that their taxable value was of very little account. Having this object in view, it took account of everything which affected either taxable value or the means of collecting taxes. Although, unfortunately, what was perfectly clear to contemporaries is not always equally clear to later ages, *Domesday Book* is a valuable and unique authority as to the condition of the country, in spite of the difficulties of interpretation.

In *Domesday* we first come across a very important and very controversial term, the manor. In actual practice the manor very frequently corresponds to the individual settlement—*tun*, township, ham, or village—which was the unit of the Anglo-Saxon system, a unit which in the Norman terminology becomes the *vill* or *villa*. Hence came the idea long prevalent that the manor and the vill were originally identical; that each vill had its lord of the manor with his private demesne, while the rest of the soil was occupied chiefly by the villeins, *villani*, vill-people, who owed him service. But this is not the actual fact, though it approximates to it. The manor is not necessarily identical with a vill; it may extend over many vills. The vill is not necessarily identical with a manor; its occupiers may own half-a-dozen different lords or no lord at all. The manorial arrangement, therefore, cannot have been part of the original settlement, but was a subsequent development or extension of what was at first only occasional; when the free ceorl found it advisable to commend himself to some lord, even then the ceorls of one community did not necessarily elect to commend themselves to the same lord, though it was more often convenient to do so than otherwise. Thus we find quite small holdings

described as "held for a manor" without having any lord of the manor.

In fact it would appear that the Domesday manor is a term meaning a taxable unit. The lord of the manor is responsible for the taxes of all holdings within his manor, whether it forms one vill or many vills or includes holdings in several vills. The man who holds his "virgate" or thirty acres without a lord at all holds it "for a manor"; while the men who hold of a lord are divided into two classes—the freemen, *liberi homines*, and "socmen," who normally pay their taxes direct, but for whom their lord is ultimately responsible; and the villeins, bordars, and cottars whose taxes are paid by the lord himself. To these last are to be added the actual *servi* or slaves. It does not appear that at this stage there was any political distinction between these two classes; they were nearly all free ceorls. Nor is there any definite distinction between the methods of tenure. In both classes there are men who pay a rent in kind but render no agricultural service, and in both classes there are men who do render agricultural service; though there are comparatively few of the former among the villani and comparatively few of the latter among the socmen. It is further to be observed that socmen and freedom from agricultural service were much commoner in the districts where there was a substantial Danish population, where also slaves were practically non-existent, while slaves were comparatively numerous on the Welsh marches. But it is also easy to see that while there was nothing in itself servile in the payment of taxes through the lord any more than there is anything servile in "compounding" for rates at the present day, the man who did so could be much more readily reduced to a servile condition; and consequently a hundred years later we find that the villein has degenerated into a serf bound to the soil, whereas the socman has not. Also the villein has come to be more and more identified with the man who has to submit to particularly obnoxious forms



An ideal plan of a Norman castle.

It is further to be observed that socmen and freedom from agricultural service were much commoner in the districts where there was a substantial Danish population, where also slaves were practically non-existent, while slaves were comparatively numerous on the Welsh marches. But it is also easy to see that while there was nothing in itself servile in the payment of taxes through the lord any more than there is anything servile in "compounding" for rates at the present day, the man who did so could be much more readily reduced to a servile condition; and consequently a hundred years later we find that the villein has degenerated into a serf bound to the soil, whereas the socman has not. Also the villein has come to be more and more identified with the man who has to submit to particularly obnoxious forms

of service from which the socmen and the successors of the socmen are free.

Domesday, then, was not occupied with the classification of the occupiers of the soil according to the amount of freedom which they possessed, but with the taxable value of their holdings and with the question who was responsible for paying the taxes ; and hence we derive from it no light on the amount of control possessed by the lord of the manor over the socmen or villeins on his estate. What we do have recorded is the nature of the service or rent which they were liable to render, and the most minute details as to the value and productive uses of the land.

The record also shows that during the first year after the conquest



A manor-house of the 11th century.
[From a Harleian MS., British Museum.]

large numbers passed out of the class of socmen into the class of villeins ; although at a later stage the double tendency developed to commute services for rent, and to treat freedom from services as a *prima facie* proof of freedom as opposed to serfdom, the essential feature of the later serfdom being that the villein was bound to the soil and could not leave his holding without his lord's consent. It is not, however, at all clear that at the time of the conquest the villein was in this sense a serf ; the idea of serfdom may have become attached to villeinage through the interpretation of customs by Norman lawyers trained in the theories of Roman law.

Norman castles sprang up as we have noted all over the country ; but we must not imagine that the ordinary Norman baron habitually lived in one of those stone fortresses. William's followers were endowed with


few manors or with many; the baron or tenant-in-chief who got one manor lived in his manor-house, which was no more than a substantial farm-house; if he had more than one manor he might move from one manor-house to another, or he might fix his own residence in one or two and plant his bailiffs in others. But the manor-houses were not supplemented by castles except with the king's leave, and with the intention of making them serve as military centres for holding the country down.

IV

RUFUS

Of the Conqueror's sons, Robert the eldest was a valiant soldier, the only man of his time who got the better of the old Duke in single combat. He was good-natured, indolent, and irresolute. The Conqueror held him in complete contempt, and only allowed him the succession in Normandy because he could not help himself. Whereat the barons rejoiced, since they knew that Duke Robert was wholly incapable of controlling them. Richard, the most promising of the family, died before his father, who commended the third son William the Red to the English succession. William Rufus was as fiercely energetic as his father, a typical headstrong, self-willed, fighting man, who regarded not man nor feared God except when the terror of death came upon him. His energy took him in fits, and while the fit was on him he pursued his immediate purpose with vigour and determination; but he lacked his father's dogged patience; and while he was capable of forming vast designs, he was not capable of planning them out and developing them systematically. And between the fits of energy he surrendered himself entirely to the pursuit of pleasure and the gratification of his passions; while his sole virtue besides physical courage was his appreciation of courage in others.

Such was the man whom William I. commended to Lanfranc and Lanfranc commended to the magnates of England as his successor. William hurried over from Normandy while his elder brother was far away. On his promise to be guided by Lanfranc he was immediately accepted as king.



Within six months came the first revolt in favour of Robert. A large proportion of the barons of England were barons of Normandy also, whom it suited much better to owe allegiance only to the incompetent Robert than to owe it to Robert for their Norman possessions and to the fierce Red King for their lands in England. William promptly appealed to his English subjects, who joyfully answered the summons to the fyrd and the chance of striking a blow against their oppressors; while William made them large promises of good government. The revolt was crushed

and the promises were cynically ignored. Lanfranc died, and William took for his chief counsellor Ranulf Flambard, a fit instrument for his purposes.

Ranulf's primary object was to enrich the king and himself more or less under cover of law, and he set himself to systematic business of extortion and robbery. Fortunately for the people of England the extortion and robbery were directed against William's feudal tenants; that is to say, Normans rather than English, partly because there was more to be got out of them, and partly because it was more necessary for the king to keep them under his heel. And for this latter reason also William's hand fell heavily upon them when they in turn applied robbery and extortion

to the English; it suited him to have the English on his side. But where he himself or his own chosen companions were concerned a like protection was not extended to the people.

In one of its aspects the story of the reign appears to be a mere welter of wars and compositions with Robert of Normandy, and of conspiracies and revolts on the part of one baronial group or another, ferociously stamped out, which it is hardly worth while to disentangle. William was an able soldier, who nearly always struck swiftly and fiercely, and nearly always with success. The outstanding fact of importance was that the supremacy of the Crown was in every case triumphantly asserted. Perhaps the episode of the reign most characteristic of the man and his time was that which concerns the relations of William with the Church. One of Ranulf's devices for obtaining revenue was that whenever one of the higher ecclesiastical appointments fell vacant it was allowed to remain so, and



Seal of Archbishop Anselm, 1093.
[From Ducarel, "Anglo-Norman Antiquities."]

William seized the revenues for himself instead of putting in a financial administrator during the period of vacancy. It was not till four years after the death of Lanfranc that a new Archbishop of Canterbury was appointed; and then it was only because William was stricken with a severe illness; and in the fear of death endeavoured to square his account with Heaven by naming the saintly Anselm of Bec for the archbishopric. When William recovered he returned to his old courses; but he found that Anselm's apparent meekness cloaked immovable resolution whensoever questions of right and wrong were involved. He was not in the least afraid of rebuking the king to his face, nor could he be terrorised into submission to the king's will when the king required him to do what he thought wrong. It was not long before the position became unendurable, when, curiously enough at first sight, the bishops took the king's side and the barons with grim unanimity supported the Archbishop. But Anselm took the only dignified course and withdrew from the country.

Of less importance to England than to Europe was the beginning in William's reign of the crusading movement. The recovery of the Holy Sepulchre and its retention under Christian dominion for two hundred years carried off to the East occasionally great hosts of crusaders and, besides these great expeditions, a constant stream of military pilgrims. English crusaders, however, belonged chiefly to the latter group. The only crusade which takes a prominent place in our own history is that which took Richard I. to Palestine. England was touched only by the fringe of the crusading movement, and was affected by the first crusade only because it took Duke Robert of Normandy away, and thereby stopped for a time the quarrels between him and his brother in England, and afterwards enabled his younger brother Henry to secure the English throne without difficulty.

The years when Rufus was reigning in England were of considerable importance in the history of Scotland. On his accession Malcolm Canmore was still reigning in the northern kingdom with his English Queen Margaret at his side. His own English predilections have been noted, and his whole reign was marked by the Anglicising movement and the transfer of the political centre of gravity from the Celtic highlands to the Teutonised lowlands; a change, however, which, instead of tending to a fusion of the English and Scottish nations, made the once English Bernicia, or so much of it as was comprised in Lothian, more intensely antagonistic to the southern English of the English kingdom than had been the Celts of the kingdoms of the Scots and Picts. The Celts of the highlands retained for the Saxons, the "Sassenachs," of Scotland, very much of the sentiment which they had formerly felt towards the English, and resented their political supremacy more than they feared an English domination. Malcolm himself had no friendly feeling for the Normans, who had ousted his wife's family from the English throne; and he found various excuses for raiding across the Tweed, though, when either William I. or William II. marched against him, he generally succeeded in making terms satisfactory to himself.

But on one of these raids he was killed, in the fourth year of the Red King's reign.


Margaret had taken care that Malcolm's children should be extremely English, and the Scots, jealous of southern influence, made Malcolm's brother, Donalbane, king instead of one of the sons of Malcolm and Margaret. In this temporary revolution Donalbane was also supported by alliance with the Norsemen, by whom the Hebrides were to a great extent occupied, and with the king of Norway. It is not improbable that the ultimate success of Donalbane would have meant the partition of Scotland into a Celtic and a Norwegian kingdom, with further results which offer ample room for interesting speculation. But after sundry vicissitudes Edgar, one of Malcolm's sons, recovered the throne of Scotland largely by the help of volunteers from England, who were permitted to join him on condition of his promising allegiance to Rufus. Norway was bought off by what was practically the cession of the Hebrides. Edgar personally remained loyal to his pact with the king of England, though his successors did not hold themselves bound by it; and Malcolm's house was permanently established on the Scottish throne.

The evil days of William Rufus were brought to a sudden conclusion. In the year 1100, before Robert of Normandy had returned from the first crusade, William went a-hunting in the New Forest, and an arrow from the bow of one of his companions killed not a stag but the king. The body was left lying where it fell, while those who had seen the accident galloped off with the tidings to Prince Henry, who was one of the hunting party, and Henry, without a moment's delay, made straight for Winchester to secure the royal treasure, and, having done so, to secure his own succession to the throne of England.

V

THE LION OF JUSTICE

Henry had over his brother Robert the practical advantage of being on the spot. He claimed a prior right to the succession on the ground that he was born on English soil, son of the king of England, whereas Robert was born a foreigner before his father won a kingdom. The blood of Alfred ran in his veins, since his mother Matilda was descended from that daughter of Alfred who married Baldwin II. of Flanders. Robert's advocates were outnumbered among the barons and clergy, who were at the moment assembled in sufficient numbers to claim the character of a Witan or National Assembly. The absent Robert was set aside; Henry was elected, and proceeded to strengthen his position by issuing a charter which was accepted in all good faith, wherein he promised to observe "the good laws of King Edward" as modified by his father, and to abolish the innovations introduced by his brother. Another popular move was the arrest of



KEEP OF CASTLE RISING, A NORMAN CASTLE BUILT BETWEEN 1140 AND 1150
From a photograph.




Ranulf Flambard. Moreover, Henry was shrewd enough to select strong and capable advisers and at once to recall Anselm. The support of the English population was made certain by his politic marriage with Edith, otherwise called Matilda, the daughter of Malcolm Canmore and of Margaret, and therefore a princess of the royal house of Wessex. The prevailing brutality of the period is illustrated by the fact that Edith had apparently actually taken the veil as a nun as the only way of protecting herself from some more cruel fate. Anselm himself had no qualms in accepting a declaration that though she had professedly taken the veil she had not technically "entered religion."

Henry was not to remain in possession for long undisturbed. In 1101 Robert was back and succeeded in effecting a landing in England. The exceedingly uncertain attitude of the baronage made the issue of a fight doubtful; but Robert was contented to sell his claims for a pension and an agreement for mutual assistance in the punishment of traitors. Henry was prompt to strike one after another at the great barons whose loyalty was dubious or more than dubious. The group of Montgomerie brothers, headed by Robert of Bellême, prepared to resist, but others hesitated to support them; the English gladly answered the summons to the fyrd, and the rebels took flight to Normandy. During the next few years Robert demonstrated his incapacity for restraining the plots of the barons who had taken refuge in his dominions; and Henry took the view that he himself had no alternative but to appropriate the control of Normandy to himself. The result was a campaign in Normandy in which Robert was decisively defeated and taken prisoner at the battle of Tenchebrai, a victory which the English foot soldiery, fighting for Henry, regarded as compensation for Hastings. Robert was held in custody for the rest of his life, though the tradition that his eyes were put out was probably a fiction of later date.

But troubles were not ended, because Henry did not detain Robert's young son William, called the Clito, in his own hands; and the boy was afterwards made the figurehead for rebellions in Normandy and Maine which were fostered by the French king. The total result of the consequent fighting which went on at intervals from 1111 to 1119 was the recognition of Henry as Lord of Normandy, Maine, and Brittany. Henry's daughter Matilda or Maud was wedded to the German emperor, Henry V., while his son and heir, William, was betrothed to the daughter of Fulk of Anjou. With these alliances Henry's power threatened to become overwhelming; but his designs received a check when his son William was drowned at sea in the disaster of the *White Ship*. The Count of Anjou then married his daughter to the Clito, who had been restored by his cousin's death to the position of claimant to the English succession, and now found new support for his immediate claim to the Duchy of Normandy. Henry's arms, however, were again successful, and then the emperor died. While Matilda was the emperor's wife there would have been no chance of her succession to the English throne; but although there was no precedent for a

queen regnant of England, Henry now succeeded in persuading the Great Council to do homage to her as his heir. Those who took the oath included her uncle David, the last of Malcolm Canmore's sons, and now king of Scotland, and also Stephen of Boulogne, son of the Conqueror's daughter Adela.

Two years later the Empress Maud, as she is generally called, was wedded to Geoffrey, son of Fulk of Anjou; and the offspring of this marriage, Henry, born in 1133, was destined to establish the Plantagenet




A Norman school about 1130-1140.

line on the throne of England. The marriage, however, was unpopular, since Normandy had no inclination to find itself annexed as a province of Anjou, and the barons of England were no better disposed. Thus in spite of the death of the Clito, and the renewal by the baronage of their oath of allegiance to Matilda, Henry was painfully aware that his daughter's succession might be disputed. For there were two grandsons of the Conqueror, Stephen of Boulogne and his elder brother Theobald of Blois, either of whom might put in a claim, although Stephen could not do so without breaking the oath of allegiance which he had already taken.

In one aspect of his reign, then, a vast amount of Henry's time was taken up with the wars and the diplomacy which first established him on the throne of England, then secured his grip on Normandy and Brittany, and finally was intended to secure the English succession to his daughter. We can now give brief attention to his relations with the Church. One of his first acts was the recall of Anselm with whom he was on friendly terms to the end of the archbishop's life. Nevertheless there was no such cooperation between Anselm and the king as there had been between Lanfranc and the Conqueror. Though Lanfranc was a great ecclesiastic, he had supported William in his determination to surrender no tittle of the independence hitherto enjoyed by the kings of England. But Anselm owed allegiance first to the Pope. In the last years of the Red King a papal decree had claimed new authority, and that claim Anselm felt bound to support so long as it was maintained by the Pope himself. Henry, however, was as definite as the Conqueror himself in his refusal to surrender rights which the Conqueror had claimed. Ultimately a compromise was arrived at which practically recognised the king's power of making ecclesiastical appointments, and required the higher clergy to do homage for their

temporalities—in other words their estates—like the lay baronage. But Henry surrendered the right of actually investing his nominees with the insignia of their spiritual office. For the rest, the king was as firm as his predecessor in refusing admission of papal legates or papal letters to the kingdom without his leave or the carrying of appeals out of his kingdom to Rome.


The great importance of Henry's reign, however, lies in his organisation of the system of government, which provided the foundations upon which Henry II. was afterwards to build. Henry was perhaps not a genius, certainly no idealist and no hero; but he was shrewd, far-sighted, determined, and in things political master of himself. Two underlying principles may be observed in his policy—the disintegration of the forces adverse to the power of the Crown, and the consolidation of the forces making for the power of the Crown. Externally that power was threatened first by rebellion which made Normandy its base, and secondly by the pretensions of the papacy. How he dealt with these dangers we have seen. Internally the danger arose from the power of the barons. Here he was helped by the extensive opportunities for confiscation which followed on the various rebellions. The greater estates the king retained in his own hand, while the lesser he distributed so as to avoid a material increase in the power of those who were already strong. Further, he used his rights as suzerain to divide inheritances which fell vacant among the sons, so as to separate the holders of fiefs in Normandy and fiefs in England, and generally to prevent the accumulation of great estates in the hands of single feudatories. In all this he simply applied the precedents set by his father.



An organ about the middle of the 12th century.

For strengthening the Crown the method upon which Rufus had relied was the merciless application of sheer brute force. Henry's method was the resolute administration of the law without fear or favour, unless it were fear of and favour to the king by ministers dependent on the Crown. And even here there was no encouragement to wrest the law in the king's favour, though he might and did exact his legal rights to the uttermost farthing. It does not appear that Henry was moved by any strong desire to strengthen the courts of the shire and the hundred as against the extensive jurisdiction which had already been appropriated by the landowners. All that he did in this direction was to check the process under which all their functions were gradually departing from them, by requiring that they should meet at regular intervals. Of great importance, however, was the development of

the practice of sending supervising justices on occasional visits to different parts of the country, who took in charge the trial of the more important cases, and uniformly applied the law in the shire courts as it was recognised in the king's own court, the Curia Regis. Their registered judgments were established as precedents, and thus a comparative uniformity was given to the law at the same time that the capricious activity of the sheriffs was kept in check. These justices, or commissions of justices, with the king behind them, had nothing to fear from local magnates, but were rather feared by them; and their exact and even-handed administration of the law won for Henry the title of the Lion of Justice. "A good man he was," said the Anglo-Saxon Chronicler, "and there was great awe of him. No man durst misdo against another in his time. He made peace for man



Officers of the Royal Treasury about 1140 weighing and receiving coin.

[From a contemporary Psalter.]

and beast. Whoso bore his burden of gold and silver, no man durst say to him aught but good."

The Curia Regis, the central court of justice, was always in attendance on the king's person. It comprised the great officers of state and law officers appointed by the Crown. It was practically the same body which, as the Court of the Exchequer, took charge of the national finance and examined the accounts of the sheriffs who were responsible for collecting and handing in the revenue. For portions of the revenue the sheriff paid a fixed amount, and made his own profits off the difference between this agreed sum and the amount collected. For the danegeld, however, and the fees and fines collected under feudal law, he had to render a precise account. It is to be noted that in this reign many payments which had hitherto been made in kind were required to be in silver; a fact which points to a considerable increase in the circulation of the precious metals as a medium of exchange.

Henry was not far short of seventy when he died, a ripe age for a medieval monarch. There was no sign of enfeeblement of his powers

when his end came. His contemporaries regarded him with an admiration which his success as a ruler entirely deserved. In spite of his wars on the continent and the rebellions in England which marked his first years, he gave the country order and peace in marked contrast to the two reigns which preceded and followed his own. The measure of his success is shown by the ease with which Henry II. restored and developed the system which he had organised, although nineteen years passed between the death of the grandfather and the accession of the grandson—years which represent a period of wild anarchy, in which there was no supreme controlling force whatever, and the one institution which succeeded in maintaining something of its own dignity, some fragment even of a higher idealism, was the Church.

VI

STEPHEN


Henry died in Normandy. With all his shrewdness and anxiety to secure the succession to his daughter he had omitted to take the somewhat obvious step of making sure that she should be present in England at the time of his death, though he knew well enough that her succession would be unpopular with every class of his subjects. Perhaps the one time in his life when Stephen of Boulogne showed signs of intelligence was when he hurried over to England to capture the support of the great officers of state and the clergy in claiming the inheritance. The great bulk of the barons, who assumed that the election of a king would remain with them, were in Normandy. After due deliberation they offered the dukedom and the crown to Theobald of Blois, while Geoffrey of Anjou, who cared much more about Normandy than about England, was collecting a force on the Maine frontier in order to make good his own claims. The election of Theobald was interrupted by the arrival of a messenger, who announced that his younger brother Stephen had already been elected and crowned by the English Witan. The cautious and unambitious Theobald accepted the situation and refused to stand in his brother's way.

Stephen, however, was no sooner crowned than his inefficiency became obvious. A very valiant knight in single combat or against any odds, he had no vices and no brains, lacking the most elementary notions whether of strategy, of diplomacy, or of statesmanship. Therefore, from the very outset all over the country every man began doing that which may have been right in his own eyes but was very seldom so in the sight of any one else. Robert, Earl of Gloucester, the Empress Maud's illegitimate brother, was very soon plotting to place her on the throne. David of Scotland, who, as Earl of Huntingdon, had sworn allegiance to her, demanded as the price of peace the succession to the earldom of Northumberland for his own son

Henry, basing the claim on the fact that his own wife was the daughter of Waltheof.

In 1138 the country was ablaze with miscellaneous insurrections, more particularly in the west country. In that year David, whose demands had not been satisfied, having already harried the border, led a considerable host of invaders across the Tweed, and advanced over the Tees. A Scottish incursion was more than the Yorkshiremen would endure, and the stout old Archbishop Thurstan got together a considerable force to meet them,

who marched out with sundry sacred banners at their head, which gave their name to the Battle of the Standard fought at Northallerton. It is curious to note that the Englishmen, instead of employing the usually successful cavalry tactics of the day, dismounted and fought as heavy infantry; also that they fought having clumps of archers intermixed with them, which looks very much like a foretaste of tactics applied nearly a hundred and fifty years afterwards in the Welsh wars of Edward I. and developed in the French campaigns of Edward III. At any rate the Scots, though in superior numbers, met with an overwhelming defeat, due largely to the slaughter inflicted by the archers. Nevertheless, the victory led to nothing beyond the immediate expulsion of the invaders; and very soon afterwards David made peace with Stephen on terms rather better for himself than he had demanded before the invasion.



The English Standard,
A.D. 1138.

Stephen himself proceeded to quarrel with the ecclesiastical party, including his own brother Henry, Bishop of Winchester, who had the Pope at his back since he was himself authorised papal legate. Nothing could better have suited the empress and her party, who at this juncture succeeded in landing in England. The king on the one side and the empress on the other began to purchase support by lavishing rights and privileges, lands, and titles on every one who asked for them. With the exception of Robert of Gloucester, whose interests were bound up with those of his sister, no one could be relied upon to remain on one side or other for any continuous period; the civil war was not so much a battle of parties as a welter of private wars. Says the English Chronicler: "Every powerful man made his castles and held them against him; and they filled the land full of castles. They cruelly oppressed the wretched men of the land with castle works. When the castles were made they filled them with devils and evil men. Then they took those men they imagined had any property, both by night and by day, peasant men and women, and put them in prison for their gold and silver, and tortured them with unutterable torture; never were martyrs so tortured as they were. . . . They laid imposts on the

towns continually and called it *tenserie*; when the wretched men had no more to give they robbed and burned all the towns, so that thou mightest well go all a day's journey, and thou shouldst never find a man sitting in a town [that is township or village] or the land tilled." So goes on the hideous record of rank unbridled violence "till men said openly that Christ and His saints slept."

Stephen himself was taken prisoner in a battle at Lincoln early in 1141. His cause seemed to have collapsed, and Maud was elected "Lady of England." She in her turn at once, by her arrogance and violence and her total disregard of the advice of both Gloucester and the king of Scots, aroused such a spirit of resentment that within the year she was herself a fugitive and her brother of Gloucester was a prisoner. Then Stephen and Gloucester were exchanged, and in a few weeks half the country had again acknowledged Stephen. It is scarcely profitable to pursue the ups and downs of the fighting. Gloucester's death in 1147 threatened to ruin the Angevin cause; it was, perhaps, saved by the death four years afterwards of Count Geoffrey, whose son Henry, then eighteen years old, was not long in proving himself a youth of extraordinary capacity, vigour, and intelligence.

So far as concerned the fight between Stephen and Maud herself, it had been practically won when the empress retreated from England after Robert of Gloucester's death. But the succession was another matter. Stephen's one desire was to secure it for his son Eustace; but he had finally succeeded in driving the clergy solidly over to the Angevin side. In 1153 young Henry landed with a small enough force, but one which sufficiently enabled him to display his qualities of leadership. The tide of favour seemed suddenly to turn; Eustace was unpopular, and the barons began to come in to Henry. The death of Eustace made Stephen careless for the future. Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, intervened to negotiate between the rivals, and terms were agreed upon at Wallingford. Stephen was to remain upon the throne, but Henry was to succeed him, and was to be in some sort associated with him in the government of the kingdom; and in the meantime Stephen, with Henry's support, was to set about the ejection of the mercenaries or free-lances, who had been employed in large numbers by both sides throughout the struggle, and the destruction of the many hundreds of unlicensed castles which had sprung up all over the country. Henry, in fact, left Stephen to carry out these stipulations by



Seal of Henry, Bishop of Winchester, brother of King Stephen.


himself; but only a year remained to him for the fulfilment of his undertakings. The something that was done was done with characteristic inefficiency, and the country only began to breathe freely when Stephen died to make room for a man who, whatever his faults or merits, was nothing if not efficient.

VII

SCOTLAND

A half Saxon royal family was established on the throne of Scotland when Edgar secured the throne during the reign of William Rufus in England. Since the reconciliation of Edgar the Ætheling with the

Norman, the undercurrent of hostility to the Norman dynasty in England disappeared among the sons of Malcolm Canmore and Margaret. Those princes in fact, themselves, now represented the hereditary claims of the house of Wessex, any attempt to assert which would have been particularly absurd in view of the relations between King




Edgar and William Rufus. When Henry I. married King Edgar's sister, the family claims, such as they were, were absorbed by the offspring of that marriage. But it is curious to observe that on the principles of pure legitimacy the kings of Scotland were the rightful kings of England, not the Norman line, which, on feudal principles, periodically put in its own claim to the overlordship of Scotland.

Three brothers now reigned in succession. When Edgar died, Alexander I. became king with his capital at Edinburgh; but even during his reign the last brother, David, as Earl of Southern Scotland, was practically the ruler of the whole of the Lowlands. David was in constant contact with the English, and his wife was the daughter of Waltheof. Alexander himself was considerably occupied with the repression of the rebellious Celts of the North, and with the Anglicising or Normanising of the ecclesiastical organisation; although he was extremely careful to avoid doing anything which could be construed into a subjection of the Church of Scotland to the supremacy either of Canterbury or York. Perhaps, if

Alexander had left a son, Scotland might have been parted into two kingdoms. As he was childless, David ascended the throne in 1124.

David's reign of twenty-nine years established the character of the Scottish kingdom, both through his failures and his successes. It was his ambition to obtain the northern earldoms of England and absorb them into the Scottish kingdom; but though he procured from Stephen the grant of Northumberland, he did not succeed in absorbing it. Tweed and Solway remained the lasting boundaries between the kingdoms. It was not to these ambitions that the great importance of David's reign must be attributed. It is to be found rather in the Normanising of the southern aristocracy, in the organisation of the Church and the extension of its influence, and in the municipal development which he fostered. The elements which went to make up the Scottish state proved to be much more difficult of combination than those in England, when Norman feudalism and English institutions blended together. There the Crown took the people into partnership in order to hold the lawlessness of the barons in check; then the barons took the people into partnership in order to hold the lawlessness of the Crown in check. The Church generally took the side of the law, except when it followed an aggressive line on its own account, when the king and the barons made common cause against it. The Celtic element was always insignificant. But in Scotland the Celtic element was always active, and there were constant cross currents of Celtic tribalism in the North and Norman feudalism in the South, both acting against the central government, which was, on the other hand, constantly in close alliance with the Church against both Celtic and Norman nobility. The effect of David's Normanising and ecclesiastical policy was in the first instance pre-eminently civilising, and Scottish culture attained a higher standard in many respects than that of England. Scotland became a nation, and developed a sense of nationality which enabled it to set its far more powerful neighbour at defiance; though the warring elements of which the nation was composed kept it internally in a state of anarchy,



Church of St. Regulus, St. Andrews.
[A pre-Norman church of 10th to 12th centuries.]

which was hardly checked except by the unifying influence of the common hostility to England.

But all this did not become apparent in the reign of David I., or indeed till long afterwards. What was apparent in that reign, which ended a year before the death of Stephen, was that Scotland had emerged definitely in the character of a state developing on the general lines of European civilisation—lines, that is, partly Teutonic and partly Latin; not on the un-Latinised and un-Teutonised Celtic lines which she had been following down to the accession of Malcolm Canmore. The politically predominant division of Scotland approximated not to Ireland or to Wales, but to England; and her future relations with England were for a time at least to be seriously complicated by the fact that the great barons of the Lowlands for the most part held fiefs in England as well, and were vassals at once of the two kings of England and Scotland.

CHAPTER IV


THE EARLY PLANTAGENETS

I

HENRY II

HENRY PLANTAGENET, Count of Anjou, was barely one and twenty when he became king of England. Already his audacity and ambition had been displayed by the wooing and winning of Eleanor of Aquitaine, an alliance which added to his dominions about a quarter of the whole French realm. The lady's marriage with her previous husband, the king of France, had been annulled, owing to incompatibility of temper. With the English inheritance came that of Normandy, carrying with it Maine and the over-lordship of Brittany, so that in his own right or in that of his wife he was actual lord of more than half of France, besides having disputed claims on Toulouse. In respect of these counties and duchies the king of France was his suzerain; in respect of England he was of course entirely independent. The populations which owned his sway even on the other side of the channel were exceedingly diverse; and undoubtedly it was his ambition to weld all these dominions into a consolidated empire. Hence more than half the years of his reign were spent on the continent; and we have to realise that he was not a king of England with continental possessions so much as a great continental prince who happened also to be king of England. But since he did happen to be king of England it was in this country that he found scope for his genius as a ruler, while France absorbed his talents for war, diplomacy, and intrigue.

THE BLOOD ROYAL OF ALFRED



He found England utterly sickened and surfeited with the anarchy of Stephen's reign and ready to welcome the strong hand which should put down disorder. Young as he was, he displayed at once a combined vigour

and shrewdness which won him support on every side. In nine months he had restored order and government. The mercenaries were cleared out of the country and the unlicensed castles were levelled to the ground. The nobles who dreamed of recalcitrancy, of asserting their right to follow their own devices, were paralysed by the swift energy of his movements. Men no longer felt that each had to fight for his own hand; the majority were ready enough to combine on the side of law and order when the principles of law and order were incarnated in a chief endowed with so vigorous and capable a personality.

Henry took nominally for his chief counsellor Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury, a prelate trained in the school of Roger of Salisbury, who had been the right-hand man of Henry I. For chancellor he took the archbishop's brilliant young secretary, Thomas Becket, a man after the king's own heart, to whom Theobald willingly relinquished the onerous work of the king's chief minister. The administrative system which had been organised by his grandfather and had gone to ruin under the general chaos of Stephen's reign was restored, and for some years to come Henry allowed himself to be absorbed mainly by his continental ambitions. During these years, however, he took advantage of the youth of the king of Scots, Malcolm IV., the grandson of David, to compel him to surrender the claims on Northumberland and Cumberland which Henry had promised David to acknowledge, and to do homage for his earldom of Huntingdon.

Henry's French wars established the important institution of scutage. He could summon the barons and their feudal levies to his banner, but their attendance could only be required for a limited period. Hence the system was extremely inconvenient for him and also for them. Therefore they welcomed a scheme under which they were allowed to commute personal service with their levies for a proportionate money payment, to which was given the name of "scutage" or shield-money. The scutage enabled the king on his side to hire soldiery who were directly in his own pay and were, by consequence, exclusively devoted to his interests. On the other hand, the barons being virtually released from their feudal obligation to maintain forces ready to take the field ceased to do so, with the obvious result that they ceased also to be ready to take the field on their own account. This commutation had already been practised in respect of land held by the Church; but its extension to the lay baronage immensely increased the military power of the Crown. Some twenty years later another step in the same direction was taken by the Assize of Arms, which reconstituted the national fyrd and regulated the arms which all freeholders, burghers, and freemen were required to carry.

In 1162 Archbishop Theobald died. The Church, with ample justification, had acquired under Stephen many relaxations of its subordination to the Crown; rules established under the Conqueror and under Henry I. fell into abeyance. Henry II. was resolved to re-establish the claims of the Crown but was willing to wait for Theobald's death. Now it seemed



EFFIGIES OF HENRY II AND HIS QUEEN ELEANOR AT FONTREVAULT
ABBAY, NORMANDY



that his time had come, and he conceived that he had an instrument ready to his hand in his chancellor, Thomas Becket, who had hitherto seen eye to eye with him. He nominated Thomas to the archbishopric. Becket, as chancellor, acted the rôle of the great minister of the Crown with dramatic zeal and enthusiasm ; but he had a different conception of his duties as archbishop. He had become the head of the Church ; and in that capacity he was no longer the servant of the Crown, but the champion of the Church against all comers, resolute to surrender no tittle of her privileges. Since the part was thrust upon him he would play it like his previous part, with dramatic thoroughness, of which martyrdom would be a welcome climax. In the meanwhile the brilliant and worldly statesman, the king's boon companion, the cleric before whose lance knights had been known to go down, became the ascetic devotee, the father of the poor, the servant of the Lord's servants.

Now the reforms on which Henry was set were twofold. On the one side he claimed the recovery for the Crown of those rights which it had successfully maintained in the time of the Conqueror and Henry I. On the other he demanded the curtailment of ecclesiastical powers which



Thomas à Becket arguing with Henry II.
and King Louis.


had grown out of that complete separation of ecclesiastical and temporal jurisdictions for which William I. and Lanfranc had been responsible. In the chaos of Stephen's reign there had been little hope of obtaining justice from any except ecclesiastical courts, which, as a natural consequence, encroached upon the jurisdiction of the lay courts. King Henry found that in all cases in which any person was concerned who belonged to the ranks of the clergy, including what was practically the lay fringe of that body, the Church claimed exclusive jurisdiction, and inflicted on clerics penalties which, from the lay point of view, were grotesquely inadequate. Royal expostulations were met by archiepiscopal denunciations. The quarrel waxed hot. The king was determined that the clergy should not be exempted from the due reward of their misdoings. In the Constitutions of Clarendon he propounded a scheme which he professed to regard as expressing the true customs of the kingdom. Becket was induced to promise to accept the customs ; but not without justification he repudiated the king's view of what those customs were.

The clauses in the Constitutions which forbade carrying appeals to Rome and required the higher clergy to obtain a royal licence to leave the kingdom were hardly disputable. But the case for the "customs" broke down when the king claimed that criminous clerks should be handed over to the secular arm for further judgment after the Church had inflicted its

own penalties. Becket, however, chose to resist the demand on the ground that a cleric as such was exempt from secular punishment in virtue of his office. The barons took the king's side and threatened violence. Becket yielded avowedly to force and nothing else. Having done so he obtained a papal dispensation annulling his promise. The king's indignation was obvious and justifiable. Becket persuaded himself that his life was in danger, as it really may have been; and he fled from the country to appeal to the Pope and the king of France.

In the course of the quarrel both sides had committed palpable breaches of the law. Now, with Becket out of the country, diplomacy at Rome, coupled with the logic of facts in England, might have secured the king a complete victory; but he was tempted to a blunder. He had his eldest son Henry crowned as his successor. Coronation was a prerogative of the

FOUR GENERATIONS OF PLANTAGENETS



Archbishop of Canterbury; the young prince was crowned without him. The Pope threatened to suspend the bishops who had performed the ceremony and to lay the king's continental territories under an interdict. Henry was alarmed and sought a reconciliation with Becket. At a formal meeting in France the quarrel was so far composed that Becket was invited to return in peace to Canterbury.

He returned, but not in peace. He had hardly landed in England when he excommunicated the bishops who had participated in the coronation ceremony. The news was carried to the king, who was then in the neighbourhood of Bayeux. He burst into a fit of ungovernable rage. Four knights caught at the words which he uttered in his frenzy, slipped from the court, posted to the sea, and took ship for England, where they at once made for Canterbury. They broke into the archbishop's house and charged him with treason. He flung the charge in their teeth. They withdrew, but only to arm themselves. The archbishop's chaplains forced him into the cathedral where the vesper service was beginning. As he passed up into the choir the knights burst in with drawn swords crying,

"Where is the traitor? where is the archbishop." He turned and advanced to meet them. "I," he said, "am the servant of Christ whom ye seek." One of them laid hands on him; the archbishop flung him off with words of scorn. They cut him down and scattered his brains on the pavement. Then they took horse and departed.

The murder of Becket gave him the victory which otherwise would hardly have been his. Henry's repentance was abject and sincere. Nearly eighteen months passed before he finally came to terms with the Pope; he evaded the extremity of submission, making a pretext for delay out of the expedition to Ireland, of which we shall presently speak further. When he did come to terms he was able to maintain those claims for the independence



Mounted soldiers of the time of Henry II.

[From a Vulgate Bible at Winchester.]

of the English Crown which had been asserted by his predecessors. But he had to surrender on the question of the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts; and no encroachment was made upon those privileges called "Benefit of Clergy" until the dawn of the Reformation.

The story of the later years of Henry's reign is very much taken up with his quarrels with his sons, the details of which scarcely concern our history. But how effectively the king had organised the royal power we can see by the fact that for nearly twenty years after his accession there was no revolt. And then when of a sudden his enemies rose up against him on all sides—his sons, his foes on the continent, English barons, and the king of Scots—he turned to bay, stamped out rebellion, routed his external enemies, took the king of Scots prisoner, and extorted from him by the treaty of Falaise the one unqualified and unquestionable submission of the northern kingdom which history records.

Henry's victory in this first contest was shortly followed by the Assize of Northampton, which gave a final shape to the system of sending justices on circuit which had first been instituted by Henry I. Two years later, in 1178, another step was taken in the organisation of the judicial system by the appointment of a special committee of the Curia Regis to deal with the bulk

of the questions which normally came before that body. At a later date this committee, now known as the *Curia Regis in Banco*, developed into the two Courts of King's Bench and Common Pleas. The final court of appeal, however, continued to be that of the king sitting in council.

In 1183 family quarrels again broke out, in which the three elder sons fought against each other and occasionally combined in order to fight their father. In this year, however, died the eldest son Henry, thus leaving the second, Richard, who was already Duke of Aquitaine, heir to the English throne. Three years later died the third son, Geoffrey, on whom Brittany had been bestowed, to whom after his death was born that son Arthur, of whose tragic fate the tradition, if not the actual facts, are preserved in Shakespeare's play, *King John*. Quarrels between King Henry and Richard were sedulously fomented by the crafty and utterly unscrupulous young king of France, Philip II., called Augustus. A check was put upon them, however, by a sudden blow which fell upon Christendom.

For eighty years the Christians had held Jerusalem and the sacred places in Palestine, which had been torn from the Saracens in the first crusade. But a new leader of aggressive Mohammedanism arose in the

person of the Seljuk Turk Sala-ud-Din, the famous "Sultan Saladin." He fell upon the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem and captured the Holy City itself. All Western Christendom began to arm for a mighty crusade, and in the horror of that great disaster all other feuds were for the time compounded. The preparations for the crusade led in England for the first time to the imposition of a tax not upon land, but upon movables or personal property, known as the Saladin Tithe. The tax was sanctioned by the Great Council; and it is to be observed that although the individual gave in his own sworn return of the value of his



Knights of the late 12th century.

property, his assessment might be appealed against to a jury of his own parish.

Henry probably and Richard certainly were both sincere in their crusading zeal. But Richard's policy was always ruined by the personal passions and jealousies of the moment, which Philip of France always turned to his own account. Richard involved himself in a quarrel with the Count of Toulouse; Philip joined in against him, and Henry himself was dragged in. Then Philip and Richard became reconciled and turned on the old king. How and why Henry broke down it is hard to guess; but break down he did, both in body and mind. He had no heart to fight, and submitted, conceding everything that was demanded of him, including the pardon of all who had joined the conspiracy. The last blow fell when he opened the list of traitors and found it headed by the name of his youngest and favourite son John. The shock killed him. Richard, passionate in



Ladies of the 12th century weaving.

[From Eadwine's Psalter.]

his remorse as in his anger, came to view his father's corpse; and men said that blood trickled from the dead man's nostrils, a sign that he who stood by him was his murderer.

The tragedy and failures of Henry's last months do not touch the fact that in England he raised the crown to the highest point that it ever reached. When he came to the throne the one absolute necessity was the concentration of power in the central government, which meant and could mean only in the king's hands. There was no independent political organisation of the people; while of the greater barons each one was a law to himself. They had not learnt to stand together as champions of public law. But they were not unwilling to receive from the king the conception of public law which was afterwards to bear fruit. The new powers of the Crown prepared the way for the tyranny of John; but Henry's own methods implanted in the barons that conception of public spirit which was exemplified at Runnymede and culminated in Simon de Montfort.

The most marked of the royal innovations was to be found in the extension of taxation in the form of exactions for war purposes called "scutage" in the case of tenants-in-chief, and "gifts," "aids," or "tallages" when levied from shires and towns. The Crown was further strengthened when the king made almost a clean sweep of the sheriffs, and for local magnates substituted exchequer officials in that office—an administrative reform of great importance. We have already noted how the dis-

integrating character which attended continental feudalism was checked by the institution of scutage and the more thorough organisation of the national militia by the Assize of Arms, which also extended the obligation of military service to classes which had hitherto been exempt.

In the field of judicature we have noted the reorganisation of the Curia Regis itself and the revival of Henry's system of occasionally sending visiting justices to inspect and supervise judicial administration in the provinces. This system also was reorganised by the Assizes of Northampton and Clarendon, which sent justices regularly on circuit and reserved for their judgment whole classes of cases which had hitherto been dealt with by local courts, although in the main questions of guilt or innocence were settled by the preliminary inquiry. That is, no one was presented for trial who had been acquitted in preliminary investigation; and the fact of presentation was treated as *prima facie* evidence of guilt. The itinerant justices were the representatives of the Crown. Thus by his various reforms Henry concentrated in the hands of the Crown and of officers dependent on the favour of the Crown the control of finance, the control of the military forces, and the control of judicial administration. When the Crown abused its powers it became the turn of the barons to insist that those powers should be exercised, not arbitrarily, but in accordance with precedent and custom. But those powers were so great that they could not be set at defiance or even challenged at all by individuals, or capriciously even by groups of individuals, but only by the concerted action of men moved by a strong sense of loyalty to a common cause.

II

THE ANNEXATION OF IRELAND

Henry II. won, as we have seen, from the Scots king a complete submission and an acknowledgment of his suzerainty over the kingdom of Scotland. This, however, was to be immediately abrogated by Henry's successor. On the other hand, he made a permanent acquisition by the annexation of Ireland, which hitherto had stood outside the region of English affairs, though it had influenced the early history of Scotland.

The Romans came and passed but never set foot on the sister island. The English came and made themselves masters of Britain, save for the highlands of the west, from the Channel to the Forth, the "Scots water." And they also left Ireland alone. The Irish Celts continued their Celtic development untouched by the Latin or the Teuton. They sent out those tribes which occupied Argyle, and ultimately gave their name to the Scottish nation. They sent out the missionaries who taught Christianity to the wild peoples of the North, and seemed likely enough at one stage to capture all England for their Church. But Celtic tribalism never adapted itself to the


evolution of an advanced political State. The subordination of the parts for the sake of the whole was alien to the Celtic temperament; and the progress which followed upon the stirrings of religious enthusiasm ended when the motive impulse died down. Ireland continued to be peopled by clansmen personally devoted to their petty chiefs, but under no common government. Powerful chiefs exercised some dominion over numerous minor chiefs, and some sort of nominal supremacy over the whole island on the part of the chief of the O'Neills seems commonly to have been recognised by these lesser kings.

But Ireland was no more immune from the attacks of the Northmen than the rest of Western Europe. Danes so-called, and probably many more Norwegians than Danes, harried her coasts and planted settlements from Dublin to Waterford—settlements which were made the occasional base for attacks upon England. But these Danes made no great effort to effect a conquest; the Danish host never flung itself in force upon Ireland as it did upon England and France. According to tradition

a Norse conquest was attempted early in the eleventh century, when the invaders were overwhelmed at the great battle of Clontarf by the Irish hero, Brian Boromhe, in 1014. This, however, was precisely the time when Denmark was conquering England, and no aggressive national movement was taking place from Norway. The Danes or Norsemen who were overthrown by Brian Boromhe were no great host of invaders from overseas, but probably the folk from the Danish settlements on the coast, though reinforced no doubt by bands of miscellaneous sea-rovers.

However, the battle of Clontarf put an end finally to active aggression on the part of Danes or Norsemen. Ireland was not included in Knut's conception of a northern empire. Seventy years later it appears that William the Conqueror contemplated the annexation of Ireland, of which doubtless also William Rufus also dreamed. The English Chronicler says that the Conqueror, had he lived two years longer, "would have subjugated Ireland by his wisdom without war." But his plans remain unrevealed and never materialised in action. Whatever Rufus may have intended, his ambitions were cut short by Walter Tyrell's arrow in the New Forest.

Nevertheless, if Brian Boromhe delivered Ireland from the Scandinavian conqueror, he did not succeed in organising an Irish state. Ireland remained unconsolidated, a congeries of clans engaged on interminable feuds, and of petty kings engaged on interminable rivalries; politically and ecclesiastically as well as geographically outside the influences which were



An Irish chalice of the 10th to 11th centuries.
[In silver exquisitely ornamented with gold repoussé and filigree work.]

shaking western Christendom; un-Teutonised, un-Latinised, and, from the papal point of view, heretical and hardly better than pagan.

Towards this region Henry Plantagenet turned an occasional glance, as one which it might some day be worth while to conquer if he should find time. Very early in his reign he obtained from Pope Adrian IV., the one Englishman who has ever occupied the papal throne, an authorisation to bring Ireland under his dominion and into ecclesiastical obedience to Rome. Other matters were of more immediate importance to the king; but an opportunity presented itself for establishing his authority in Ireland without undertaking a war to that end. Dermot, King of Leinster, was desperately at feud with a neighbour. Deposed from his kingdom, he appealed for aid to the mighty monarch on the other side of St. George's Channel. Henry would not take up the quarrel himself, but he allowed a group of Norman adventurers to make what they could out of the situation, always on condition of their remaining his own liege subjects and doing homage to him for any new territories they might acquire. The chief of the adventurers was Richard de Clare, Earl of Pembroke, called Strongbow, a baron whose acres did not suffice to make him wealthy or powerful at home in spite of remarkable abilities. With him were associated sundry Fitzgeralds, De Burghs, Fitzurses and others. They went over to the aid of Dermot with forces which were not indeed large, but were incomparably better equipped than the half-armed levies of the Irish clans, whom they routed with ease. Dermot was reinstated in his kingdom; Strongbow married his daughter, and was endowed with wide estates and the reversion of Leinster. The rest of the Normans had their share.

But Henry of England had no intention of permitting his own barons to set up independent principalities in the neighbourhood of his own kingdom. He was minded to make his own profit out of their adventure; moreover, the murder of Becket made it particularly convenient for him at that moment to place himself out of reach of rapid communication with Rome. So in 1171 he proceeded to Ireland with a considerable force. Whatever ambitious projects Strongbow may have entertained, he had no thought of defying the king of England, who came, moreover, armed with the papal authority which conferred upon him the dignity of Lord of Ireland. Strongbow was well enough content to retain the ample estates of Leinster as Henry's vassal and to surrender the royal title.

There was no united Ireland to bid defiance to the invader; and most of the Irish chiefs had no particular objection to acknowledging the overlordship of the king of England, such acknowledgments being in their experience easily made and easily set aside. All that Henry wanted was a general submission on their part and a secure foothold for himself in case he should afterwards find it convenient to turn it to account. There was no such prospect of immediate profit as would tempt him to expend time, labour, and money on the organisation of the newly acquired kingdom. Policy however, demanded insistence on the ecclesiastical side of his old

bargain with Adrian IV. in order to conciliate the present Pope Alexander III. The Churchmen in Ireland saw better hope for the future in the prospect of a government organised on the English model than in the prevalent lawlessness. They may perhaps be forgiven if they acted on expectations which were unfulfilled. Their unorthodoxy was not deeply rooted; they accepted the Roman supremacy and ranked themselves on the side of the annexation.

Henry then did not conquer Ireland in the sense in which William I. conquered England, or even in the sense in which William would have conquered England had there been no insurrections after his coronation. It was rather as though William had merely established a few of his followers with a couple of earldoms and several minor baronies carved out of Wessex, and had then left the country to take care of itself under the nominal control of one justiciar. Practically this was what Henry did in Ireland. He placed Hugh de Lacey in Dublin as justiciar, and gave him the great earldom of Meath to counterbalance Strongbow's earldom of Leinster. A few Normans held scattered territories, while the bulk of the Irish chiefs retained their land as feudatories of the English king. The English law ran only in the regions from Waterford to Dublin known as the English Pale. Henry, in fact, was quite as anxious to ensure that the Norman barons in Ireland should not become too powerful as to establish over the whole country a control which would have been costly and unremunerative. It was indeed his intention, at the time of the conquest of Ireland, to part his great dominion among his four sons; and probably when he annexed Ireland he had the idea of making it the portion for the youngest of them, John, who had come into the world ten years after his elder brothers and could otherwise only be provided for by slices out of their territory. But the fact remains that his organisation of a government for Ireland never went beyond the initial stages; and when twelve years later John did actually visit Ireland, his behaviour went very near to driving the native chiefs into a general insurrection. In short, the official government exercised only a very inefficient control within the Pale and none at all outside it; while the Norman barons made fresh acquisitions of territory for themselves and, like the Danes before them, adapted themselves to the native manners and customs; and the Fitzurses, by translating their name into its Celtic equivalent M'Mahon, exemplified the general truth that they had become in spirit much more Irish than Norman.

III

CŒUR DE LION

Richard I. is one of the magnificently picturesque figures of our history, the incarnation of all that most appeals to the imagination in feudalism. He is the fiery soldier dominated by the great ideal of winning back the Holy

Sepulchre from the Paynim ; he is the knight of unmatched prowess before whose terrific onset the Saracens are scattered like chaff ; he is the hero so fearless and so mighty that it was fabled concerning him that he slew a lion with his hands ; he is the minstrel king, rescued from durance vile by the faithful persistence of his loyal follower, Blondell ; he is the genial monarch who exchanged buffets with Robin Hood and Friar Tuck in merry Sherwood ; he is the generous prince, too chivalrous to punish the traitorous



An English monarch about 1190.

brother whom he freely forgave ; who, dying, freely pardoned the man who had dealt him his death-blow. Fact and fable are largely mingled in the picture. But as far as concerns the history of England Richard's personality belongs chiefly to romance. Out of his whole reign of ten years he spent barely six months, all told, in England. His crusading exploits form no part of English history ; the political aims on which he was engaged in his latter years belong to his position as a continental potentate, not as king of England. His reign had, indeed, a constitutional importance not very easily grasped and very easily forgotten in the glamour of romance which attaches to him ; but this was owing, not to Richard, but to the ministers to whom he entrusted his kingdom during his absence.

Although there was practically no established law of succession, Richard's title to the crown was unchallenged when Henry II. died. From August to December, 1189, he was in England, engaged in preparations for the crusade. His great need was money, which he raised with unparalleled recklessness by selling everything he had the power to sell for which he could get a price. For a price he set William the Lion of Scotland free from the obligations of the treaty of Falaise, and cancelled all English claims which rested upon that transaction. He sold a share in the chief justiciarship to the Bishop of Durham ; he sold sheriffdoms right and left ; he sold charters to the towns ; he sold offices and honours ; he sold permission to resign offices and honours. Then he departed, and England did not see his face again till the spring of 1194.

He left behind him as chancellor and chief justiciar—the Bishop of Durham was soon superseded—a low-born Norman, William Longchamp, who had the one supreme merit of being loyal to his master. His brother

John and his illegitimate brother Geoffrey, Archbishop of York, were under oath to remain outside the kingdom for two years. Longchamp, who was generally detested as an upstart, and displayed all an upstart's vices, started on a policy of repressing the nobles by re-occupying the royal castles which had been left in their hands in consideration of substantial payments. But Prince John had been allowed to return to the country, and now sought to pose as the champion of liberty against the justiciar's oppression. Richard, whose progress to Palestine was delayed in Sicily till the spring of 1191, received warnings which led to the appointment of the trustworthy and capable Walter of Coutances as justiciar in the room of Longchamp.

John plotted to obtain supreme power for himself, with the connivance of Philip of France, who had returned from Palestine a few weeks after Richard's arrival there. In the autumn of 1192 Richard himself started on his return journey ; but he was shipwrecked on the Adriatic coast, captured by his personal foe, Leopold of Austria, and handed over to the clutches of the German Emperor Henry, who held him in captivity. An enormous ransom was demanded, and the conspirators, Philip and John, spent the year 1193 in intrigues to prevent Richard's liberation. But Walter of Coutances and his successor in the justiciarship, Hubert Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury, aided by the old queen-mother Eleanor, succeeded in raising the huge ransom ; and the conspirators were checkmated by Richard's own arrival in England in March 1194. Rebellion collapsed and the rebels met with undeservedly generous treatment. Richard's exploits had secured him a popularity in England, which was evidenced by the readiness with which the nation had submitted to fearfully heavy taxation in order to set him free ; and which was not destroyed even by the new taxation imposed for carrying out Richard's vengeful designs against his arch-enemy, Philip of France. Within two months Richard had again departed from England, never to return, leaving the government in the hands of Hubert Walter, who ruled the country for four years.

Richard's wars and diplomatic intrigues concern England mainly because of the heavy demands for taxation and for military service which they entailed. The latter brought about what may be called a constitutional alliance of the greater barons and the higher clergy, which foreshadowed the events of the coming century. Headed by Bishop Hugh of Lincoln, they declared that their feudal obligation did not extend to service beyond the seas. And this Constitutional Opposition carried its point. Hubert thereupon resigned his position, and Geoffrey FitzPeter, Earl of Essex, took his place.

But the fundamental importance of Walter's term of office lies in his development of the system of representation and election for the purposes of local government, which afterwards provided the machinery for a representative parliament. The archbishop, it may be taken for granted, was not looking forward to any such development ; probably he was concerned

only with administrative convenience. But the changes he made also had the political effect of adding greatly to the importance of the class which grew into the gentry of the country, the "knights of the shire," who were for the most part tenants-in-chief holding from the Crown. Men of greater estate than the small freeholders, there was no class in the community whose interests were more bound up with the maintenance of peace and the enforcement of law. Hitherto the local "juries" had been bodies selected by the sheriff; it was their function to lay sworn information before the Crown officials in connection with assessments for taxation and for fiscal purposes, and to present cases for trial at the grand assizes. Walter substituted for this arrangement the election in the shire court of four officers called Coroners, who decided which cases should be reserved to be presented for trial by the judges; and the selection of the juries, instead of being left to the sheriffs, was placed in the hands of four knights of the shire elected for that purpose in the shire courts. Thus the way was prepared for sending elected knights of the shire to attend the Great Council, the name now clearly appropriated to the National Assembly, at which all tenants-in-chief were entitled to be present. Incidentally also knights of the shire were appointed "custodians of the peace," which meant primarily that they controlled the "Hue and Cry," which may be described as the local machinery for police purposes, out of which again at a later stage developed the functions of justices of the peace.

In 1199 Richard received his death wound while besieging the fortress of a recalcitrant vassal, the Viscount of Limoges, and was succeeded by his brother John.

IV

JOHN

There was another claimant to the throne in the person of the twelve year old Arthur of Brittany, the posthumous son of Geoffrey, a brother who had come between Richard and John. Both England and Normandy, not without hesitation, acknowledged John's claim; and in England he was formally elected. Hubert Walter became chancellor, and while he lived co-operated with the justiciar Geoffrey FitzPeter. But Arthur's mother, Constance, claimed for him Anjou and Maine, as well as Brittany, encouraged by Philip of France. Aquitaine in the meantime indubitably belonged to the old queen-mother Eleanor, whose marriage with Henry II. while he was still only Count of Anjou had associated it with the Angevin dominion. John stirred up a host of enemies by divorcing his wife Isabella of Gloucester, whose name is commonly given as Hadwisa, on a plea of consanguinity, and marrying another Isabel, of Angoulême, in spite of her being betrothed to Hugo of Lusignan. Out of these embroilments Philip of France meant to get his

own advantage by giving his support wherever there was most to be gained, though always professedly acting in accordance with feudal law.

The Lusignans formed a party; revolts spread among John's French vassals of various sorts; Philip intervened as suzerain and mediator; trickery was answered by trickery; and when Philip thought himself strong enough he summoned John to appear before him to answer charges brought against him in his capacity as Duke of Aquitaine. John refused to appear and Philip declared his fiefs forfeited.

Normandy Philip meant to keep for himself; for the rest of the Angevin dominion he recognised the rights of Arthur. Arthur attacked Aquitaine and besieged the queen mother. For once John exerted the military ability which he really possessed, swooped upon Arthur by a brilliantly rapid march, and captured him with all his company. He had the game in his own hands, and lost it by murdering Arthur as every one believed, and treating others of his captives with a brutality which alienated numbers who would otherwise have supported him. Philip flung himself against Normandy, and

John's English barons refused to fight for him. By the midsummer of 1204 Normandy was irrevocably lost. By the end of the year Gascony, which was bound to England by trade interests, was all that was left to John of the Angevin inheritance except a part of Poitou.

While John was losing Normandy and most of his other territories, matters went tolerably smoothly in England itself under the government of Geoffrey FitzPeter and Hubert Walter. John insisted upon exactions which were excessive and of doubtful legality. But the justiciar made politic concessions, sometimes to powerful barons, sometimes to a section of the clergy, and sometimes to the towns. The charters and trading rights granted to the last served for a long time to keep them royalist, when the baronage had




already been goaded into an attitude of open opposition to the Crown. The obstinate refusal of the baronage to follow John from France made the success of his cause impossible there, though probably in any case he would have compassed his own ruin.

In 1205 the death of Hubert Walter opened the second phase of King John's reign, the struggle with the papacy. For John it was unfortunate that the most powerful and the most uncompromising of all the Popes, Innocent III., now occupied the papal throne. The king's nominee for the archbishopric vacated by Hubert Walter's death was John de Grey, Bishop of Lincoln. The actual right of election lay with the Chapter of Canterbury; but the bishops of the province had in practice claimed to participate, and the king had in practice an effective power of control. The Chapter did not want John de Grey, but some of them at least would have preferred to avoid a quarrel with the king and the bishops. A hot-headed section, however, held a secret and irregular election, chose their sub-prior, and hurried him off to Rome to obtain papal confirmation of the election. The facts leaked out while he was on his journey. The other party in the Chapter hastened to make their peace with the king by electing John de Grey in conjunction with the bishops. De Grey went off to Rome to procure his own confirmation. Innocent took the view that both the elections were highly irregular, and he invited the king to send to Rome a commission of the Canterbury Chapter with authority to make a new election. When the commission arrived, Innocent, having set aside the two previous elections, invited them to adopt a nominee of his own, Cardinal Stephen Langton. The commission obeyed; and now every one concerned except Stephen Langton himself, including the Pope, had behaved irregularly, though there was no question of Langton's fitness for the office, and Innocent had believed that the appointment would be acceptable to the king.

John wanted his own creature and flung defiance at the Pope; the Pope retorted by taking the high ground of his supreme authority as the successor of St. Peter. John seized the Canterbury estates, and the monks withdrew or were driven into exile. The Pope threatened an interdict. John offered submission with a saving clause; Innocent would listen to no saving clause. John proclaimed that if the interdict were issued he would forfeit the estates of every ecclesiastic who obeyed it. Innocent pronounced the interdict, and the clergy obeyed it. Practically the king and the king's officers on the one side declared war on the clergy, while the clergy on the other side closed the churches.

The populace seem to have accepted the situation with a surprising equanimity. On the whole they inclined to the king's side, probably because, when the ecclesiastical revenues were seized, they were themselves delivered from the excessive burden of taxation. But John was threatened with excommunication, which would give every one who wanted it the papal authority for repudiating allegiance to him. At the end of 1209 John was excommunicated, and the excommunication was followed by

the threat of inviting Philip of France to effect his deposition. John continued to be defiant; but discontent increased, the air grew thick with plots and rumours of plots; John could trust no one and suspected all; Philip was preparing for invasion; and John, at last in sudden terror lest he should find himself deserted and alone, resolved on submission. In May 1213 he admitted the papal legate Pandulph, and made the famous submission in which he surrendered the crown of England and received back the kingdom as a fief of Holy Church. Thenceforth John was the Pope's repentant son and very obedient servant, and Innocent was John's very good lord and father. The submission does not appear at the time to have shocked public opinion to any great extent; John was by no means alone among the European princes who received their crowns as vassals of the Holy See. And



A translation of holy relics in the 13th century.

[Drawn by Matthew Paris.]

John's foes were deprived of the papal sanction for attacking him.

Stephen Langton, now accepted as Archbishop of Canterbury, and Geoffrey FitzPeter, were anxious to turn the new situation to account by efforts to restore the kingdom to its normal condition, and to remedy the abuses which had increased and multiplied while the quarrel with the papacy was in progress. But John had other views. Philip of France had protested loudly that he would not give up at the Pope's dictation the project of deposing John in favour of his own son, which he had taken in hand by the Pope's desire. But immediately after the reconciliation an English fleet had fallen upon the French ships, destroyed large numbers of them, and captured some hundreds with quantities of stores. For anything like invasion Philip was temporarily paralysed. Nevertheless, John's first desire was to pursue a vindictive policy. Continental powers, including the Emperor Otto, were ready to join in an alliance for the overthrow of the French king.

The English baronage, however, would have nothing to say to a renewal of the French war. They mistrusted John as a soldier; they knew that he had before collected vast sums of money, ostensibly for military purposes, which were thrown away in extravagance and mismanagement. John raged, but in the face of their stolidity he was helpless. Resolved to vent his wrath upon some one, he started for the

North, intending to exact penalties from the northern barons for their recalcitrance. Stephen Langton followed him, with threats even of renewing the excommunication if he persisted. An assembly was called at St. Albans by Geoffrey FitzPeter, where the proposal was perhaps made that the charter of Henry I. should be laid before John for ratification. Constitutional resistance to unconstitutional action was taking shape. And then the old justiciar, who, like Hubert Walter, had in some sense stood between the Crown and the barons, died. Both those men had been loyal supporters of the Crown, but had exercised a restraining influence on John himself while endeavouring to conciliate the interests which it was most dangerous to outrage.

John had rejoiced in the death of Walter and rejoiced now in the death of FitzPeter. The Pope, who had been ready to depose a disobedient king, was equally ready to condemn disobedience to his repentant vassal. But Innocent himself had presented England with an archbishop who feared neither king nor pope when he saw before him the clear path of justice. If the baronage produced no conspicuously competent leader, the Church gave them in Stephen Langton a guide as courageous as he was wise. It was Langton who produced and set before them the actual charter of Henry I., and gave them the controlling principle that they should demand not innovations, but the observance of the laws which the people and the great rulers of the past had recognised as just and righteous. The strength of the barons in the coming contest lay in the fact that it was made one not on behalf of the privileges of a class, but on behalf of the supremacy of the law.

Still John was bent on his project of destroying Philip of France, in conjunction with the Emperor Otto and other enemies of the French king. Unable to raise the feudal levies, John collected a large force of mercenaries and sailed for Poitou. He made terms with his old enemies of the house of Lusignan, and reports came home of a series of successful operations. But Otto on the east did not strike, and Philip organised his defence. At last Otto did move, in conjunction with a considerable force of John's troops which were in the Low Countries under the command of William Longsword, Earl of Salisbury. Then came complete disaster. At the battle of Bouvines Philip put Otto utterly to rout, taking the Earl of Salisbury prisoner; and his victory entirely dissolved the alliance which had been formed against him. Pope Innocent succeeded in procuring a peace which still left Gascony and Guienne to the king of England; but John returned to his kingdom, not with the palm of victory as he had hoped, but under the stigma of defeat and disgrace.


Characteristically enough John wished to relieve his feelings at the expense of the barons; but Bouvines only served to stiffen them. The leaders entered into a solemn compact to insist on the demand for the confirmation of Henry I.'s charter. In January 1215 they appeared before John in arms and made their demand. John procured three months' delay,

and in the interval employed every device of which he was master to break up the opposition; on his behalf, too, Innocent thundered from Rome. But it was in vain. The barons collected a great army in the North and once more sent in their statement of grievances. John flew into a passion, declaring with many oaths that they had better have asked him for his kingdom at once. They had awaited his reply; now they marched south to London, while John retreated towards the west. London received the barons with open arms; no one gathered to the king's support. He saw that he was beaten, and placed himself in the hands of the archbishop. The Great Charter, based upon that of Henry I., was drawn up, placed before him, and received the royal seal on June 17, 1215, at Runnymede, near Windsor.

The fundamental quality of all political revolutions that have taken place in England has been a theoretical conservatism. From the Charter to the

Parliament Bill of 1911 the reformers have invariably taken their stand on the doctrine that they were insisting on fundamental principles of the constitution against unconstitutional innovation. The only exceptions are to be found in the divers forms of republic which were attempted between 1648 and 1660; since it was not possible to maintain that England had ever before been a republic. In no case has the doctrine been more completely warranted than in that of the Great Charter, "the Charter" *par excellence*. With the exception of a single point, every line of it insists upon principles either explicitly formulated in previous charters or implicitly sanctioned by them—principles which had been set aside only in times of sheer lawlessness or by the deliberate innovations of the Plantagenets. Its novelty lay in the fact that it was extorted from the king at the sword's point instead of being voluntarily conceded by him. In the charter itself the main variation from precedent lay in its explicit formulation of principles which hitherto had only been implied. But it was precisely that change which established it as a permanent criterion.

It laid down that no man should be brought to trial unless evidence could be produced against him; that no man should be punished except after lawful trial, or in a manner disproportionate to his defence; that justice should not be sold nor delayed nor denied to any man. It claimed also that only recognised taxes and feudal fees (though these are



West Dean Parsonage, Sussex, a 13th century building.

somewhat inadequately defined) might be levied without obtaining the formal consent of the Great Council. There was ample ground for declaring that every one of these principles had been observed by the great rulers of the past. When the Charter comes to details the remarkable fact is that the barons did not confine themselves to insistence on the privileges of their own order, but also bound themselves to observe the just rights of other sections of the community in accordance with the law. Not that they wished to improve the position of the humbler classes or pretended to be champions of democracy; but they stood for the Supremacy of Law, and the right of every man to be in practice secure of what the law promised him in theory.

The one innovation of the Charter was the machinery which it set up for compelling the Crown to carry out its obligations. It created a committee of twenty-five, nominated from among the Greater Barons with the addition of the Mayor of London, which should have authority to enforce the Charter in arms even against the king. That innovation was the one feature of the Charter in which there was no permanence, although it was followed as a precedent at various crises during the next two hundred years.

The Charter marks an epoch in English history; it set up a permanent formula of liberties to which appeal could for ever after be made. But it did not bring immediate peace and good government. There were numbers of the barons who wanted something very much more drastic than what the wisdom and moderation of Stephen Langton sought to procure. For a short time it seemed that the king meant to fulfil his promises; but insubordination among the barons provided him with an excuse for making preparations to repudiate the Charter. He procured from the Pope a decree which annulled it; the more readily, because Innocent wanted John to take a leading part in a new Crusade, which under the existing conditions was impossible. Langton himself was paralysed by a papal threat to suspend him from his office. By the autumn both sides were preparing for war; and before the end of the year the barons, or a majority of them, took the extreme step of inviting the French Dauphin Louis to come to their aid. The barons suffered from the want of any strong and capable leader, and the coming of a French force identified patriotism with the Royalist cause. At first, indeed, the king gained few supporters, and none from among the baronage. Though Dover held out for him stoutly under the Justiciar Hubert de Burgh, it seemed at the outset as though Louis would carry matters all his own way. But time was on the side of a reaction, and the barons began to perceive with wrath that Louis's French followers expected to reap their own harvest, while the Committee of twenty-five were almost ignored by him. John occupied Lincoln, and already there were signs of the tide turning, when the king was seized with a sudden illness and died at Newark on October 19, 1216.

John deservedly enjoys the reputation of the worst monarch who ever

occupied the English throne, with no one to challenge that unenviable primacy except possibly Æthelred the Redeless. But John's very crimes and failures wrought good for the country. The recklessness of his rule, his utter disregard of law, his violence towards the Church, his extravagance, his monstrous taxation, and his personal wickedness, drove the baronage to assume the attitude of champions of law and order, and to wring from him the Charter to which appeal could for ever after be made when the ruling powers set law and order at naught. He shattered the Angevin dominion, but by so doing he made England English. The fusion of English and Normans had made great progress even in the reign of Henry II. ; but the loss of Normandy finally deprived the Norman families in England of their interest in Normandy, and bound them to England ; so that in the next reign they looked upon themselves as English, and upon Frenchmen, wherever they came from, as aliens and foreigners. Hence the national development of England was greatly indebted to the loss of John's possession in Northern France. Henceforth no king of England could treat the kingdom, after the manner of Richard I., as secondary to his continental dominions. England was not a province of the Duke of Normandy and Aquitaine ; Gascony and Guienne were French provinces in the possession of the king of England.

V


HENRY III. AND SIMON DE MONTFORT

On John's death the small group of loyalist barons and bishops was prompt to proclaim his young son Henry king. At its head was the stout old Earl Marshal, William of Pembroke, who accepted the office of Protector ; supported by Ranulf of Chester, as well as by the Justiciar Hubert de Burgh and the legate Gualo, who represented the new Pope Honorius III. The great Charter was reissued by the new government, but with a significant suspension of the clauses which forbade taxation except by consent of the Great Council. The rebels were at pause ; uneasy and dissatisfied with the Dauphin and his French companions, but unwilling to submit to the loyalists. Hostilities were suspended till the early summer of the next year, by which time there had been appreciable accessions to the king's party. The run-away fight known as the "Fair of Lincoln" turned the scale ; and this was followed in August by the victory of Hubert de Burgh in the Straits of Dover over a considerable fleet bringing French reinforcements for the Dauphin. Louis saw that the struggle had become hopeless, and came to terms in September. An almost complete amnesty was granted to the rebels, the exception being in the severity displayed by the papal legate Gualo towards the clergy who had opposed the Crown in defiance of the papal commands—a severity which accentuated the disposition of the English clergy to resent the exercise in England of control by Rome.

The Earl Marshal lived only eighteen months longer, ruling during that time with firmness and moderation. On his death the control passed to Hubert de Burgh and the Bishop of Winchester, Peter des Roches, a Poitevin like John's queen and her kinsfolk, who placed himself at the head of the foreign element which John—forced to depend on mercenaries—had brought into the country. Gualo's successor Pandulph sought to enforce a papal supremacy, but retired in face of the combination of Hubert and Peter; while Stephen Langton persuaded the Pope to give up imposing foreign legates on the country. The barons were leaderless, and for a time there was a struggle for power between the foreign party inspired by the bishop and the patriots represented by the justiciar, from which Hubert de Burgh emerged triumphant.

But in 1227 Henry III. came of age and assumed the government. For five years Hubert remained his chief minister, bearing the burden of the young king's follies and doing his best to counteract or minimise their bad effects; while Peter des Roches intrigued to undermine his position. In 1232 the intriguer in his turn achieved success; charges of maladministration and peculation were brought against Hubert which could not indeed be proved, but were not easy to disprove, and he was deprived of office and of most of his estates; though some of his strongest political adversaries interposed in his favour, and popular sentiment was all on the side of the stout old patriot.

Hubert de Burgh had striven honestly and loyally to restore what the misdeeds of John had destroyed—a strong central government on national lines. Not only were the Commons of England English, but the baronage of England had become at length definitely English also in the course of the last three generations. The barons were resolved that the government of England should be English, not foreign, but they



An early 13th century knight.

[From a tomb at Bitton Church, Somersetshire.]

were by no means clearly bent on keeping it strong and centralised. For some twenty-five years after the fall of the last great justiciar it is impossible to discover anywhere acknowledged leaders, or a definite positive policy in the opposition to the Crown, or a definite plan for remedying the persistent misrule, mismanagement, and extravagance.

King John was a brutal and debauched tyrant, clever enough to have been a distinguished statesman and general had he not been the slave of his own passions and vices, which were ignoble without qualification. Henry was neither cruel nor debauched, and if he had recognised his own intellectual limitations and allowed himself to be guided by sensible and patriotic advisers, he would have been an eminently respectable monarch. Unfortunately, although he was pious and a gentleman, he was obstinately determined to go his own way, which was invariably unwise; and like many other obstinate but shortsighted persons, he was generally managed by crafty intriguers who took advantage of his weaknesses to gain their own ends. But there was nothing so fatal as his persistent mistrust of all Englishmen, which led him habitually to repose his confidence in foreign advisers, and to place the administration in the hands of men who, whatever their merits, were detested as spoil-hunting aliens and were wholly un-English in their sympathies.

In the first stage the alien domination was that of the Poitevins, the allies or protégés of Peter des Roches. But Henry's marriage in 1236 to Eleanor of Provence, whose mother was of the house of Savoy, brought an incursion of the young queen's Savoyard uncles and Provençal kinsmen, who had been disappointed of expected profits when Eleanor's sister married the king of France, Louis IX.; and a few years later there was a fresh influx of Poitevins, sons and kinsfolk of Henry's mother, who had married again. To these alien swarms had to be added members of the French nobility who by descent or marriage discovered claims to territories in England. When Simon de Montfort, the great Earl of Leicester, first appeared on the scene, he was a conspicuous member of this last group, though as time passed he identified himself with the country of his adoption and made himself the whole-hearted champion of English liberties. And while Henry's jealousy of the English baronage provided power, place, and profit for the foreigners, his pious submission to the papacy made him ready to accede to every demand of the Holy See, to pour the revenues of the National Church into the Roman Treasury, and to fill ecclesiastical vacancies with the nominees of the Pope.

The influence of Peter des Roches was first challenged by Richard Marshal, the son of the Protector, perhaps the one man who was fitted to head a patriotic opposition. But the Earl was done to death by a treacherous stratagem while in Ireland, and although the baronage and the clergy, headed by the new Archbishop, Edmund Rich, succeeded in forcing the Bishop of Winchester into retirement, there was no one strong enough to dominate the king, who kept the management of matters in his own

incompetent hands. A series of magnificent marriages, including that of the king's sister to the German Emperor Frederick II., as well as the king's own nuptials, involved a tremendous expenditure, which was bitterly grudged while it could hardly be resisted. Matters were not improved when Henry made an unpopular military expedition to Poitou, of which only a remnant was left to the Angevins. Year after year saw repeated protests against taxation and extravagance on the part of the Great Council, a body which still for practical purposes usually consisted of the greater barons and ecclesiastics.

At last in 1244 the opposition began to formulate something like a scheme for controlling the king. Their leaders on this occasion were the king's brother Richard of Cornwall and Simon de Montfort, who a few years earlier had been allowed to marry a sister of the king. They urged, though without success, that three great officers of state, the justiciar, the chancellor, and the treasurer, should be elected, and a permanent council appointed with some power of control. But the attempt collapsed. Montfort was for some years employed abroad mainly in establishing the king's authority in Gascony; while the position of Richard of Cornwall prevented him from acting energetically in antagonism to the king. Edmund Rich of Canterbury, a saint but not a strong statesman, was succeeded by one of the queen's uncles, Boniface of Savoy, who showed considerable independence, and was apparently willing to act as a good Englishman, but was inevitably under suspicion as a member of the Savoyard family. Practically the papacy and the Crown combined to lay the country under ever-increasing impositions, which neither the baronage nor the national clergy were strong enough to resist effectively.

The climax, however, was reached when the king accepted from the Pope Innocent IV. the nomination of his second son Edmund to be King of Sicily, which the papacy was determined to take out of the hands of the Hohenstauffen. In accepting the kingdom, Henry in effect pledged himself to extract from England money for Innocent and his successor Alexander IV. to carry through the papal quarrel with the Hohenstauffen, which had nothing whatever to do with England. The immense demands involved upon the national purse strained the endurance of baronage and clergy to the breaking point. The opposition closed up its ranks; although in 1257, a portion of Henry's demands were conceded, the Great Council, known as the Mad Parliament, which assembled in 1258, insisted uncompromisingly on the redress of grievances.

The grievances and the proposed remedy were formulated in the Provisions of Oxford. The facts of portentous extravagance, illegal exactions, endless mismanagement, military incapacity, and subservience to the papacy were patent. Henry's expeditions in France had ended, not in the recovery, but in the complete loss of Poitou. Llewelyn, the Prince of North Wales, had succeeded practically for the first time in uniting nearly the whole of Wales in defiance of England, and the attempts to bring him to



THIRTEENTH CENTURY KNIGHTS IN BATTLE



THE KING CONFERS WITH THE ARCHITECT AT THE BUILDING OF A NEW CATHEDRAL
 DRAWINGS FROM AN EARLY THIRTEENTH CENTURY MS. BY MATTHEW PARIS

From the original MS. in the British Museum. The drawings are perhaps by Matthew Paris himself, and were certainly made in St. Alban's Abbey under his supervision about 1250.

subjection had failed ignominiously. All these troubles the barons attributed in the main to the king's employment of aliens in nearly all positions of trust. Repeated confirmations of the modified Charter went for nothing when there were no means of compelling the king to carry out his pledges. So the Provisions demanded a clean sweep of the aliens and of incompetent and corrupt officials. But they went much further, and insisted on the appointment of a quite novel species of oligarchy, which, on the one hand, was to take the place of the Great Council, and on the other was to exercise complete control over the administration. The arrangements were extravagantly complicated; but the practical outcome was that there was to be a supreme council of fifteen, two committees of twenty-four, and another committee of twelve, with various functions to discharge, all the committees being made up so that one group of the greater barons were members of each, and government was to be permanently vested in the hands of a few families.

But the oligarchy was united in nothing but the determination to remove the control of the government from the king's hands. The system could in no case have been shaped into a working constitution. Montfort would probably have entirely repudiated the idea that he was seeking his own personal aggrandisement; his honest aim was the establishment of a strong and just government. But also he would probably never have regarded any government as strong and just in which he was not practically the dictator. There were others who wanted a strong and just government, but would not have Montfort as dictator. And there were others who were actuated by merely personal ambition, and wanted to dominate the government for their own personal ends. Within four years the oligarchs were hopelessly at odds among themselves, and half of them, in order to overthrow Montfort, had gone over to the side of the king, who in his turn obtained from the Pope a dispensation from his repeated oaths to observe the Provisions. At last there was a general agreement to refer the whole question to the arbitration of the French king, Louis IX., one of the noblest characters of the century. Louis gave his award, known as the *Mise of Amiens*, in January 1264, entirely on the side of Henry.

Montfort repudiated the award as the other side would undoubtedly have done had it gone against them. Both sides appealed to arms. Montfort had emphatically championed popular rights and popular liberties, as his opponents had championed baronial privileges. The contest now was not one between the Crown and the barons, but between a popular party headed by Montfort and supported by the towns and Commons generally, and a feudal party which had joined hands with the supporters of the Crown. But Montfort was far superior to his adversaries in military skill; and although the odds at first had seemed against him, when the opposing forces met in a pitched battle at Lewes he was completely victorious; Henry himself and his eldest son, who afterwards became Edward I., were obliged to surrender to him.

Thus Earl Simon was able practically to dictate to the king a new arrangement known as the Mise of Lewes. The government was to be in the hands of a council, and the council was to be appointed by a committee of arbitrators from which all aliens were to be excluded. The arrangement collapsed at once, because no tolerably impartial committee could be brought together. But immediately afterwards the Great Council

was again assembled, at which there was again present that fleeting element, the representative knights of the shire. To this Council or Parliament Earl Simon presented a new scheme. The Council was itself to appoint three electors, none of whom were to be aliens. The three electors were to nominate a council of nine. The nine were to appoint all officers of state, and were in fact to control the government. The parliament chose as electors Montfort himself with the young Earl Gilbert of Gloucester and the Bishop of Chichester, two of his strongest supporters. The arrangement meant the dictatorship of Simon de Montfort.



Simon de Montfort the elder.

[From a window in Chartres Cathedral, about 1230.]

At the end of the year the dictator summoned the famous parliament which met at the beginning of 1265. Hitherto the Great Council had consisted of the greater barons and higher clergy, summoned personally by the king, occasionally but irregularly supplemented by elected knights of the shire. Not all of the greater barons were summoned to Montfort's parlia-

ment, which was in fact a packed assembly, but the Earl introduced an important innovation. Besides the elected knights of the shire, he selected a number of boroughs, which were in general favourable to him, and summoned two elected burgesses from each of them. The parliament is famous, not because of what it accomplished, but because it was the first in which the burgess element was represented. There had been previous occasions when burgesses had been summoned for consultation and to give information, but they had not been allowed any voice in the actual deliberations of the Council. Montfort set a precedent which was not to be permanently adopted till thirty years afterwards, but its importance is not therefore to be underrated

Montfort professedly intended the method of government instituted after the Mise of Lewes to serve merely as a *modus vivendi* until a permanent system could be agreed upon. But in the meanwhile the other side was mustering troops in France for a renewal of the war, and the provisional government was constantly threatened from the side of the Welsh marches, where Mortimer stood for the king's party. Earl Simon's popularity was derived from those qualities in his character which had won for him the name of Earl Simon the Righteous, and heroes of the Puritan type are generally prone to make enemies. His sons lacked their father's idealism and alienated many who would willingly have supported the Earl himself. They quarrelled with the Earl of Gloucester, who opened negotiations with Mortimer. Prince Edward escaped from his custody and joined the Marcher earls who rose in arms.

The insurgents were in overwhelming force from north to south of the Welsh marches. Montfort had at last met his match. A year before he had out-generalled the Royalists ; and at the battle of Lewes, Prince Edward had played the part of Prince Rupert in the great Rebellion four hundred years afterwards. His cavalry charge had swept away the wing of Simon's army opposed to him, but he had rushed on in a prolonged pursuit and returned to the field only to find the battle lost. It was the blunder of inexperience. Edward had learnt his lesson and realised the importance of scientific strategy and scientific tactics in war. Montfort's son was at Kenilworth in Warwickshire, and with him the Earl intended to form a junction and then crush the Prince. But Edward struck at the younger Montfort before the elder arrived. When the Earl reached Evesham, instead of being joined by his son, he was met by the Prince in superior force. With anything like equal capacity in the leaders the result of the battle was a foregone conclusion. Montfort's army was annihilated and he himself was slain.

Nearly two years elapsed before pacification was completed. Gloucester had turned against Montfort on personal grounds, but his aims had always been nearly akin to those of Montfort himself ; and when the Royalists seemed to him to be using their victory unjustly, he threatened to raise revolt again. But, in fact though not in name, Edward had already taken his father's place. The great Earl was dead, but essentially his cause was victorious. Edward was Montfort's disciple in statesmanship as well as in war ; and the Crown itself took up the task of establishing a government which should be at once just, strong, and patriotic. Five years after Evesham order had been so completely restored, and the existence of a new and firm regime so thoroughly recognised, that Edward himself was able to leave the country on the last crusade in which an English Prince took part, and to remain absent for four years, although his father died during the interval.

Earl Simon's career is unique in English history. Born and bred a foreigner, a younger son of that Simon de Montfort of European fame who

led the crusade against the Albigenses and acquired the county of Toulouse, he came to England merely to make good a claim to the earldom of Leicester which had descended to his father. At the outset he was in the eyes of Englishmen a typical alien, to be classed with the Poitevins and Savoyards ; especially when he obtained the royal assent to his marriage with one of the king's sisters, a marriage which greatly disgusted the king's brother, Richard of Cornwall. Yet we find him associated with Richard as most prominent among the barons in calling for a revision of the whole system of government after Henry's expedition to Poitou. He won himself a foremost place by his high abilities as a soldier and as an administrator, which were put to the proof when he was sent abroad to govern Gascony in the king's name. But his high moral character with its Puritan quality, his idealism, his devotion to a cause which appealed not at all to other men of his own class, singled him out even more than his abilities from the rest of the English magnates and made him inevitably the leader. There is little enough sign in him of constructive statesmanship ; he was one of those men who with power in his own hands would have ruled autocratically, with even-handed justice according to his lights, and with a single eye to the welfare not of himself, not of a class, but of the community at large. But the one innovation introduced by him which was in the long run to be permanently established, the representation of the towns in the National Council, was merely an accident, the outcome of the fact that he was himself assured of the support of that new element. None of the machinery which he devised for controlling the power of the Crown could conceivably have been made permanent with beneficial results, though it must also be remarked that he himself never intended it to be permanent. His greatness lies in his insistence on the principle that the aim of the government must be the prosperity of the whole state, and his manifest desire to make the government a government by national consent.

VI

ASPECTS

Norman kings bore sway in England for eighty-eight years. That period was not one of progress ; it cannot be said that at the end of it the people of England were more prosperous or the political status of the country higher than in the days of Canute or of the Confessor. Superficially at least the Conquest has the appearance of a convulsion which turned the land upside down from end to end, overthrew its institutions, and set up an entirely new system while imposing upon the English control by an alien and conquering race. We are able to discover, when we get below the surface, that fundamental institutions were not after all destroyed. The Normans introduced a new factor, but they did not wipe out what they

had found before them. The new factor and the old conditions, violently antagonistic as they were at the outset, had to be adapted to each other and harmonised into new conditions, which should render a national growth possible. The Conqueror by blood and iron, and Henry I. with his cold-blooded aptitude for business, constructed out of the warring elements foundations on which it was possible for their successors to build and which even the impotence of Stephen did not obliterate. The building was taken in hand by the first of the Plantagenets and the era of English progress began.

Henry II. found the hostility of Norman and Englishman already being forced into the background by the common danger from unlicensed feudalism which threatened the bulk of the Normans no less than the Englishmen themselves. Before the close of his reign a notable public official, Richard FitzNeal, could affirm in his *Dialogus de Scaccario* (i.e. the Exchequer) that Norman and Englishman had become practically indistinguishable outside the class of villeins. The unifying process was completed when the separation from Normandy identified the interests of even the greater baronage entirely with the country in which all their estates now lay; and at least from the beginning of the thirteenth century, the entire baronage looked upon itself as English and was imbued with the nationalist conception of the state. This disappearance of racial hostility was the first condition of national progress.

The second necessary condition was the development of a higher moral standard. The Conquest tended to force to the front all the baser and more brutal qualities alike in the conquerors and in the conquered—greed, cruelty, vindictiveness, treachery. The sheer excesses of Stephen's reign brought about reaction, a craving for order, a revulsion against the principle that might is right. In all the civil strifes during the Angevin period there was no reappearance of the horrors of the anarchy. But the change which came was more than a mere revulsion against abnormal excesses. A positive conception of personal duties and obligations permeated the higher ranks of the community. Barons and knights were not indeed possessed with a sudden spirit of altruistic self-sacrifice, but the chivalric ideal became elevated and purified though it was often enough misdirected. A Cœur de Lion provided an infinitely higher type for imitation than a Rufus; and the change which made a Richard rather than a Rufus the ideal of knighthood prepared the way for a conception of knighthood which took for its ideal a St. Louis or a Simon de Montfort. Men had learnt at least to pursue ends that were not purely selfish, and to take thought for the public good.

In bringing about this change the Church played a not inglorious part. At the close of the eleventh century and throughout the twelfth, the papacy was in aggressive conflict with the lay potentates of Europe. But England was too remote from Rome to be very directly involved in that struggle. The claims of the Roman pontiff until the thirteenth century were for the most part resisted alike by the Crown and by the clergy in England; and

in the thirteenth century it was the Crown which submitted to those claims while the clergy continued to resist them. The political aggression of the papacy, however, was in itself the outcome of a lofty conception of the Church's duty in the world, a conception by which the clergy in England were as emphatically actuated as the Popes themselves.

From Lanfranc to Edmund Rich the archbishops of Canterbury and many of the bishops provided conspicuous examples of that public spirit which only began to make its appearance among the lay baronage in the

time of Henry II. Becket and the Popes of the thirteenth century were responsible for translating the ecclesiastical ideal into one of conflict between the ecclesiastical and the secular authority; but Stephen Langton, Edmund Rich, and the great bishop Grossetête of Lincoln, the friend of Simon de Montfort, were the foremost champions of the highest ideals of their day.

And to their support came a new movement which gave the religious sentiment a new vitality. The orders of Mendicant friars, founded by St. Francis of Assisi and by



Ordination of a priest, 12th century.

[From the Roll of Guthlac in the British Museum.]

St. Dominic, were planted in England just after the accession of Henry III. By precept and example the brothers taught men to deny themselves, not, like the ascetics, for the discipline or salvation of their own souls, but for the welfare of others, material as well as moral.

Political and moral progress reacted upon material progress to which the Conquest had in the first place given a set-back. The villeins of Domesday had been freemen; by the time of Henry II. they had become in the eyes of the law serfs bound to the soil. But with the development of the new conditions they ceased to be the victims of perpetual oppression. In practice they were not greatly affected by the change in their legal status, because in practice it would very rarely have occurred to the villein to wish to leave the soil on which he was born, and if he did so wish, the difficulties would in general have been almost insuperable. But we have now to distinguish. The villein had now come to be roughly identified with the

man who held his land from a lord to whom he owed agricultural service, while he who held by payment in coin or in kind was generally looked upon as a free man. The effect of the Conquest had been to transfer large numbers of the latter class to the former. But with the new conditions came an increasing tendency to allow services to be commuted for payment; with the necessary complementary tendency to employ labour for which wages were paid, in place of the compulsory labour which was commuted for rent. This movement was further facilitated by the growing employment of coin as a medium of exchange and of payment, in place of the more primitive methods of barter and payment in kind which necessarily prevailed when the precious metals were generally unavailable.

The change marked improved relations between the lords of the soil and the actual cultivators, a gradual passing of the feeling that the one class were practically the chattels of the other. But it does not otherwise imply any material modification in the manner of life of the rural population. A more prominent feature, however, of the period is the development of the boroughs.

The borough or town, in the sense in which we shall now use that term, was, as we have seen, at the time of the Conquest, merely a larger *tun*, township or village, formed either by expansion or by the aggregation of two or more townships in a single community. Life in the town did not differ essentially from life in the village; the population was mainly concerned with agriculture. But so far as trade existed, the town was the centre of trade. Within this larger community men specialised to a greater extent in the few handicrafts which were practised. Thither to market or to fair came the village folk who had produce to exchange for goods which their own labour could not provide. The Norman demanded more and better goods of various kinds than had satisfied the Saxon; and the Conquest brought in its train foreign merchants with manufactured wares to sell, and willing to buy the raw materials which were the only English produce of which they stood in need. Foreign commerce in the sense of commerce with foreigners in England increased, for the English themselves did very little in the way of direct import or export. Roughly speaking, the trade within each county or shire was concentrated in one or two boroughs, and, on a larger scale, in the half-dozen leading towns in the kingdom, London and Winchester, York, Lincoln and Norwich, and Bristol.

The borough lay sometimes within the lordship of a single manor; more often perhaps two or more lords of the manor had jurisdiction within its borders. It was also subject to the jurisdiction of the king's officers, often because it had originally acquired its dignity as a *burh*, a fortified garrison town. It regarded its neighbours with jealousy and counted their citizens foreigners, to be admitted to the privilege of trading only because it was inconvenient or impossible to do without them; so they were to be generally discouraged and made to pay for the privilege.

The boroughs were already possessed of certain powers of self-government separating them from the jurisdiction of the shire authorities, but they had a natural desire to be free also from manorial control and from that of the king's officers. Throughout the early Plantagenet period one borough after another acquired immunities or privileges by a charter or a series of charters obtained from the lords of the manor and the kings. These rights were not granted for nothing, since they involved the surrender by the authority which granted the charter of rights financially

valuable, tolls and fees. In one way or another the charters were purchased at a price, and were granted most readily by kings or lords when in want of money.

The powers and rights conferred by the charters were not identical in form, but the same two objects were always in view—immunity from outside jurisdiction, which was to be vested instead in the freemen of the borough, and authority to establish a gild-merchant having power to regulate trade in the borough.



Travellers in Anglo-Norman dress.

[From a 12th century MS.]

In discussing the gild-merchant we are on exceedingly debatable ground, and can only put forward probable explanations which must not be taken as dogmatic pronouncements. Apparently in the first instance, wherever a gild-merchant was established, the freemen of the borough formed themselves into two separate organisations with separate officers for the discharge of two separate functions—town government, which was the work of the corporation, and trade regulation, which was the work of the gild-merchant. But the gild-merchant became distinct from the body of the freemen of the borough, because in the first place the men who were not engaged in trade would not enroll themselves in the gild-merchant, and in the second place the gild-merchant admitted to its membership persons who were not freemen of the borough. The most explicit constitutional regulation of the gild-merchant was that no one should be permitted to trade within the borough, except by special occasional licence, unless he had been admitted to membership of the gild-merchant. On the other hand, the gild was not a private association which captured the control of trade, but was a body to which every burgess was entitled to belong if he chose. The term merchant had not, it must be remembered, its modern signification; the manufacturer, the wholesaler, and the retailer had not been differentiated. Every one without distinction who sold goods was a merchant.

The gild-merchant could carry its regulations down to the minutest

details. It could fix wages and prices, standards of quality, the time at which work might be done. The idea of free competition had not come into existence. Buying and selling was, of course, a matter of bargaining, but no one had any doubt that a public authority was entitled for the public good to draw the line between fair and unfair bargaining. It was the legitimate business of the gild-merchant to take such measures as it thought fit to ensure good workmanship, fair dealing, and fair wages and prices.

VII

SCOTLAND

Scotland affords no counterpart to the constitutional struggles with which England had been so largely occupied for three-quarters of a century when Henry III. died; and the process of consolidation which went on in the northern kingdom was also on quite different lines. For England the vital fact was that the country ceased to be merely a portion of the dominions of a European potentate, and that French provinces became merely appanages of the English crown. Scotland, on the other hand, had no foreign possessions and no direct interest in European politics. For her, foreign policy meant relations with only two powers, England and Norway.

But Scotland itself was composed of much more heterogeneous elements than England. A dynasty, which until the middle of the eleventh century was pure Celt, had established a claim to supremacy over the whole of the lands north of the Tweed; but very little Celtic blood ran in the veins of the Scottish kings. Malcolm Canmore's mother was a daughter of Siward the Dane, Earl of Northumbria; his wife was the sister of Edgar the Ætheling; his son David, the progenitor of the later kings of Scotland, married the heiress of Siward's son Waltheof. Thus the royal family was to an immense extent Saxonised, and as time went on became also very much Normanised. Of the dominions over which it ruled, two-thirds of the Lowlands and much of the eastern coastal districts beyond the Forth, though still perhaps mainly Celtic in race, were Teutonised in character; but Galloway at least, on the west, and the whole of the highlands, were almost entirely Celtic; while the population of the islands was partly Celtic and partly Norwegian; and Caithness, as well as the Orkneys and Shetlands, was almost entirely Norwegian. From Shetland to the Isle of Man the isles fell under two groups known as the Nordereys and the Sudereys, and it was exceedingly doubtful whether they regarded their allegiance as due to the King of Norway or to the King of Scotland, while the Earl of Caithness, a Norseman, paid homage to the King of Scots for Caithness itself and to the King of Norway for the Orkneys.

The Celtic highlands resented the supremacy of the Anglicised royal house, and whenever it suited them supported any pretenders to the throne who might appear ; of whom there were two groups, one the MacHeths, claiming by descent from the son of Lady Macbeth, in whose name Macbeth himself had seized the crown ; while the other group, the Mac-Williams, descended from an elder son of Malcolm Canmore by his first marriage. So that there was, broadly speaking, a Scandinavian or semi-Scandinavian fringe which leaned towards Norway, a great Celtic population



David I. and Malcolm IV. of Scotland.
[From the Kelso Abbey Charter, about 1160.]

covering nearly the whole of the north and the west which still clung to the old tribal system and detested the Anglo-Norman form of feudalism, and a large Teutonic or Teutonised population, mainly in the Lothians, which accepted the Anglo-Normanised monarchy and its Anglo-Norman institutions. But this section, the wealthiest and the most progressive, remained stubbornly antagonistic to the English of England ; while the kings resented the English claims to overlordship, and at every available opportunity made counterclaims on the English counties north of the Tees.

The period of wildest anarchy in England, when Stephen was king, was the period when David I. in Scotland was organising unity in Church and State, extending Anglo-Norman institutions, and introducing a very considerable Norman leaven into what was now becoming the Scottish baronage. David died a year before Stephen. His eldest grandson and immediate heir was placed on the throne as Malcolm IV. (nicknamed the Maiden) at the age of twelve ; and was followed twelve years later by his brother William, called the Lion. William died in the fifteenth year of his reign, two years before King John. We have already seen how he was captured in the reign of Henry II., when raiding the north of England with intent to assert his claims in Northumberland and Cumberland, and how he was compelled to do homage for the kingdom of Scotland to the King of England by the treaty of Falaise, which was abrogated fifteen years afterwards by Richard Cœur de Lion.

After this time the Scots claim for Northumberland and Cumberland was not again made a pretext for war, although it was from time to time asserted when the King of England appeared to be in a dangerous strait. Moreover, for a hundred years no attempt was made by any King of England to enforce a claim of sovereignty over Scotland ; though on

sundry occasions when a Scots king did homage for possessions in England the English king sought without success to exact homage for the Scottish crown also.

The last of the MacHeth and MacWilliam insurrections were suppressed on the accession of William's young son Alexander II., a vigorous monarch who reigned from 1214 to 1249. He met his death on a western expedition, undertaken in order to bring under his dominion the southern isles, which at this stage professed allegiance to Norway. Twelve years earlier he had finally settled the Northumbrian question, by commuting his claims for estates in those counties held from the King of England.

His son and successor Alexander III. was only a boy of eight, and the years of his minority foreshadowed what was afterwards to become the normal state of affairs on the demise of a Scottish king. A child succeeded to the throne, and opposing factions of the more powerful barons endeavoured to capture the person of the young king and the authority of the regency. When young Alexander came of age, however, he asserted his authority undisputed by either of the rival factions; and very shortly afterwards the Norwegian question was settled as the dynastic question in Scotland itself had already been settled. Alexander resolved to assert his authority over the islands. The chiefs appealed to King Haakon of Norway, and according to Scottish tradition Haakon attempted to make good his own claims by an invasion on the west. The Norsemen were routed at the battle of Largs, and three years later Haakon's successor, Eric, King of Norway, ceded to Alexander all his claims on the islands except the Orkneys and Shetlands. King Eric subsequently married Alexander's daughter, Alexander himself having married a daughter of Henry III.

Broadly speaking, the whole period under review was one of prosperity for Scotland. After the Norwegian treaty following the battle of Largs the royal authority was recognised over the whole of the mainland and the islands from Cape Wrath to the Solway. The risk of political disruption or of a dynastic overthrow had practically disappeared; and in the Lowlands at least, north as well as south of the Forth, the Church flourished and commercial towns were developing. No one anticipated the storms which were destined to arise after the death of Alexander III.

BOOK II

NATIONAL CONSOLIDATION (1272-1485)

CHAPTER V

NATIONALISM AND CONSTITUTIONALISM

I

THE REIGN OF EDWARD I

THE reign of Edward I. marks an epoch in the history of the peoples of Great Britain. It saw the subjugation of Wales and her incorporation into the English kingdom. It saw that attempt at the incorporation of Scotland which aroused the fierce struggle for Scottish independence that was decisively concluded in the ensuing reign. Scotland achieved her liberty; and if liberty were not itself priceless, we might be tempted to say that the price she paid in after years was excessive. In England it saw the final confirmation of the nationalism which had been developing during the previous century, and the establishment of the constitutional system, which assured to a representative parliament the control of the public purse and all which that control implies. It may be doubted whether any one of these things would have happened but for the personality of the king who occupied the throne of England.

For two hundred years England had been ruled by kings of whom all except the two last spent more than half their lives outside her borders. The two exceptions, John and Henry III., had both stood in direct antagonism to the national ideas growing up amongst the baronage, who had hitherto been as alien and un-English as the kings themselves. With those ideas Edward identified himself, so that he became the typical national leader, presenting in his own person and character with a singular precision those qualities which have ever since characterised the nation of which he was the head.

The English people, although foreign critics have always reproached them with inordinate greed, while to some they have appeared, like the Carthaginians to the Romans, as the typically "perfidious" race, have always prided themselves on their love of justice. No less have they prided themselves on their love of liberty, although again the foreign critic is apt to denounce their tyranny. In fact they have always loved liberty passion-

ately, in the concrete for themselves, and in the abstract for their neighbours. But this has not prevented them from being perfectly confident that it is good for other people to be ruled by them. There is, indeed, ample warrant for that belief; but it has been apt to leave out of count the fact that other peoples hold the same view of liberty which they take for themselves, and prefer their own self-rule, however defective, to a rule forced upon them, however admirable. The Englishman loves strict justice administered without fear or favour, but he has an aptitude for persuading himself that the course of strict justice, and the course which coincides with his own interest, are identical; though if he fail so to persuade himself, he will choose the course which he believes to be just. He will keep faith with resolute precision; the letter of his bond is sacred; but he is given to taking an advantage of the letter himself, and is somewhat inclined when occasion arises to evade the spirit in reliance on the letter. Hence the fervid denunciations of England as tyrannical and greedy, hypocritical and perfidious, by those who have suffered from her methods. Edward I. was an exemplar of the English national character as here portrayed; whether we look at his Scottish or Welsh policy, or study his relations with the England baronage and the English people. To Welsh and Scots he is the ruthless king, the tyrannical usurper, though he himself probably never had a doubt of the perfect righteousness of his treatment of both countries. He took for his own motto *Pactum serva*, "Keep troth," while his enemies denounced him as an unprincipled trickster.

From a purely English point of view, however, Edward stands out as emphatically the greatest of the Plantagenets—the greatest, perhaps, of all England's rulers during the six centuries between the grandsons of Alfred and Queen Elizabeth. He completed the work of consolidating the English nation, although he failed in his design of bringing the whole of Great Britain under a single sceptre. No other country in Europe was formed into such a state of unity till nearly two hundred years afterwards. His legislation gave permanent shape to the law. His creation of the Model Parliament gave that assembly a form which it retained for more than five hundred years, and made it the mouthpiece of the will of the nation; while its power of withholding supplies made the administration increasingly dependent on its support and goodwill, as the development of expenditure placed the government more and more at the mercy of those who held the purse-strings. Government in England became essentially, as it had never been before, government by assent of the commons; government which was not controlled by the commons but must rest upon their support. The fact stands out, although it is not to be attributed to any relaxation on Edward's part of the absolutist theory. Rather it was his aim to create a force which would counterbalance that of the baronage and prevent baronial groups from dominating the Crown. But it followed also that the Crown must conciliate that force, lest it should make common cause with the baronage.

In another aspect also the reign of Edward I. was of great importance, because in it were laid the foundations of national commerce, the sense of

community of interests among English traders, and the expansion of trade with foreign countries.

The reign falls broadly into two periods. The first, from 1272 to 1290, during which Edward was admirably served by his great Chancellor, Robert Burnell, was the period of legislation ; within which fell also the conquest of Wales. The second, from 1290 to 1307, was the period of a constitutional struggle in which the two most prominent incidents were the summoning of the Model Parliament and the Confirmation of the Charters. In this period falls also Edward's attempt to establish the English supremacy over Scotland.

II

EDWARD'S LEGISLATION

Down to the time of King John the kings of England had all succeeded to the throne only after a form of election ; it had never been recognised that there was any one with an indefeasible title to the succession. On John's death, when there was no other possible claimant of the blood royal, the boy Henry had been proclaimed as a matter of course by the loyalists ; there being no other pretender except the French Dauphin. Thenceforth the hereditary title was assumed ; though always with a reservation, not explicitly set forth, of the right of parliament to set aside the legitimist occupant or heir of the throne. Edward himself was in Palestine when Henry III. died, but the estates swore fealty without demur to the representatives whom he had appointed. Affairs went on so peaceably that Edward made no haste to return. He was at first detained by affairs in Gascony, and his relations with his cousin and suzerain, Philip III. of France ; and he did not land in England to take up the work of government till 1274.

The disturbances of Henry's reign had been due to the royal and papal exactions and to the favour shown by the king to aliens. The Opposition had attempted to find a remedy by setting excessive restrictions upon the power of the Crown, by transferring to a baronial oligarchy or a dictator powers fraught with danger unless wielded by men of the purest integrity and patriotism. From the baronial wars Edward had learnt two political lessons ; first, that the strength of the Crown must lie in its accord with the feeling of the nation ; and secondly, that it must not be subjected to the control of fortuitous baronial combinations. The most irritating feature of Henry's government had been that it was unstable, capricious, and incalculable. Policy demanded that its methods should be systematic, recognisable, clearly defined. It was the object of the legislation to which Edward now set himself to make definite what had hitherto been indefinite, and thereby to remove sources of disputation ; neither to create nor to abolish rights, but to arrive at and keep to a clear understanding and acknowledgment of rights which were entitled to recognition ; whether of king, barons, clergy, or commons. This definition of rights ought to be


arrived at not arbitrarily, but in such a fashion that the various parties concerned should share the responsibility for the conclusions accepted.

The process opened with the summoning in 1275 of a parliament in which the commons were represented. Of all the sources of friction none was more serious than that of taxation. The Great Charter had laid down the principle that while the Crown had a legal right to exact feudal dues it had no right to make additional exactions except by consent of the Great Council. But the dues which the Crown was entitled to exact were inadequately defined, and claims which Henry III. asserted had been angrily resented. Moreover, there were other claims which in practice were undisputed because their operation was limited and their effect as taxation was not realised. Such was the authority of the Crown to regulate trade, by the issue of licences and the imposition of port duties. The alien who wished to trade in England was only allowed to do so under supervision, and had to pay for a licence, and also to pay toll on the goods which he imported or exported. Magna Carta had merely stipulated in general terms that such tolls should be limited to the right and ancient customs. Edward's Statute of Westminster made progress in defining the feudal dues to which the king was entitled; but it also explicitly conferred upon the king the right of imposing at the ports a fixed toll upon all the exported wool, wool-fells and leather, which very soon came to be known as the "great and ancient customs." The point especially noteworthy is that these port duties had not hitherto attracted notice as sources of revenue. It was the great expansion of foreign trade now setting in which impressed, first on the king and then on the parliament, a consciousness of the value to the royal treasury which such impositions might attain. It is in this reign that taxes on imports and exports take their place beside the land tax, dating from the time of Æthelred, and the tax on movables dating from the Saladin tithe of Henry II., as sources of revenue important enough to demand popular control; whereas hitherto they had been merely an incidental part of the government machinery for regulating trade.

The next step was concerned with a different subject. Various barons claimed and exercised various rights of jurisdiction locally, with exemption from interference on the part of the king's officers, and in effect superseding the royal authority. The Statute of Gloucester empowered the king's officers to examine, in virtue of the writ called *Quo Warranto*, the authority under which the barons claimed and exercised these privileges; on the hypothesis that the claims were null and void, unless supported by documentary proof that they had been conferred by royal grant. As a matter of fact they had been established for the most part only by long custom; and the proceedings of the royal officers aroused among the barons an outburst of indignation so threatening that Edward found it necessary to withdraw the demand for documentary proof and to accept a compromise, under which all such rights were recognised as valid if they had been in practice recognised at the accession of Richard I. Nevertheless the king's

great object was secured; since it was thenceforth impossible for those rights to be extended or multiplied except by express grant of the Crown.

From the baronage Edward turned to the Church. Henry's subserviency to the popes, repaid by the support which he consistently received from them in his contests with the baronage, had allowed them to make great encroachments, to assert successfully their claims to make ecclesiastical appointments, and upon ecclesiastical revenues. In 1279 Pope Nicholas III. ignored Edward's wishes, and appointed to the archbishopric of Canterbury the Franciscan friar John Peckham, who immediately set about asserting the ecclesiastical as against the secular authority in a highly aggressive manner. Edward's immediate answer was the Statute of Mortmain, which forbade the conveyance of land from private ownership to the "dead hand" of a corporation without the assent of the Crown. The particular corporation which the king had in view was of course the Church; and the justification was twofold. For military purposes, that is, for the feudal levies, lands held by the Church were of less use to the Crown than lands held by lay feudatories. In the second place, lands held by a corporation were necessarily exempt from those incidental fees and fines to which individual owners were liable on succession to an estate and in connection with the wardship of minors, marriage, and knighthood. In practice, indeed, the new law made very little difference, beyond ensuring that the transfer of land to the Church should be open and *bona fide*; but, like the Statute of Gloucester, it empowered the Crown to limit the extension of an inconvenient practice. Two years later Peckham invited another collision by an attempt to extend the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts, which was checked by the royal ordinance *Circumspecte Agatis*—a warning to the clergy to attempt no extension of their



A knight of the 13th century.

[From the brass of Sir John D'Abernoun, died 1277, at Stoke Dabernon, Surrey.]

jurisdiction beyond the limits recognised by the secular authority, which were carefully defined.

This enactment had been deferred by the exigencies of the Welsh war to which we shall presently revert. It was issued in 1285, a year of considerable legislative activity. In that year the second Statute of Westminster established the principle of entailing estates by prohibiting the tenant from alienating land to the detriment of the rights of his heir. Later the parliament sitting at Winchester reorganised the militia, the ancient *fyrd* which Henry II. had regulated by the Assize of Arms a hundred years before, and at the same time reorganised the system of local police or "watch and ward," and revived the authority and jurisdiction of the local popular courts of law.

The last statute of what we have called the legislative period was that of 1290, called *Quia Emptores*, or the third Statute of Westminster. This, like the Statute of Mortmain, was one which had the approval of the baronage and strengthened the landed interest; but it strengthened the Crown still more, since it was a check on feudal disintegration. It forbade subinfeudation; that is, it required that when land was alienated the new tenant should hold not from the grantor but from the grantor's overlord; so that the grantor multiplied not his own vassals but the vassals of his overlord; whereby to the king as supreme overlord the maximum of advantage accrued.

III

WALES

The legislative activities of King Edward were periodically interrupted by the contests with the Welsh, which were hardly ended with the overthrow of the patriot prince Llewelyn and the absorption of Wales into the English dominion. But Edward's conquest was so far practically effective that the Welsh thenceforth were troublesome only when they acted in concert with English rebels. The story of the relations of the Welsh with their more powerful neighbours, and of their final subjugation, may now be briefly told.

Swept out of England into the mountainous districts beyond the Severn by the advance of the Saxons, cut off from their kinsmen in the south by the battle of Deorham, and from the Strathclyde Britons in the north by the battle of Chester, the Britons in Wales had still defied subjugation by the English. Offa of Mercia drove them in behind his dyke; but the utmost that any of the Saxon kings had accomplished was to exact a precarious tribute and formal acknowledgments of sovereignty. The raids of the mountaineers compelled the Norman sovereigns to grant their own earls on the Welsh marches abnormal powers; a Norman earldom was even planted in Pembroke; but while the lords of Chester, Shrewsbury, Hereford, and Gloucester carried on perpetual wars with their Welsh neighbours, the

Welsh still remained practically independent, separate, speaking their own language, following their own customs, and owning no Norman overlord, except so far as their various princes found it convenient to acknowledge the sovereignty of the King of England. Rufus tried to bring them under his heel, but his Welsh invasions ended in ignominious failure ; even Henry II. was hardly more successful. The Welsh, like other Celtic peoples, were extraordinarily difficult to subdue, and yet lacked the political instinct of unity necessary to the formation of a consolidated state capable of establishing a permanent independence.

Yet in the thirteenth century such a consummation seemed almost within sight. Almost throughout the first half of it, Llewelyn ap Iorwerth was lord of Snowdon, the north-western division of the country. He for the first time succeeded in combining other Welsh princes under his leadership, and made use of the contests between King John, King Henry, and the barons to strengthen his own position. When Llewelyn died in 1240, it seemed that his work was doomed to be undone ; the Welsh again betook themselves to internal strife, until a second Llewelyn, son of Griffith, son of the first Llewelyn, succeeded in establishing himself as prince of Gwynedd or Snowdon, and assumed the rôle of a patriot leader in 1254. Since Henry's principal supporters among the baronage were to be found among the Marcher earls, Llewelyn was presently in alliance with Montfort. Nevertheless he did not fall with Montfort, but made his peace with the king at Shrewsbury on terms highly satisfactory to himself ; making a formal acknowledgment of the English overlordship, and retaining for a price the northern territories which had been annexed to the English Crown after the death of the first Llewelyn, and recaptured by himself on his first assumption of the Welsh leadership.

But Llewelyn on the one side was not content ; he dreamed at least of creating an entirely independent principality. Edward, on the other side, had his own dream of a dominion extending from Cape Wrath to the Channel ; though that dream could not come within the range of practical politics while his brother-in-law, Alexander III., reigned in Scotland. There was no apparent prospect of an opportunity for dealing with the northern kingdom ; but if Llewelyn should give him an opening in Wales he was prepared to turn it to account ; though according to his principles he would only act under colour of legal right.


Henry III. was hardly in his grave, and his successor was still abroad, when Llewelyn began to experiment with the government of England. He evaded every summons to render homage to the new king, and he ceased to make the payments required of him under the treaty of Shrewsbury. Edward was fully warranted in taking active measures. In the beginning of 1277 the royal forces advanced in the middle Marches and in South Wales, where the Welsh made immediate submission. In the summer he marched a great force along the northern Welsh coast, and cooped up Llewelyn in the Snowdon district. Faced with the prospect of being starved out

in the winter, Llewelyn submitted to the treaty of Aberconway, which left him the lordship of only that portion of Gwynedd which he had acquired in 1254.

So far Edward's conduct was unimpeachable, and he now proceeded on the lines which present themselves to the English mind as those obviously dictated by common sense, and to the Celtic mind as a violation of the most cherished sentiment. He tried to Anglicise Wales, and to impress upon the Welsh by the force of example the superior merits of

English institutions.

The Welsh looked askance. Customs which in the eyes of the English were relics of a childish barbarism, which an intelligent people would be prompt to repudiate as soon as their eyes were opened, had to the Welshmen the sanction of immemorial tradition. The Welsh mountaineers found nothing to admire in



Conway Castle, North Wales.

[Built during the reign of Edward I. after the English conquest.]

the little colonies of English traders and agriculturists which were planted in the government centres. The English law and the English legal machinery offended their instincts and ignored their traditions. The Welsh gentry found their rights curtailed and their personal dignity insulted by the intruders, who held them in small respect. In a very short time the Welshmen were repenting of their submission and craving for escape from the beneficent English rule which in their blindness they had brought upon themselves. The men whose jealousy and desertion of Llewelyn had made his overthrow so easy were the first to turn to him as their only possible deliverer. The surface was calm, but under it insurrection was brewing. Edward was deaf to complaints which savoured to him of childish not to say immoral unreason. The storm broke suddenly and without warning.

The first blow was struck by a man who had been hitherto a conspicuous adherent of the English, the arch-traitor in the eyes of patriotic Welshmen, David the brother of Llewelyn, who had been rewarded by a lordship in North Wales. David attacked and captured Hawarden, surprising it. His stroke was the signal for a general rising. Llewelyn flung himself on the English district bordering his principality on the north; David sped south to raise southern Wales. For the moment it seemed as if the English would be swept out of the territories of which not five years

ago they had taken possession. No preparation had been made for an emergency so wholly unexpected. The Marcher levies, hastily raised, could make no immediate headway. The summer passed in a series of isolated operations, in which the English gained very little advantage. In the autumn Edward had succeeded in getting a considerable force in motion on the line of his previous northern campaign; but the troops, inefficiently commanded, met with a disaster in early winter, close to the Menai Strait. Edward resolved on the unprecedented course of a winter campaign.

But five weeks after the Menai disaster a battle and an accident decided the results of the struggle. Llewelyn himself had moved down to the middle Marches. His forces were posted in a strong position at Orewyn Bridge, and he himself was absent, when the English effected a surprise attack. Orewyn Bridge is noted as the first occasion when an English army employed the method of distributing archers among the men-at-arms and opening the battle with artillery to prepare the way for a cavalry charge; an adaptation of the tactics employed by the Conqueror at Hastings, and apparently by the English at Northallerton. Orewyn Bridge was improved upon some years later by the Earl of Warwick, again in the course of the suppression of a Welsh insurrection, at the battle of Maes Madog; where we have a more detailed account of the way in which the archers were distributed among the soldiery. To the student of the art of war, at least as practised by the English, it is interesting to observe that the long-bow did not become conspicuous until after the Welsh campaigns. The cross-bow was still accounted the superior weapon. There is reason to suppose that although the English archers acquired a unique proficiency in the use of the long-bow, they derived the use of the weapon itself in war, not from the outlaws of Merry Sherwood, but from the Welshmen.

At Orewyn Bridge the Welsh were scattered or slaughtered. The accident which made the battle practically decisive was the almost simultaneous capture and death of Llewelyn, not on the field of battle; his slayers being unconscious of the prize which had fallen into their hands.

These events took place in December. For six months more Llewelyn's brother David held out in North Wales, while Edward was seriously hampered by the defection of the feudal levies which had served their time, and by the difficulty of obtaining supplies for the payment of troops. In June, however, David was captured, and three months afterwards was put to death as a traitor. The conquest was completed.

The practical effect was that so much of Wales as had hitherto remained under Welsh princes, owning not much more than a nominal overlordship of the King of England, was now annexed to the direct domains of the Crown, the Marcher earldoms and baronies under the great Norman feudatories not being immediately or directly affected. The new domain formed the Crown principality of Wales, which it presently became customary to bestow upon the heir-apparent of the English throne. In the principality Edward established the regular shire system, raised castles to keep the

country in subjection, and continued the Anglicising process by the plantation of English colonies under the castle walls. For some centuries to come the principality was governed under the Statute of Wales of 1284 as a Crown domain standing outside the general political system of England. But indirectly also the Marcher earldoms were affected, because the establishment of the king's government in Wales did away with the reasons which had necessitated the bestowal of exceptional power and authority in districts where a state of war had been practically chronic.

Ten years after the Statute of Wales there was another insurrection, headed by Madog, a son of Llewelyn ; but this was crushed at the battle of Maes Madog, to which reference has already been made. After this, though the Welsh preserved their sense of nationality, Wales did not again attempt to break away from England, and the contingents of light Welsh soldiery habitually formed an element in the armies of the Plantagenet kings both on their Scottish and their French campaigns.


IV

EDWARD AND THE CONSTITUTION

It is a common note of constitutional struggles in England that they have been largely concerned with questions of finance. Primarily in theory the policy of the State was the policy of the king. The king was supposed to live "of his own," and so long as he could pay his own way he could follow what policy he chose. But if he sought to pursue an expensive policy he could not live "of his own," and must supplement his resources by taxation of one kind or another ; that is, he must either persuade or compel his subjects to provide him with additional means. Persuasion involved convincing them that the objects he had in view were desirable ; in other words, as long as his subjects could refuse supplies, they could paralyse the king for action, and therefore could in effect control his policy. The Crown, seeking a free hand, sought also every available means of raising revenue otherwise than as a grant by favour of the subjects. The subjects, on the other hand, without in the first instance having any particular desire to interfere with policy, resented arbitrary exactions. The mere fact that, by doing so, they found themselves exercising a control over policy, taught the people to regard the control of policy as an end to which the control of finance was a means ; but to begin with, the motive of the subjects' resistance to taxation was not a political one but a simple objection to being arbitrarily deprived of their property. Thus the principle laid down in the Charter had been that taxation should not be arbitrary ; that apart from the liabilities established by recognised custom, no additional liabilities should be imposed without the subjects' consent. It is not till the time of Edward I. that we have indications of an inclination to be jealous of

the development of new sources of revenue in the hands of the Crown ; to resent anything which helps the Crown to act independently of supplies voluntarily granted by the people. It is the exigencies of war and the expenses involved by war that bring financial and therefore constitutional questions into the foreground of the latter portion of Edward's reign.

The affairs of Scotland demand separate and consecutive treatment, but their bearing upon other aspects of the years between 1290 and 1307 necessitates some reference to them here. The death of Alexander III. in 1286, followed by that of his granddaughter Margaret, the Maid of Norway, four years later, opened the debatable question of the succession to the Scottish Crown. The King of England consented to arbitrate between the various claimants on condition that his own suzerainty should be formally recognised. The demand was admitted by the Scottish magnates, and after a prolonged inquiry and investigation, judgment was delivered in 1292 in favour of John Balliol, who became King of Scotland as Edward's vassal. But when it became evident that Edward meant to treat his suzerainty not, like his predecessors, as a mere formality, but as a substantial fact, Balliol and the magnates attempted defiance. Edward counted Balliol as a recalcitrant vassal, declared the crown forfeited, invaded Scotland, and set up an English government in 1296. In 1297 Scotland was in revolt, led by William Wallace, and the English garrison was expelled. Next year Edward again invaded Scotland, and routed the Scots at Falkirk, but withdrew at the end of the year, leaving the country by no means subdued. Another invasion in 1301 was ineffective, but a campaign in 1304 was followed by a reorganisation of the government of Scotland in 1305. Balliol had disappeared at an early stage ; Wallace, the popular Scottish hero, was captured, and executed in London as a traitor in 1305. But in 1306 a



The Toll House and Prison, Great Yarmouth.
[Mostly built in the 13th century.]

declared the crown forfeited, invaded Scotland, and set up an English government in 1296. In 1297 Scotland was in revolt, led by William Wallace, and the English garrison was expelled. Next year Edward again invaded Scotland, and routed the Scots at Falkirk, but withdrew at the end of the year, leaving the country by no means subdued. Another invasion in 1301 was ineffective, but a campaign in 1304 was followed by a reorganisation of the government of Scotland in 1305. Balliol had disappeared at an early stage ; Wallace, the popular Scottish hero, was captured, and executed in London as a traitor in 1305. But in 1306 a

new liberator appeared in the person of Robert Bruce, and Edward was once more preparing for what he intended to be a final and crushing conquest when he died, a few miles from the Scottish border, in 1307.

Now in the year 1292, after twenty years of rule, Edward's position appeared exceptionally strong. He was the officially acknowledged overlord of the whole island from end to end, suzerain of Scotland, and master of Wales. He had acquired an almost unprecedented reputation as a legislator. The Marcher earls of Hereford and Gloucester had incidentally learnt that they must not presume upon their privileges. Ecclesiastical encroachments had been held in check. After the settlement of Wales Edward had spent three years abroad, mainly in Gascony, where his relations both with his subjects and with his suzerain, Philip IV. of France, were apparently satisfactory. Edward's personal prestige among the sovereigns of Europe was exceedingly high. Nevertheless both in France and in Scotland trouble was brewing, while in England there were members of the baronage, notably Humphrey de Bohun, the Earl of Hereford, who were vindictively disposed.

Trouble began with France. Philip IV. meant to get Gascony into his own hands, though he did not intend to go to war over it. But apart from the antagonistic interests of the two kings in Gascony, their subjects on either side of the English Channel were constantly at feud, each perpetually charging the others with piracy. In 1293 there was an organised sea-fight, in which the English were completely victorious. Philip IV. used the opportunity to summon Edward before him as a vassal. Edward, particular always in insisting on the letter of the law, could not on his own principles ignore Philip's claim. For form's sake certain castles in Gascony were temporarily placed in Philip's hands. Having got the castles, Philip showed his hand, pronounced the duchy forfeited on the ground of Edward's contumaciousness, and proceeded to establish his own government.

Philip's action made war inevitable. Parliament was called, large grants were made reluctantly enough by the estates, and further, the king arbitrarily took possession of the wool, the staple export of England, which was lying at the ports, and compelled the merchants to redeem it at a high price. A considerable force was collected and despatched to Gascony. Even the Welsh wars had proved that feudal levies, with their limited periods of service, provided at the best of times very unsatisfactory armies for the conduct of long campaigns. Now, the claims for compulsory service overseas led to that Welsh insurrection which was only suppressed at the beginning of 1295 by the battle of Maes Madog. The Welsh rising hopelessly crippled the expedition to Gascony, where Edward's forces met with repeated disaster. It was hardly suppressed when the Scots added to the complications by making a treaty with France, the beginning of an alliance which was to be as a thorn in the side of the English for more than two and a half centuries. Edward even saw himself threatened with a French invasion.

The king met the immediate danger by a strategic organisation of the fleets

in the Channel which marks the first clear recognition of command of the sea as a specific need of the military organisation. But beyond this it was realised that a situation had arisen in which it was emphatically necessary that the nation should consciously identify itself with his policy, and to this end he summoned the Model Parliament of 1295.

The summons to parliament included the significant pronouncement that "what touches all should be approved by all," and that the common danger should be faced with a united front. To this parliament Edward called all the magnates, lay and ecclesiastical, representatives of the lower clergy, two knights from every shire, and two burgesses from every borough. Parliament had at last almost achieved its permanent shape. The three estates, baronage, clergy, and commons, met and deliberated separately, each estate taxing itself in answer to the king's appeal. The baronage voted an eleventh, the clergy a tenth, the boroughs a seventh. But it is to be observed that at this stage the knights of the shire voted with the baronage, not with the burgesses. It was not till nearly forty years afterwards that the different division was established under which the hereditary and ecclesiastical magnates sat in one chamber, the shire and borough representatives in another as the Commons, while the clergy ceased to attend as an estate of parliament, but made their grants in their own separate assembly, called Convocation.

Though Edward was thus enabled, with the nation at his back, to make great preparations for meeting the gathering storm of war, he felt himself obliged to divide his forces; and himself spent the year 1296, as we have seen, in an invasion of Scotland, while the second expedition was despatched under his brother Edmund to Gascony. Though the Scots war was to all appearance completely successful, the expedition to Gascony fared little better than its predecessor. Free to concentrate on the French war, Edward called a new parliament, where the barons and the commons gave the king liberal support; but to the intense indignation of every one else concerned, the clergy declined to contribute.

This surprising action was the outcome of the celebrated Bull known as *Clericis Laicos*, issued by Pope Boniface VIII., forbidding the clergy to make contributions for secular purposes except with the permission of the Holy See; an injunction which had perhaps been issued not so much with the object of asserting papal authority as to prevent the revenue of the Church from being devoted to the carrying on of war between Christian princes. The effect, however, was intolerable to the kings both of France and of England. But while it brought the Pope in direct personal collision with Phillip, the collision in England was between the king and Archbishop Winchelsea, the successor of Peckham. The Archbishop pleaded in vain that the clergy were ready enough to make the grant, but that their allegiance to the Pope forbade their doing so until they had obtained his permission. This doctrine, that allegiance to the Pope stood before allegiance to the king, was peremptorily rejected. The king replied that unless

the clergy made a contribution of a fifth, they should be outlawed—that is to say, denied the protection of the civil law—and proceeded to carry the threat into execution.

The clergy did not hold out long, but some of the barons who owed the king a grudge found their opportunity. Edward had formed an alliance



Edward I. receiving the Bull of Pope Boniface VIII.

[From a MS. written and illuminated in Edward's reign.]

with the Count of Flanders, the friendship of Flanders being for commercial reasons of great value to England. Edward's design was to throw a force into Flanders to strike at France on the north-east, instead of confining himself to military operations in Gascony itself. Of this force he intended himself to take command, while the Constable and the Marshal, the Earls of Hereford and Norfolk, the highest military officers of the kingdom, were to command in Gascony. Both refused flatly, on the ground that while they were bound to follow the king in person, they were not bound to go to Gascony without him. And there

was no disputing the fact that the technical right was on their side

Meanwhile the exigencies of the situation had driven the king to further arbitrary exactions. Again he had seized large quantities of wool, and extracted a heavy fee called a *male-tolte* from merchants who had been allowed to retain their goods. A spirit of resistance was kindled, and the king found clergy, barons, and commons all clamouring against him.

Edward realised that he had placed himself in a false position, and nothing, perhaps, testified more completely to the real strength of his character than the wisdom of the concessions by which he retrieved the

situation without loss of dignity. As concerned the clergy, indeed, not only lay sentiment, but probably that of half the clergy themselves, was on his side. It was the clergy who gave way, not the king. The two earls having refused to serve in their capacity as marshal and constable, the king yielded on the technical question, and their places were taken by other barons. In like manner Edward publicly admitted that there was no feudal obligation to accompany him to Flanders, and offered pay for volunteer services, whereby he was enabled to raise an adequate force. He was at pains to pay for all the military supplies which had been seized, and announced that in due course the wool impounded should also be paid for. The North was left to look after Scotland, where Wallace had just raised anew the banner of insurrection; and the king and his army departed for Flanders, while Gascony was left to take care of itself.

But even at the last moment the two recalcitrant earls presented a demand for a confirmation of the Great Charter and the Forest Charter; and they made it clear that the further collection of supplies would be made exceedingly difficult unless their demand was conceded. They did not stop the king's departure, but six weeks later, when the regency which had been left in charge of affairs summoned a parliament, they appeared in arms and presented a petition which later generations interpreted as a statute, *De Tallagio non Concedendo*, and cited practically as if it had been a second Charter; it required that the claims called tallages or aids should not be imposed without the consent of parliament. The regency responded by publicly confirming the charters, to which they added the express inclusion of the *male-tolte*, though not of tallages, as a burden which might not be imposed except by assent. The action of the regency was endorsed by the king in Flanders, and this *Confirmatio Cartarum* of 1297 stands out in constitutional history as a landmark hardly less prominent than the issuing of the Great Charter itself or the calling of the Model Parliament.

The great Flemish expedition, which had brought about the crisis, came to nothing from a military point of view. Philip brought up an army too big for the English and their allies to attack, while he was afraid himself to adopt the offensive. When the kings had got tired of doing nothing they agreed to refer their quarrel to the Pope, in his private capacity, for arbitration. The enemies were reconciled; Edward took to his second wife the French king's sister, while the Prince of Wales was betrothed to his infant daughter. Both parties tacitly dropped their allies; and for the remainder of Edward's reign England and France were on terms of amity.

Edward's return in 1298 was followed by the Falkirk campaign, but Scotland remained sporadically in arms. Through the winter and the whole of the year following Edward was much occupied with efforts to avoid giving effect to the Confirmation of the Charters, whereby much irritation was revived among both baronage and commons; however, in the spring of 1300 he found himself compelled to give the royal sanction to

what were known as the *Articuli Super Cartas*, which were in effect additional clauses dealing with recent grievances. But still another year passed before the reconciliation could be regarded as complete. Perhaps what conduced more than anything else to this consummation was the action of Archbishop Winchelsea, who supported Pope Boniface in a claim to interfere between England and Scotland, on the somewhat amazing ground that Scotland belonged to the papacy. The barons were as angry as the king, and a reply was returned to the Pope signed by more than a hundred of the lay magnates, in which he was very bluntly warned that temporal affairs were the king's business and not the Pope's. The remainder of the reign was mainly occupied with Scottish affairs, which can now be recorded in detail.

V

THE LORDSHIP OF SCOTLAND


For a hundred years after the abrogation of the treaty of Falaise Scotland prospered, and had no serious collision with her southern neighbour. English kings had from time to time formally claimed the fealty of which the three Scottish kings carefully evaded any formal acknowledgment. After the accession of Edward I., Alexander III. in 1274, on the occasion of the coronation, very definitely rendered homage only for his English lordships. Four years later Edward again required Alexander to do homage, and in respect of the details the contemporary English and Scottish chroniclers are not in precise agreement. It is clear, however, that homage for the Scottish Crown was not explicitly included in the form of the oath which was taken by Alexander's proxy, Robert Bruce, Earl of Carrick; while the Scottish chronicler affirms that it was explicitly excluded. Edward, on the other hand, explicitly accepted the homage, reserving the right to claim homage for Scotland. Evidently, therefore, the whole question still stood precisely where it had stood at all times except during the fifteen years while the treaty of Falaise was in force.

Alexander lived and the kingdom prospered until 1286, when the king was killed by a fall from his horse. The sole surviving heir of his body was his very youthful granddaughter, Margaret, the Maid of Norway, the child of his daughter who had married King Eric and had died herself when little Margaret was born. She had been formally acknowledged as heir, and a regency was appointed to carry on the government until the child should be brought from Norway. Such a state of affairs was eminently conducive to the formation of parties among the nobility, since at any moment the succession to the throne might become an open question. Edward saw his opportunity, and suggested a judicious and peaceful union of the Crowns by the marriage of Margaret to his own youthful heir, Edward of Carnarvon, an arrangement which promised to be satisfactory.

The treaty of Brigham was signed in 1290, by which it was agreed that if the marriage took place the laws and liberties of Scotland should be maintained. If heirs failed, the kingdom was to go to its "natural heir," and was to remain free and separate, "saving the rights of the King of England."

The little queen was despatched from Norway, but was landed in the Orkneys only to die. The law of inheritance was exceedingly vague. In England itself a hundred years before, and in Normandy, it had been held that Richard's youngest brother stood nearer to the throne than the child of an intervening brother. In Scotland it was possible to hark back to Celtic custom, and argue that even the vague feudal rules of succession did

THE SCOTTISH CROWN



not apply to the Crown. No fewer than thirteen claimants now came forward, each asserting some sort of title to the succession. Of these only four counted: Robert Bruce, Earl of Annandale, John Balliol, Hastings, and Comyn of Badenoch. All these were descended in the female line from David of Huntingdon, brother of William the Lion; and all were of Norman families holding lordships in England as well as in Scotland. Balliol claimed as the grandson of David's eldest daughter. Comyn's claim through the same grandmother could not stand against Balliol's, but he also had a claim as descending from Donalbain, the brother of Malcolm Canmore. He, however, withdrew from the competition. Bruce claimed as the son of David's second daughter, and therefore as standing nearer to the throne than the grandson of the eldest daughter. Hastings claimed through the third daughter, but could only maintain that the kingdom should be divided among the descendants of the three sisters instead of going to the representative of one of them.

The magnates appealed to the King of England to act as arbitrator. Edward agreed, but on condition, as he was master of the situation, that all parties should acknowledge his overlordship. The magnates, faced with a prospect not only of civil war, but of a forcible assertion of his own claims by Edward in the event of their refusal, accepted the situation. While the arbitration was proceeding Edward was to hold certain castles, and was to remain in possession until the award settled who the new king was to be. A strong committee of investigation, mainly Scottish in its composition, was appointed, and in course of time arrived at what seems the most obvious conclusion, that Balliol's claim was the strongest. He was accordingly crowned, and did homage for the Scottish kingdom.


The Scots had probably assumed that Edward would be content with the formal acknowledgment of the suzerainty which all his predecessors had claimed and none had attempted to enforce. Neither the magnates in general nor the competitors in particular can be greatly blamed for yielding to Edward's demand ; and most of the Norman barons in Scotland, being in any case feudatories of Edward in respect of estates in England, had no inherent objection to recognising him as supreme overlord in Scotland as well. But when Edward made it evident that the overlordship was not to be a mere formality at all, the situation was changed. Appeals were carried from Scotland to be decided by the overlord in England, and Edward summoned feudal levies from Scotland to aid in his projected wars in France. Balliol was a feeble person, with no capacity for asserting himself. Two years after he became king the Scots virtually deposed him, and set up a Council of government, something after the fashion of the Provisions of Oxford ; while they repudiated Edward's claims, forced Balliol to the same course, and entered upon negotiations with Philip IV.

Edward summoned Balliol to appear before him as a recalcitrant vassal ; and early in 1296, just after the Model Parliament, he appeared in arms on the Scottish border. Then, since Balliol did not present himself in answer to his summons, he fell upon Berwick and subjected its inhabitants to a massacre. Balliol renounced his allegiance, and Edward marched through Scotland, meeting with little resistance. In the summer Balliol surrendered, and was adjudged to have forfeited the kingdom, which by feudal law reverted to the overlord : exactly as a short time before Philip IV. had declared Gascony to be forfeited to the French Crown.

There should be no new King of Scotland ; a hint from Bruce, that his own title might now be recognised, was waved aside. Edward himself was to be king, and would govern through his own officers. He appointed Earl Warenne his Lieutenant, and Hugh Cressingham Treasurer. Nearly every prominent person in Scotland took the oath of fealty, and Edward withdrew to England to devote his whole attention to the Flanders expedition.

Edward's probable intention was ultimately to assimilate the government of Scotland with that of England ; but practically the government he set up was a military occupation by the English ; and the English garrison be-

haved after the arrogant fashion of conquerors. Whatever feudal magnates might do, the people of Scotland had no mind to submit to the tyranny of foreign masters: and long before Edward had departed to Flanders popular insurrections were on foot, headed in the western lowlands by a gentleman named William Wallace, round whom large numbers of the common folk promptly gathered. Several of the barons joined the insurrection, though their attitude was habitually half-hearted, and most of them were to be found during the following years fighting alternately for and against the English king. Warenne attempted to suppress the rising; but owing to his blundering incapacity his forces were cut to pieces by Wallace at the battle of Cambuskenneth or Stirling Bridge. Except for two or three castles, the English forces were swept out of Scotland; while the barons of England were engaged in extorting the Confirmatio Cartarum from the regency which Edward, now in Flanders, had left in England.



The battlefields of English and Scots in the 13th and 14th centuries.

Wallace was the one man who had openly and uncompromisingly set England at defiance. He had begun his career by breaking the heads of English soldiers and continued it by what the English called brigandage; whereas such of the barons as had joined with him were at least in no

worse position than that of mere rebels against feudal authority. None of them was prepared openly to stand forth as leader of a revolt in the name of King John Balliol. Wallace, by what authority we do not know, was proclaimed Protector of the kingdom. But six months after Cambuskenneth Edward was back in England, and in July he was in Scotland with a large army.

Wallace had collected a large force, though he had but few archers, and a mere handful of cavalry, on whom no reliance could be placed. Still, at Falkirk he gave battle to King Edward's host. The Scots fought after their own fashion, and if Edward had not drawn the moral from his Welsh wars the Scots would have won. Wallace massed his men in four solid bodies of spearmen, the formation known as the "schiltron." The few archers posted between the solid masses were promptly cut to pieces by the charging English, and the cavalry incontinently took to flight. But the chivalry of England hurled itself against the mass of spears as vainly as the Normans had done at Hastings, until Edward, coming up with the main body of his army, advanced the archers within point-blank distance and bade them concentrate their fire on particular points in the spear-hedge. The Scots could only stand to be shot at or break their formation and charge. Great gaps were made in their ranks, and into these Edward hurled his cavalry. The stubborn resistance was turned to a rout, and thousands of Scots were left dead on the field, though Wallace escaped and remained at large.

For the moment it seemed that the battle of Falkirk was decisive. Edward withdrew; but he had only effected a temporary reconciliation with his barons, who were still pressing to have full effect given to the *Confirmatio Cartarum*. He was too much taken up with other affairs immediately to organise the government in Scotland. Wallace's power was gone, and probably he betook himself abroad to negotiate with the King of France and the Pope; but the barons, who withheld their support from a mere gentleman like Wallace, were more inclined to act when Wallace was out of the way. Hence in the years following Falkirk there was little enough sign of English authority north of the Tweed, though no one knew at any given time which of the nobles would be posing as patriots and which as Edward's men a week later. Then came the Pope's intervention, which seemed to unite the English barons in support of Edward so far as Scotland was concerned.

The prospect of an invasion of the country by Edward in person brought over some of the Scots nobles, including young Robert Bruce, the grandson of the old claimant, who at this stage of affairs appears to have changed sides perpetually.

In 1303 Edward marched through Scotland, meeting with little resistance as usual; and when he again entered Scotland with an army in 1304, the nobles of the national party gave up the struggle and surrendered on terms. Edward was ready to admit practically every one to his peace with the exception of William Wallace, who was back again, though without

any recognised authority. Not long after, Wallace himself was caught, by vile treachery according to common tradition, carried to London, and hanged, drawn, and quartered as a traitor. Myths and legends swarm about the national hero who never bowed the knee to the foreign usurper. He was probably bloodthirsty, and he had suffered personal wrongs enough to make his bloodthirstiness excusable. But he stands out alone as conspicuously the one man who gave himself body and soul to the cause of Scottish liberty, and therefore the one who in Edward's eyes was guilty of unpardonable crime. It was he and no other who inspired the people of Scotland with that passionate patriotism which was to bear fruit when another leader came to the front who had hitherto shown little enough promise of becoming a national hero.

The capture of Wallace seemed to have removed the last obstacle to the establishment of Edward's supremacy. Balliol was forgotten; Bruce and Comyn of Badenoch, the only possible pretenders, had both come into the king's peace. At last, then, in 1305, Edward, at peace with France, reconciled with his own subjects, victor in his contest with the archbishop, was able to set about the organisation of the Scottish government. A constitution was prepared something after the Welsh precedent. Evidently it was Edward's intention to leave Scottish law and custom unaltered so far as was compatible with the establishment of a strong central government under his own royal control. There was to be no general substitution of English for Scottish authorities after the manner of the Norman Conquest. An administrative system was to be set up which would probably have proved excellent if it could only have won acceptance from the Scottish people; if also the English who were planted in Scotland, forming necessary garrisons, should endeavour to make themselves acceptable to the natives. While revolt was leaderless Scotland might have time to accustom itself to the new order, to recognise its merits, and to settle down into a peaceable union with the southern kingdom. But these things were not to be.

If a leader appeared it was still probable that the hatred of the English burnt into the Scots by recent events would rouse them to another effort to fling off the foreign supremacy. And the leader appeared immediately in the person of Robert Bruce. In 1306 the startling intelligence was brought to Edward that Bruce had met, in the church of the Grey Friars of Dumfries, John Comyn, who was temporarily acting for Edward as Lieutenant of Scotland, had quarrelled with him, and slain him before the high altar. Apart even from the sacrilege, the deed would have been unpardonable; and Bruce had left himself no alternative save to make a desperate bid for the crown of an independent Scotland or to die ignominiously as a traitor. Probably he had already made up his mind to the former course before he slew Comyn, with whom he had sought the meeting in order to bring him over to his own cause. At any rate the deed was done, and Robert, the vacillating turncoat of the past, perforce transformed into the champion of Scottish independence, redeemed the sins and faults of his youth as the

indomitable and magnanimous hero who fought and won against enormous odds the victory of Scottish freedom. Comyn was hardly dead when Bruce got himself crowned by a few uncompromising supporters, declared himself King of Scotland, and proclaimed a war of liberation. It began unpromisingly enough, for the king was promptly placed under the ban of the Church, and the whole of the Comyn kin was roused against him. The few bold adherents who at once collected were routed by a superior force at Methven. He himself became a fugitive; two of his brothers were captured and beheaded, and his wife and daughter also fell into the hands of the English. Bruce passed the winter in hiding, but with the spring he reappeared in his own earldom of Carrick, where he began an energetic system of raiding diversified by hairbreadth escapes; while Edward was collecting a large army in the north of England to crush Scottish resistance once and for all. A victory in the open field at Loudon Hill over an English force under Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke, brought new adherents to the adventurer. But Edward's own army of conquest was on the point of crossing the Border when the great king died at Burgh-on-Sands. His bones were carried back to Westminster, and his tomb bears the significant inscription, *Malleus Scotorum*, "The Hammer of the Scots."

VI

ASPECTS OF THE POLICY OF EDWARD I

We have seen that Edward's policy during the first twenty years of his reign tended to restrict the individual powers of the great nobles. This was the effect of the legislation from the Statute of Gloucester to *Quia Emptores*. A like effect was produced by the conquest of Wales, so far as the Marcher earldoms were concerned; since it was no longer necessary to concede to the earls that freedom of action which in practice was required so long as it could be pleaded that the Marches were virtually in a persistent state of war. The same sort of policy was observed by Edward during the remainder of his reign. When Gloucester and Hereford attempted to assert their traditional authority, they were promptly taught that their independence had disappeared with the disappearance of its *raison d'être*; and that was the main cause of Hereford's subsequent attitude of persistent opposition to the king.


Edward, however, sought to strengthen the Crown as against the great feudatories in another way, by the absorption of great estates into the lordship of the royal house. First Gloucester, and afterwards Hereford's successor, were compelled, willingly or unwillingly, to marry two of the king's daughters, so that the earls of the next generation were both of the blood royal. The third member of the baronage who had stood in conspicuous opposition to the king was Roger Bigod, Earl of Norfolk. His estates

were entailed on the heirs of his body; and since he was childless, they passed on his death to the Crown. In like manner Cornwall lapsed to the Crown on the death of its earl, the king's cousin. Thomas of Lancaster, Edward's nephew, held three earldoms, to which two more were ultimately added by his marriage to the daughter of the Earl of Lincoln. The immediate effect was to secure a great preponderance for the blood royal among the greater barons. The same policy with the same end in view was pursued by the king's grandson, Edward III.; although, as we shall presently find, it subsequently bore fruit of a very different kind from that which had been intended.

In the second place, the king aimed at procuring authority for pronouncements which should secure to him beyond cavil powers of raising money without a direct appeal to the goodwill of his subjects. To that end his statutes defined feudal aids and expressly authorised the levying of the "Great and Ancient Customs," the fixed tax on exported wool. But he was in no haste to procure definitions which expressly limited his powers of exaction, and tried his hardest to avoid formal ratifications of the Charters in terms which expressly required the assent of parliament to various imposts such as the tallages which had from time to time been levied from the towns. The tallages, as we have seen, were not formally surrendered by him in his Confirmation of the Charters, despite the petition of the barons which was subsequently treated as a statute. In effect, Edward devised or applied various means of raising money, to which exception was taken sooner or later as contravening the principle that only specified taxes might be raised without parliament's consent. Thus under pressure of circumstances the king seized the wool of the merchants, or war supplies, as being within the prerogative of the Crown, though of his grace he consented to compensate the sufferers for their losses. Long custom treated an estate of a certain value as being a knight's holding; and on it he based a decree that every one in possession of such a holding must take up knighthood, and pay the feudal fee on taking up knighthood, on pain of a heavy fine. He made, at the very close of his reign, a bargain with the foreign merchants, in accordance with which he of his own authority imposed what were afterwards called the New and Small Customs as opposed to the Great and Ancient Customs—additional taxes on exported goods. On occasion, instead of applying to parliament, he bargained with separate sections of the community for particular grants. Hardly any of these methods were decisively challenged at the time; but all later provided bones of contention between Crown and parliament when parliament learnt to think of financial control as a means to the control of policy and administration.

Apart from these various sources of supply, legitimate or otherwise, English kings in the past had been in the habit of meeting financial emergencies by borrowing; and the source from which alone they could borrow was the Jewish community. The ethical standard upheld by the medieval Church forbade Christian men the practice of usury, that is, of lending

money at interest. The Jews recognised no such moral restriction, and as a body they derived their wealth not from trading but from financing their neighbours. Socially they were outside the pale; but the kings of England generally took them under their own protection, because they were a useful source from which the Crown could obtain supplies upon reasonable terms, as their protector. That proviso did not apply to private persons who found themselves driven to borrowing; and the Jews were detested both on the ground of religious prejudice and as extortioners. Perhaps the most popular act of Edward was his expulsion of the Jews from England; a measure which, while it gratified popular prejudice, appeared to be conspicuously disinterested because the Crown thereby deprived itself of the source from which it had hitherto been able to borrow



A 13th century caricature upon the Jews of Norwich.
[From the Jews' Roll in the Public Record Office.]

on emergency. But in fact Edward found a substitute for the Jews. The great commercial houses of the cities of northern Italy had already developed a financial business, in spite of ecclesiastical doctrines as to usury, which had deprived the Jews of their monopoly; and the expulsion of the Jews made room for the Lombards and Florentines. The Crown in fact probably lost little by the exchange.

Before the time of King Edward the development of national commerce had not presented itself to the kings as an object of policy. The mere expansion of trade developed the consciousness of common interests as opposed to merely local interests among the English producers, and so fostered that national idea which was so prominent in Edward's own mind; and a similar notion is latent in Edward's habit of negotiating with mercantile groups in preference to individual boroughs.

These beginnings, however, of the nationalisation of commerce went on side by side with the development of the corporate life of the boroughs themselves, both being encouraged by the final recognition of borough

representatives as an element of the national parliament. And here we may note in the boroughs, beside the gilds-merchant, the growth of the craft-gilds, to which the authority of the gilds-merchant was gradually transferred. The craft-gilds were associations of the members of the separate trades or crafts ; and we must not be led by modern analogies to imagine that they consisted of handworkers in opposition to capitalist employers. In the thirteenth century the trader was a master craftsman who was already a free burgess. He might or might not have journeymen and apprentices in his employ, but in any case he was practically certain to be a worker himself. And every apprentice and nearly every journeyman looked forward to the time when he should himself become a master craftsman and a burgess. There was no active antagonism between employer and employed when the employed looked upon himself as an employer in the making. Nor was there direct antagonism between the gild-merchant and the craft-gild, because the master craftsman was of necessity a member of the gild-merchant—seeing that if he were not so he could not carry on his trade. In the main, the substitution of the leading craft-gilds for the gild-merchant as the local authority for the regulation of trade was not the outcome of the struggle between rival organisations but merely a matter of practical administrative convenience.

The national idea was, as we have seen, only in embryo, and the commercial idea of breeding and accumulating wealth was only in embryo. Commerce was practically the local exchange of goods of which there happened to be a superfluity, for goods of which there happened to be a deficiency, and the local producer was extremely jealous of the competition of the outside producer, whom he called a "foreigner." But Edward saw in the development of a national commerce a means not only to increasing the material prosperity of his subjects, but also to filling the royal exchequer. By increasing the volume of exports and imports, the produce of the customs, new or old, would be proportionately increased. The superior quality of certain English products, notably wool and hides and some other raw materials, had created a demand for them on the Continent, notably for the looms of Flanders. The export was to be encouraged ; and Edward sought to concentrate it at particular ports, partly because the trade could thereby be better supervised in the interests of the traders, and partly because the customs could be more easily collected in the interests of the Crown.

VII

ROBERT BRUCE

The death of Edward I. put an entirely new complexion upon the prospect of Scottish independence. The old king had made up his mind to punish the fresh revolt with an iron hand and to bring Scotland under his

heel. A successor of the same quality as himself might have carried out his plan, though it may be doubted whether he could have effected a permanent pacification of Scotland. But Edward II. was of an altogether different type. Devoid of patriotic or kingly ambition, the young Edward had little thought except for his amusements and the gratification or the wealth of the favourites by whom he was surrounded. Moreover, as often happens with a masterful ruler, the great Edward had been served, latterly at least, by men who were efficient instruments for executing his will but were not capable of relieving his successor of the responsibilities of government. So instead of carrying out his father's plans, Edward II. contented himself with a mere military parade, dropped the conquest of Scotland, left its government in charge of the Earl of Pembroke, and retired to England. No one troubled about Scotland, since the whole of the baronage immediately found themselves entirely taken up with the personal rivalries and jealousies which were let loose by the conduct of the new king.


So Bruce continued his raiding, held in check only by the various castles which the policy of the first Edward had filled with English garrisons, and by the hostility of nobles who were either involved in the blood-feud with the Comyns or, for one cause or another, were irrevocably committed to the English side. Those who were not so committed either sat still and awaited events, or, as one success after another attended the arms of the adventurer and the band of brilliant fighting men who had attached themselves to him, became open adherents of King Robert. Each new feat of arms achieved by the king himself or his brother Edward, by James Douglas or Thomas Randolph, Earl of Moray, brought in fresh supporters; while no similar successes attended the English, who sat sullenly in their castles until one after another was surprised, and, being captured, was levelled with the ground. For the Scots could not afford to lock up their own fighting men to garrison the castles, nor would they run the risk of their being reoccupied by the English.

In 1310 Edward was stirred up to lead an invasion into Scotland; but he found no one to fight, the country was laid waste before him, and he retired in inglorious discomfiture. In 1311 and 1312 the Scots took the offensive and raided the northern counties of England. Then Perth was surprised in January 1313, and Roxburgh a year later, by Bruce himself and by Lord James Douglas respectively. Before Easter Randolph had surprised Edinburgh, scaling the precipitous rock by night. Stirling had already been invested, and was now the only fortress of importance which remained in English hands; moreover the commandant had pledged himself to surrender unless he were relieved by the Midsummer Day ensuing.

The fall of Stirling would mean that the last fragment of Edward I.'s conquest of Scotland would vanish. Even Edward II. awoke to the necessity for action. A superficial reconciliation had just been effected between the king and his barons; and, though some of them still declined to join him in person on a Scottish campaign undertaken without the express

sanction of parliament, he led a mighty army across the border in June 1314, magnificent in equipment and attended by a vast baggage train. He had a short week in which to reach Stirling before the hour should arrive when it was pledged to surrender unless relieved. The great host rolled to the north-westward in a hasty and ill-managed march. King Robert knew that the crucial hour had come, and posted his comparatively small force on a carefully selected position, the field of Bannockburn, covering the immediate approach to Stirling. Wallace had staked all on the field of Falkirk, which had come near to being a decisive victory for the Scots. Bruce himself had been present at that battle, and fully understood how it was that Edward had turned it into a decisive English victory. Falkirk was not to be repeated at Bannockburn, since Bruce rightly calculated that there was with the English army no commander possessing the large experience and the technical resource of Edward I. It was a moral certainty that the English, with their huge force of men-at-arms, would rely upon the customary medieval tactics, and endeavour to crush the Scottish infantry by the shock of charging squadrons. He himself must rely, like Wallace, upon the stubborn valour of his footmen; since he, like Wallace, had no masses of cavalry and few archers. Therefore he had to guard against the possibility of having his flank turned, and against a repetition of the archery tactics.

The position chosen gave Bruce what he needed, a narrow front where his soldiery could be massed, with broken and boggy ground on the flanks which secured them from being turned. Boggy ground on the front itself would minimise the shock of the charge; and where it was not boggy it was carefully prepared with the iron spikes called calthrops, and with covered pits, so as to produce a similar effect. The bulk of Bruce's cavalry too were dismounted, and disposed so as to strengthen the line of infantry, while only a picked squadron was retained to strike suddenly and swiftly when occasion



Plan of battle of Bannockburn.

- English main body.
- Scottish forces.
- English archers.
- Scottish horse.

The position chosen gave Bruce what he needed, a narrow front where his soldiery could be massed, with broken and boggy ground on the flanks which secured them from being turned. Boggy ground on the front itself would minimise the shock of the charge; and where it was not boggy it was carefully prepared with the iron spikes called calthrops, and with covered pits, so as to produce a similar effect. The bulk of Bruce's cavalry too were dismounted, and disposed so as to strengthen the line of infantry, while only a picked squadron was retained to strike suddenly and swiftly when occasion

should arise. The Scots were outnumbered by more than three to one, but on the field the English could not bring their numbers into play.

Such was Bruce's plan. When the advancing hosts of the English appeared, the incidents of the day gave a foretaste of the coming struggle. A detachment of English horse made a dash round the Scottish flank in order to reach Stirling and effect the technical relief. A detachment of Scottish foot was just in time to intercept it and drive it back in rout. An English knight, Henry de Bohun, seeing the Scottish king riding almost unarmed along the Scottish line, charged down upon him. At the critical instant Robert swerved his palfrey, and as De Bohun crashed by, clove his skull with his battle-axe.

On the following day the battle went precisely as Bruce had designed. The masses of mail-clad horsemen were hurled against the Scottish front, crashing vainly upon the serried spears. The archers were thrown forward on the left, but no steps were taken to cover them, and almost with the first flight of the arrows the small squadron of Scottish horse burst upon their flank and cut them to pieces. With repeated charges, the English horse became a huddled, unmanageable mass; the Scottish infantry rolled forward in unbroken line; a band of camp followers descending the neighbouring Gillies' Hill was mistaken for a fresh Scottish host; and the great English army broke in a panic rout. Never had the English met with a disaster so overwhelming; the fugitives were slain in heaps, though the small supply of cavalry made the pursuit only desultory. Numbers of prisoners and vast spoils fell to the conquerors.

On the field of Bannockburn the independence of Scotland was decisively won, though fourteen years were still to pass before England acknowledged the fact by the treaty of Northampton. During those fourteen years the Scots became the aggressors. Berwick, the only corner of Scottish soil still held by the English, was captured; and year after year Douglas and Randolph harried the north of England, while the unfailing misrule in the southern country prevented any organised effort to retrieve what had been lost. Edward himself had been murdered, and his queen Isabella with her paramour Mortimer were ruling England in the name of young Edward III., when the government at last bowed to the logic of facts, and the treaty of Northampton acknowledged Robert Bruce as king of the independent Scottish nation. But the great liberator's life was already drawing to a close, and a year later he died, leaving the crown to his son David II., a child of six years old.

A curious episode followed the battle of Bannockburn. For nearly a hundred and fifty years the King of England had been titular lord of Ireland. Within the small group of counties known as the English Pale, English government and English law and customs prevailed. Outside the Pale the north of Ireland remained almost entirely Celtic, the De Burghs, the Earls of Ulster, being almost the only great Norman family. But, in the south, Norman families, most notably the Geraldines and the Butlers, extended

their dominions and ruled almost as independent princes ; very much Celticised in their sympathies though retaining some of their Norman traditions. Outside the Pale the central government was practically powerless. After Bannockburn, the O'Neills and O'Connells, the most powerful of the northern clans, offered the crown of Ireland to Robert Bruce. That shrewd prince declined, but the proposal to substitute his brother Edward was accepted. The Bruces went over to Ireland to win the crown, and obtained a very general support from the native chiefs. The Normans, however, stood by their fealty, and while the Bruces were victorious in the field, they were unable to reduce the Norman strongholds. Still Edward Bruce got himself crowned King of Ireland, and was left by his brother to establish himself in his kingdom. His reign was brief, for a vigorous English governor arrived in the person of Roger Mortimer. In a fight at Dundalk Edward was defeated and slain, and Ireland thereafter was more or less reduced to submission ; but if the episode had any permanent effect, it was to diminish rather than extend the authority of the central government ; and the efforts of the English lieutenants were still mainly directed to vain attempts to prevent the Celticising of the English in Ireland.

VIII

EDWARD II


From the English point of view Bannockburn was merely the most disastrous incident in a reign which presents us with no incident and no character that Englishmen can think of with pride or respect. When it has been recorded that Edward of Carnarvon was not a bloodthirsty tyrant, or personally vicious, there is nothing left to be said in his favour. He lacked even the personal valour in which his grandfather, Henry III., was not deficient, as well as the intellectual sympathies and the personal piety which were at least amiable traits in that monarch's character. He is redeemed from unmitigated contempt rather than from positive execration mainly by his tragic end.

His grim father's body was hardly cold when the young king was already doing his best to make havoc of his policy. His first step was to recall to court his boon companion, the young Gascon knight, Piers Gaveston, whom his father had banished as being no fit companion for the heir to the English throne. Gaveston's sole merit lay in the beauty of person, the frivolous wit, the showy accomplishments, and the superficial cleverness which had conquered the affections of the young Edward ; who now made haste to marry him to his niece and endow him with the earldom of Cornwall, which had recently passed to the Crown by escheat. There was a general ejection of the old king's officials, who were largely replaced by men whom Edward I. had conspicuously distrusted. There was no im-

mediate opposition. The baronage had had little enough sympathy with the masterful monarch whose strong hand had been removed by death, and were content to await events. If the young king tried to play the part of Rehoboam, he was not likely to fare any better than his prototype.

With the turn of the year, Edward proceeded to France to espouse the youthful bride, Isabella, to whom he was betrothed. He left the regency in the hands of the new Earl of Cornwall, but no open dissatisfaction was yet expressed. Within two months, however, of Edward's return and coronation,

the simmering wrath of the barons had reached boiling-point. The mocking tongue of the Gascon upstart was not to be endured. The old Earl of Lincoln and the young Earl of Gloucester, both loyal adherents of the Crown, were drawn into the circle of disgusted opposition. A parliament,



of the baronage only, met in April, and unanimously demanded that Gaveston should be banished and deprived of his new earldom; while the bishops, headed by Winchelsea, threatened him with excommunication. The king, finding himself helpless, sent Gaveston off to Ireland as Lieutenant. Twelve months after the parliament of barons, Edward's need of supplies caused the summoning of another parliament of the three Estates. The Estates at once drew up and presented a schedule of grievances; and by promises to remedy these the king secured from the magnates their assent to the recall of Gaveston—always excepting the implacable Guy, Earl of Warwick, whom the favourite had nicknamed the Black Dog of Arden.

But Gaveston was as irritating, and the administration through the king's favourites as incompetent, as ever. Again within twelve months the parliament of the barons took matters into their own hands. They met in arms. They demanded unanimously the banishment of Gaveston. But they went very much further; reverting to the precedent of the Mad Parliament of 1258, they demanded that the government should be placed in the hands of a committee of magnates. They set forth the grievances of the realm. Like their predecessors fifty-two years before, they ignored the assembly of the Estates, and claimed in effect that a baronial oligarchy should perform the functions of an absolute monarchy. Backed as they were by the whole feudal force, and probably by the whole popular sentiment, of the nation, the king could offer them no resistance; and after

the precedent of the Provisions of Oxford, a committee of twenty-one "Lords Ordainers" was appointed, with full powers of government for eighteen months. Seven bishops, eight earls, and six barons made up what may be called the Committee of Reform. They did not immediately strike at Gaveston, but—at first, at least—endeavoured seriously to deal with some of the more serious ills of the administration.

Edward spent the latter part of the year in an abortive expedition to Scotland. Then Lincoln, the last of the old king's trusted servants, and the most powerful influence among the barons on the side of moderation, died; and Thomas of Lancaster, the king's first cousin, now lord of five earldoms, became indisputably the head of the baronage. About Midsummer the Ordainers had completed their scheme of reform, which was then submitted to a parliament of the three Estates. Various laws in the Statute Book were to be properly enforced. The "New Customs" were to be abolished. All officers of State both in England and in Gascony were to be appointed by counsel and consent of the barons, and a baronial parliament was to be summoned once or twice annually. War and peace, even the king's personal movements as well as every department of government, were to be under the control of the barons. Gaveston and all his kinsfolk and following were to be banished; so were the Lombards and Florentines who had become the financial agents of the Crown.

Gaveston departed, but early in 1312 he was back again in the north of England, and in the king's company. Five of the earls, Lancaster, Pembroke, Hereford, Arundel, and Warwick, joined by Warenne, who was not one of the Ordainers, took up arms to enforce the Ordinances of the previous year and to hunt down Gaveston. None took the king's side. Gaveston surrendered to Pembroke and Warrene, under promise of protection; his fate was to be submitted to the decision of parliament. But while Gaveston was travelling south in Pembroke's custody, Warwick captured him, and in conjunction with Lancaster, Hereford, and Arundel, cut off his head on Blacklow Hill.

This violent action split up the Ordainers. Pembroke, and in a less degree Warenne, felt that their honour was implicated. The young Earl of Gloucester had always been opposed to extreme action. The king's hand being thus strengthened, the four earls who had been responsible for Gaveston's death presently submitted to a form of reconciliation and amnesty which was ratified at the end of 1313.

The reconciliation was celebrated by Edward's great invasion of Scotland, which ended with the huge catastrophe of Bannockburn, where Gloucester was killed and Hereford was taken prisoner. But Hereford was exchanged for the ladies of Bruce's family, who had been held prisoners



Housewife, early 14th century.

in England ever since 1306. The disaster was a political triumph for Lancaster's faction. Lancaster at once became the most powerful man in the realm, and had he been a real statesman, or even a tolerably competent administrator, he would now have had a magnificent opportunity. He was neither the one nor the other, and anarchy reigned from end to end of the kingdom. His supporters fell away; and Pembroke, who had never forgiven the Gaveston affair, devoted himself to forming a middle party, which acquired a definite ascendancy in 1318 and gave the country a less desperately anarchical government for some three years. More could scarcely be said for it.



Costume of the commonalty,
Edward II.

But Edward was incapable of learning wisdom. He had found a new favourite in Hugh Despenser, the son of an official of some capacity. Honours were bestowed on the Despensers, who soon raised up enemies. The magnates united to demand their banishment in 1321, when the demand was endorsed by a parliament of the three Estates. But the union was only superficial. On the one hand, Hereford and Roger Mortimer of Wigmore, the head of the Mortimer connection, the bitterest foes of the Despensers, were suspicious of the king's intention of recalling the favourites. On the other hand, an insult to the

queen produced a strong reaction in the king's favour. He ventured to recall the Despensers, whereupon the Marchers and Lancaster rose. Edward marched to the north; the Lancastrians were routed by Sir Andrew Harclay, Commandant of Carlisle, at Boroughbridge; Lancaster himself was taken, and was sentenced and executed without being allowed to defend himself. The vagaries of popular sentiment transformed into a hero and a miracle-working saint this most powerful of the barons, who in his public life had displayed no single virtue which entitled him to the smallest respect.

The king and the Despensers had won for the time; and the Despensers posed as champions of popular as opposed to baronial rights; an attitude traditionally appropriate to the descendants of a Despenser who had received the confidence of Simon de Montfort. A parliament was promptly called at York, in which the commons were fully represented. The Ordinances were repealed, but the principle was asserted that affairs of state should be treated by the king in full parliament of the prelates, the baronage, and commonalty. In effect the Ordainers were condemned, not for what they did, but for doing it without the authority of the assembled Estates.

The Despensers proved no better than any of the series of inefficient administrations under which England had suffered for fourteen years past. They in their turn drove into opposition those of the great nobles whose temper inclined them to moderate counsels. Such a man was Henry of

Lancaster, the brother and in part the successor of Thomas. The queen, Isabella—a quite young woman, who had been but sixteen when in 1312 she became the mother of the future Edward III.—was violently jealous of the young Despenser's influence with her husband, and the humiliations to which she was subjected would have awakened bitter resentment in a far less passionate woman. The Scots raided at will over the northern counties, and were only bought off by an ignominious but practically unavoidable truce. There prevailed everywhere the disorder and insecurity which in medieval times inevitably accompanied a weak government. In France, Charles IV., the last king of the old direct line of the Capets, was carrying out the old policy of his father, Philip IV., and re-establishing in Gascony the authority which that monarch had filched from the first Edward but had surrendered in the closing years of his reign.

By a master-stroke of impolicy, Isabella was allowed to go to France to negotiate with her brother; thither she was followed by the boy Edward, who now bore the title of Duke of Aquitaine. But while the queen played at diplomacy, she was more occupied in a private intrigue with Roger Mortimer, who had been imprisoned after Boroughbridge but had made his escape to France. The fruits of that notorious intrigue were made manifest when Isabella and Mortimer landed in England in the autumn of 1326, announcing that they had come to remove the now generally hated Despensers. For the king and his favourites scarcely a hand was raised, while nobles and gentry flocked to the queen's standard. The king became a fugitive, but was captured along with the younger Despenser, who was forthwith put to death. Edward himself was held in honourable custody by Henry of Lancaster. In January a parliament of the three Estates met, and was invited to pronounce whether it would have for king Edward of Carnarvon or his son, the Duke of Aquitaine. It pronounced in favour of the boy. The king was forced to abdicate, and Edward III. was proclaimed and crowned. The fallen monarch was withdrawn from the charge of Henry of Lancaster and placed in that of new custodians. When the brutal treatment to which he was now subjected failed to kill him, he was



Brass of Sir John de Creke, 1325.

fouly murdered in Berkeley Castle. As in the case of Thomas of Lancaster, not his virtues but the sins of his enemies and the tragedy of his death transformed the murdered king into a popular saint.

Practically, though not nominally, the government passed into the hands of the queen and her paramour, Roger Mortimer, who was now created Earl of March. They also did evil in the sight of the nation. An attack on Scotland met with the now familiar fate of such attempts. The regency gave up the futile struggle and disgusted the entire nation by the treaty of Northampton, which acknowledged Scottish independence. The little Prince David was married to the little English Princess Joan. A year later Robert Bruce died, and for a short time the Scottish regency was placed in the capable hands of Randolph, Earl of Moray.

But Mortimer in England, supported by the besotted queen mother, had no immediate aim save the accumulation of vast estates in his own hands. A conspiracy was set on foot for the overthrow of the regency and the release of the young King Edward from a state of practical subjection. The boy had been married to Philippa of Hainault, and the birth of a son in 1330, when he was seventeen, made him realise that he had come to man's estate. He joined with the conspirators, who on a night in October were privily admitted into Nottingham Castle, where Mortimer, the queen mother, and the young king were lying. Mortimer was seized, despatched to London, and hanged. Isabella was sent into an honourable retirement—honourable so far as concerned her treatment. Almost four years after his coronation Edward III. became King of England in fact as well as in name.



Opening a joust in the 14th century.

CHAPTER VI

EDWARD III. AND RICHARD II

I

BEFORE THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR

ROBERT BRUCE had achieved the liberation of Scotland, and had organised a government which was effective so long as he lived, supported by the able and patriotic captains who had helped him to his triumph. But he had left the seeds of trouble, by the forfeiture of the estates of sundry Norman nobles who had failed to support his cause. Moreover, he left on the throne a six-year-old son by a marriage in his later years, though his elder daughter Margaret was the wife of the hereditary Steward of Scotland. The government was safe in the hands of the Regent Randolph; but the prospect if he should die was not too promising. The disinherited nobles, and in particular Edward Balliol, the son of the old King John, were eager to find an opportunity for their own reinstatement. In 1332 Randolph died, leaving no one with the ability to take his place adequately. Edward Balliol at once struck for the Crown, supported by the "disinherited" and by many of the Border lords. A force sailed from England—it was not allowed to make an invasion across the Border—landed on the coast of Fife, and at Dupplin Moor routed a large army collected by the new regent, the Earl of Mar. The victory was achieved by the combination of archers, this time, with foot soldiers massed after the fashion of the Scots themselves; while the blunder of Bannockburn, which had there exposed the archery to destruction by the attack of a small body of horse, was not repeated. Dupplin Moor was decisive for the moment, and Edward Balliol was crowned. Three months later he was a fugitive; but in the interval he as King of Scots had made a new treaty with England. This Edward was pleased to regard as cancelling the treaty of Northampton; and thenceforward, till the course of events turned his attention from Scotland altogether, he gave active support to the pretensions of Balliol. In the following year (1333) he



Edward III. and St. George.
[National Portrait Gallery.]

led an army into Scotland, and Dupplin Moor was repeated at Halidon Hill. The tactics here developed, out of those employed at Falkirk and Maes Madog, were destined to make the English arms invincible for a century to come whenever they were brought into play.

Balliol was now again King of Scots, placed on the throne emphatically by the English arms ; and he forthwith handed over half the Lowlands to the King of England, to whom he also did homage for the rest of the kingdom. The Scots declined to accept the situation. They sent off David and his wife Joan, the king and queen whom they recognised, to France for safety, and despite the lack of a leader prepared to fight. The Disinherited, replaced in their estates, proceeded to quarrel. Instead of fostering and strengthening Edward Balliol, Edward of England treated him with ostentatious distrust. In spite of annual incursions on the part



A royal dinner party in the 14th century.

of the English, continued until 1336, Balliol's cause gained no ground ; the Scots avoided any pitched battles with the invaders, and reverted to the guerilla warfare so successfully practised by Robert Bruce and his captains ; and in 1338 Edward's attention was finally absorbed by France so completely as to forbid the idea of his again attempting effective intervention in Scotland. A year later Balliol himself was ejected, and in 1341 David returned to his kingdom as its acknowledged monarch.

For England itself these were years of recovery from the endless broils, revolutions, and counter-revolutions under which the country had been suffering ever since the death of Edward I. The most prominent incident, if it may be called an incident, is the record that in 1332 and 1333 the knights of the shire became definitely associated with the borough representatives in a House of Commons, instead of with the barons, in the parliament of the three Estates ; though the time when the clergy ceased to act as an Estate of parliament is uncertain.


But in France events were taking place which were leading up to the

outbreak of the Hundred Years' War. In 1328 the French King, Charles IV., died; like his brothers, leaving no son behind him. A child born posthumously proved to be a daughter. From the days of Hugh Capet, the first of the reigning line, son had invariably succeeded father except when,

failing a son, a brother had succeeded. There had been no female succession, or succession through a female. The French now assumed the principle of the male succession, and forthwith acknowledged as king Philip of Valois, the nephew of Philip IV. and first cousin of the three brothers who had reigned since that king's death.

THE FRENCH CROWN

Philip III., 1270.



Now no one disputed the doctrine that a woman was not herself eligible for the throne; but laws of succession had not been definitely and decisively formulated; they varied in different countries and in different parts of one country; and there was a custom quite familiar in France, by which the

succession to an estate might pass on to the son of a woman who was herself precluded from the succession by her sex. Accordingly, when Charles IV. died, his sister Isabella, the queen mother of England, made a formal claim in favour of her son, as being nearer to the throne than his cousin of Valois. There was nothing absurd or irregular about the claim, which was based upon one of the recognised customary grounds of succession. But it practically rested with the French nation to choose at this stage which of



Edward III. meets his Cousin of France, Philip VI., in 1331.

[From a 14th century MS. in the British Museum.]

succession to an estate might pass on to the son of a woman who was herself precluded from the succession by her sex. Accordingly, when Charles IV. died, his sister Isabella, the queen mother of England, made a formal claim in favour of her son, as being nearer to the throne than his cousin of Valois. There was nothing absurd or irregular about the claim, which was based upon one of the recognised customary grounds of succession. But it practically rested with the French nation to choose at this stage which of

the various customs prevalent should be adopted in deciding permanently the course of succession to the French throne. They did not greatly trouble themselves over the technical pleas with which lawyers subsequently amused themselves ; but finding that their choice lay practically between the first noble of France and the king of a foreign country, they did not for a moment hesitate in choosing Philip. It is not without interest in this connection to notice that, a century and a half later, Henry VII. claimed the throne of England through his mother, but for himself, not for her ; and although succession in the female line was maintained, it was held until the reign of Henry VIII. to be a matter of doubt whether a woman could in her own person succeed to the throne.

In 1328 Isabella's claim on behalf of her son was rejected by the French baronage, and was unsupported even by the barons of Aquitaine. It is to be observed, however, that even at this stage the cities of Flanders, whose Count was a vassal of the French Crown, were prepared for reasons of their own to support Edward's title. War on this account was, however, out of the question ; Edward accepted the accomplished fact, and did homage to Philip for his French possessions ; and outwardly the two kings became very good friends. Nevertheless two bones of contention remained. Philip would not abandon his friendly attitude to the Bruces, and gave young David shelter in his court when Edward Balliol was reigning as *de facto* King of Scotland. Also the conflicting rights of the King of France and of Edward, as Duke of Aquitaine, remained unsettled. The differences, in fact, over Aquitaine were such that they could hardly in any case have been settled except by the arbitrament of war. There was no reconciling the irreducible minimum of the respective claims. So in 1336 Edward was already engaged in diplomatic efforts to secure the alliance of the Counts of the Netherlands, Flanders, Brabant, Hainault, and others, and of the German Emperor Lewis of Bavaria himself. At the end of 1337, Edward renounced the homage which he had rendered while still a minor to Philip, and again put forward his own claim to the French Crown. Hostilities of an informal character opened with conflicts in the Channel and on the Channel coasts between the seamen of England and of Normandy. In 1338 Edward had secured Brabant, and his alliance with the German Emperor was ostentatiously established. In 1339 the long-drawn-out preliminaries came to an end, and the contest known as the Hundred Years' War was fairly joined.

II

THE ERA OF VICTORIES

The old idea that the Hundred Years' War was a piece of wanton aggression on the part of King Edward, having for its object the usurpation of the French Crown, has long been abandoned. The real point at issue, the


matter which made war inevitable, was the question of Aquitaine ; over which Edward I. and Philip the Fair had wrangled at the end of the last century. A settlement had then been arrived at which outwardly satisfied both parties ; but during the incapable rule of Edward II. the French kings had continued the old insidious policy of procuring and acting upon excuses for confiscation, until the Duke of Aquitaine was effectively lord of only a small part of that inheritance which was legitimately his. But for that, other differences might have been adjusted.

But war being inevitable and not unwelcome, Edward for diplomatic purposes asserted a claim to the French Crown which in the then existing uncertainties of the law of succession was by no means without plausibility, at least in the year 1328, when it was first put forward. Had it not been asserted at that time, it would have been vitiated later by the birth in 1332 of Charles of Navarre, called the Bad ; for Charles was the son of a daughter of Louis X., the immediate successor of Philip the Fair, and the child's claim was therefore stronger than that of Edward as the son of a sister of Louis. But his birth did not vitiate Edward's claim to have been *de jure* king four years before that event. It is therefore only fair to recognise that Edward's title was one which could be maintained by a perfectly conscientious lawyer, although the weight of legal opinion would undoubtedly have supported the title of Philip VI.

Political issues, however, not the dynastic issues, provided the real motive of the contest ; and among these were very important commercial issues. The commerce between England and Gascony was of great value to both countries, and was hampered by the relations between the King of France and the Duke of Aquitaine. The commerce between England and Flanders was still more important, and was endangered by the complicated relations between the cities of Flanders, the Count of Flanders, and the French king, which made the Flemish cities desirous of having the King of England for their supreme overlord rather than Philip of Valois. It was this more than anything else which caused Edward to give prominence to his claim to the French Crown among the reasons for the war.

The opening campaigns were futile. Philip and Edward challenged each other to meet in the open field, but carefully evaded any actual collision in force. The armies ranged along the north-eastern marches of France, and desolated the country without accomplishing anything. But in 1340 Edward made formal alliance with the cities of Flanders, and explicitly took upon himself the title of King of France. In the course of the year was fought the great naval engagement of Sluys which decisively gave to the English the mastery of the Channel, hitherto disputed by the sailors of Normandy. At that time Sluys had a large open harbour, where a great fleet, chiefly Norman, was gathered. Here they were engaged by a great English fleet, the ships grappling each other ; and the fierce hand-to-hand fighting resulted in the complete victory of the English. The king took part in the engagement, which at once established his reputation as a warrior.

But the land campaign was as futile as the last, and a truce was signed which remained in force till 1345. Edward, who had lavished large subsidies on his German allies, who made little enough practical return for them, was already in serious financial difficulties, and had incurred heavy debts to the Flemish cities ; and it was only by the ignominious expedient of secret flight that he was able, after signing the truce, to escape to England, leaving his debts unpaid. Attributing his embarrassments to the neglect of the officials whom he had left in charge of affairs in England, he attacked Archbishop Stratford, who, however, was able successfully to assert his title to be tried



A sea fight about the time of the battle of Sluys.


[From a MS. in the British Museum.]

by his peers, and to procure a statute rendering the king's ministers responsible to parliament.

We may, however, set aside constitutional questions at present and proceed with the story of the war, which was in effect continued in spite of the truce. Theoretically France and England were at peace ; but a question of succession arose in Brittany between John de Montfort and Charles of Blois. The two kings supported the rival claimants ; each of them as regards Brittany reversing the doctrines of succession by which he himself claimed the throne of France. From the English point of view this phase of the contest is chiefly notable on account of the battle of Morlaix, where the Earl of Northampton, in command of the English, won a victory over superior forces, by employing the archery tactics of Halidon Hill and Dupplin Moor for the first time on Continental soil. However, under these conditions the pretence of truce could not long be maintained. In 1345 it came to an end.

The king, now in dire need of money, cheerfully repudiated his enormous debts to the financial houses of Florence; thereby very nearly ruining that city and cutting himself off from the sources from which he had hitherto managed to borrow.

A new campaign was opened, this time in Gascony; but the great interest centres in the northern campaign of 1346. In that year Edward invaded Normandy, and within two months had advanced almost to the walls of Paris. But Philip had collected a very much larger army, and Edward resolved to fall back to



English and French at Crécy.

Flanders, with the French in pursuit. Having with great difficulty effected the passage of the Somme, he took up his position, on August 26th, on the famous field of Crécy, where he turned to bay.

Crécy typifies the English tactics which found their origin in the Welsh and Scottish wars of Edward I. and were now perfected by Edward III. The approaching French outnumbered by four to one the English, who would have been doomed to destruction in a contest on the normal medieval principles, which decided battles by the weight of charging masses of heavily armoured horsemen. But the Flemings and Scots had both proved that massed bodies of spearmen could stand their ground against any cavalry charge, though their resistance could be shattered, as at Falkirk and Halidon Hill, by bringing archery into play. Edward III. was now to prove that the combination of infantry with archery could not only beat off but could annihilate an attack which relied wholly on cavalry.



An archer of 14th century.

Like Bruce at Bannockburn, Edward drew up his forces with a narrow front, flanked by ground not available for cavalry. The front was ranged in two divisions, a third being held in reserve; while archers were thrown forward on either flank of each division, where, if attacked, they could fall back to cover. The regular foot soldiers were strengthened by dismounted horsemen, again as at Bannockburn,

while only a few mounted men were held in reserve. The French, though they arrived late in the day, resolved on an immediate attack. They advanced troops of Genoese cross-bow men, but the cross-bow was helpless against the long-bow. The Genoese were shot down before they had the English within range. The chivalry of France clamoured for the charge, and crashed forward, riding down the hapless Genoese. A storm of arrows poured upon the flanks of the charging columns, driving them instinctively to huddle together, and rolling over horse and man, so that



Cross-bow and quarrell as used at Crécy.

they were already in helpless confusion long before they reached the masses of heavy infantry. Again and again they charged with desperate valour, but only for a brief moment

did any of them succeed in breaking into the English lines. Light-armed Welshmen dashed out to slaughter and strip the fallen; the rout was as complete as that of Bannockburn; vast numbers were slain; the flower of the French nobility were either taken prisoners or left dead on the field.

Complete though the victory was, Edward could make no use of it except to continue his march to the coast unmolested. There, however, he settled down to besiege Calais; a port from which English shipping had suffered much injury, while its capture would provide a permanent gateway for entering France. For almost a year Calais held out stubbornly, but was finally starved into a surrender more famous for its medieval picturesqueness than even for its political importance; a story too familiar to be repeated here.

In the interval another success attended the English arms. As the ally of France, David of Scotland, who had recovered his throne in 1341, seized the opportunity in the autumn of 1346 to invade the north of England while Edward was in France. The invasion failed to relieve David's ally by drawing back troops, as was intended, for the defence of the north; which very successfully took care of itself. At the battle of Neville's Cross the Scots were routed and David was taken prisoner.

But in spite of brilliant victories the financial strain of the war was too great for Edward's resources, and in England taxation had reached the limit of popular endurance, although the general prosperity had been increasing so rapidly that the nation could have borne much heavier burdens without serious suffering. Moreover, Edward's allies were doing him no service; so, having secured Calais and transformed it into an English town, the English king agreed to a truce in September 1347. The truce continued for eight years, although miscellaneous fighting was going on all the time. In 1354 the Pope nearly succeeded in negotiating a

definitive peace, which would undoubtedly have been welcomed by the peoples of both France and of England. Edward was prepared to resign his claim to the French Crown if the quarrel over Aquitaine were settled by the grant of full sovereignty in Guienne and the disputed provinces. But the French king refused to give way, and the English Estates supported Edward in reviving the war in 1355.

Military operations were renewed on an extensive scale. The king's son, Edward the "Black Prince," who had won his spurs at Crécy, was despatched to Aquitaine, while the king himself intended to operate from Calais. The second movement, however, was paralysed, since the Scots effected a successful diversion by capturing Berwick and drawing Edward back to England in haste. But that winter the Black Prince devastated French territory in the south, while the king himself carried fire and sword over the south of Scotland in the raid known as the Burnt Candlemas. Also he resumed his grandfather's title as not only overlord but actual King of Scotland in place of Edward Balliol, who formally resigned his own futile pretensions in his favour. Then in Normandy and Brittany the tide of war surged to and fro, mainly in favour of the English. But the grand event of the year 1356 was the Black Prince's incursion from Bordeaux into the regions of the Loire, which culminated in the brilliant victory of Poitiers. On this occasion, as in many other of the French battles, the force commanded by the prince was immensely outnumbered by the French; while it was largely Gascon, not English, and was accompanied by only a few archers. The details of the battle are unusually obscure. Almost for the first time both sides fought on foot, but the English had the advantage of the slope. The decisive blow, however, was struck when Edward executed an unsuspected turning movement with the reserve force of mounted men, who instead of having fled as was generally supposed, appeared suddenly on the French rear, fell upon them, and turned what was already almost an assured repulse into a total route. Both the French King John and his youngest son Philip, afterwards Duke of Burgundy, were taken prisoners.



Archer and arbalestier, 14th century.

With the two kings of France and Scotland in his hands Edward was now in a strong position for dictating terms. France fell into a condition of anarchy. English soldiers fought for their own hand as captains of "free companies." The peasantry broke out in the desperate revolt known as the Jacquerie. Edward released David of Scotland for a ransom which the Scots king was never actually able to pay in full; but the terms of peace for France included not only a huge ransom to the king, but practically the cession in full sovereignty of all that had ever been held in France by an Angevin King of England. In spite of her miseries France would not yield.

In the winter and spring of 1359-60 the war was renewed with increased fury ; but in May the hostilities were stopped by the temporary treaty of Bretigny. Edward renounced his claim to the French throne, and John his claim to the allegiance of the disputed districts of Aquitaine. All Aquitaine, and in addition the substantial north-eastern district which came to be known as the Calais Pale, was ceded in full sovereignty to the English king ; but in the final treaty of Calais the first-mentioned clauses of the treaty of Bretigny were not actually embodied. Peace, it seemed, had come at last.

III

THE ERA OF FAILURES

Edward III. stood now at the height of his renown. In popular estimation he was by far the greatest captain of his day ; having, indeed, no rival except his own son, the Black Prince, who was still little more than thirty years of age. Of neither does the military reputation stand so high with posterity as it did in their own day. Neither was in any sense a master of strategy ; both planned even the campaigns in which they achieved their greatest triumphs as if the one object of generalship was successful raiding. But both were masters of the art of handling troops on the field of battle ; both knew how to inspire their men with complete confidence in their leader and in themselves. Under them the English fought to win, whatever the odds might be. And Edward III. has the credit for having perfected that form of battle array which did in practice repeatedly give the English victory in the face of immense odds. It is not without interest to observe that the principle of breaking up cavalry charges by a flank fire, which won the day at Crécy, reappeared with decisive effect nearly five hundred years later at the battle of Waterloo.

But neither the conqueror's day of glory nor the triumphant peace which he seemed to have achieved were to be of long duration. France, indeed, had never formed a united nation, and Gascony felt no sense of alienation in being parted from the French Crown. But there were other portions of the dukedom of Aquitaine which resented the overlordship of the English king ; also there were French districts of which sundry captains of free companies had made themselves masters, and these were by no means minded to surrender what they had won with their own swords merely because the Kings of England and France had made a treaty. Therefore the process of establishing the supremacy of King Edward and King John in the regions assigned to them respectively by the treaty was by no means a simple one, and was attended by a large amount of free fighting. Moreover, while the renunciatory clauses of the treaty of Bretigny had been omitted from the definitive treaty of Calais, it was with the understanding that they were to be given effect later ; which completion of the

treaty was evaded by both parties. Hence large opportunities were presented, which might be seized by one party or the other, for denouncing it altogether.

The King of France, John the Good, a mirror of knightly faith and honour, made every effort to fulfil his own obligations, even to the extent of voluntarily returning to his captivity in England when the payment of his ransom fell into arrear. The Edwards were equally punctilious in performing all that the laws of chivalry had demanded; their courtesy and generosity were proverbial; but neither Edward nor John's successor, Charles V., had any qualms about evading a promise if they could find a plausible excuse for doing so. Hence those renunciatory clauses were never formally ratified. Charles, a very much shrewder man than his father, set about the pacification of his realm with considerable success.

Troubles in Spain to a great extent relieved France of the free companies, who with a light heart joined the stout French warrior Bertrand du Guesclin in supporting the revolt of Henry of Trastamare against Pedro the Cruel, King of Castile. But Pedro fled to the Black Prince, whose father had now instituted him the independent lord of Aquitaine. The prince's curiously distorted views of his chivalric *devoir* led him to take up the cause of the exiled tyrant. He crossed the Pyrenees with a large army, won the great victory of Navarette, and reinstated Pedro the Cruel. But he ruined his own health and that of his entire force, besides exhausting the finances of Aquitaine on the enterprise and incurring immense debts. Pedro, having won his crown, repudiated his obligations to his ally; who returned to Bordeaux, and unwillingly enough taxed his subjects that he might pay his debts. The towns and the commonalty of Aquitaine had found in the prince a ruler who treated them fairly enough, and were now ready to submit to his exactions; but the barons, who had found their privileges curtailed, and preferred for their suzerain a very much hampered King of France to a vigorous duke in Bordeaux, took the opportunity to appeal against the taxes to Charles as their suzerain. Charles admitted the right of appeal, on the ground that King Edward had



A temporary besieging fort of timber.
[From Froissart's "Chronicles of England."]

never formally renounced his claim to the French Crown: and cited the Black Prince to his court. The result was defiance from the Black Prince and the formal resuscitation of his father's claim to the French Crown.

So once more France and England were at war, but under very much altered conditions. For the once mighty Edward III., though still far short



France and the Angevin Dominion.

- Boundary of France.
- Boundary of the dominion of Henry II.
- English Boundary at Brittany.

of sixty, was already falling into a premature old age, and the Black Prince's powers were wrecked by disease. The English king had obtained little enough practical help from his allies in the past; but now the German Empire had passed to the house of Luxemburg, and the marriages of the last generation had so changed the interests of counts and princes that the French king now had allies where before he had enemies.

The renewal of war, then, in 1369 was attended by a series of successes for the French arms, while all that the Black Prince could effect was the capture of Limoges, the sack and destruction of the city, and the

massacre of its inhabitants. This was in 1370; and it did much more to alienate the population of Aquitaine than to terrorise them into submission to the duke. A year later the Black Prince himself was in England, having neither the health to lead his soldiers nor money to pay them. Again, a year later, a British fleet met with an overwhelming defeat off La Rochelle, thereby losing the command of the sea which had been held for more than thirty years. The war had no redeeming features; and the defeat at La Rochelle effectively cut Aquitaine off from England. Edward's second surviving son, John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, led an expedition through France; but the French avoided pitched battles after the manner of the Scots, wasted the country before the invaders, worried them on flank and rear, and raided their communications. Without having fought a single serious engagement, it was but a wreck of John of Gaunt's army which finally struggled into Bordeaux. The record of exhaustion and futility was only brought to a close by a truce which covered the two last years of the old king's life; when England was in practical possession of little more than Calais and Guisnes, the "Calais Pale," in the north-east corner of France, and Bordeaux on the south-west.

Disaster abroad was accompanied by faction and discord at home. Parliament readily endorsed Edward's resolve to renew the war, but disgust took the place of enthusiasm as disaster followed disaster. At the demand of parliament the king dismissed in 1371 the clerical ministers whose mismanagement was popularly held to be responsible; but the new anti-clerical ministry brought no improvement. Pembroke, who had led the opposition, was defeated and captured at La Rochelle, and John of Gaunt, who had identified himself with the same party, got nothing but discredit out of his expedition in the following year. Anti-clericalism became the party cry of John of Gaunt's faction; while the party now in opposition was headed nominally by the dying Black Prince and more actively by Edmund Mortimer, Earl of March. Mortimer had married the daughter of Edward's second son, Lionel of Clarence, recently dead; so that his infant son Roger stood next in succession to the Black Prince's own son Richard. The Anti-clericals called in to their aid the learned doctor John Wiclif; who held austere views as to the iniquity of wealth and worldliness among the clergy, and was further promulgating unaccustomed doctrines, which were presently to be denounced by the Church as heretical and by politicians as anarchical.

The parliament, summoned after a somewhat unusual interval of three



English man-at-arms and archer.

[From Froissart.]

years in 1376, gave the temporary victory to the Black Prince's party, who had honestly enough adopted the rôle of constitutionalists. A vigorous attack was made on the Anti-clerical or Court party. The trial and imprisonment of Lord Latimer and other ministers are regarded as the first example of impeachment—the process under which officers of state are arraigned before the House of Lords by the House of Commons. At this juncture the Black Prince himself died. John of Gaunt made the mistake of inviting the Commons to make a declaration in favour of the



A 14th century abbot preaching.

French rule of succession, which would have given to himself and his son priority over young Roger Mortimer, who, as we have seen, claimed through his mother to stand next after Richard in the succession. Lancaster's proposal was emphatically rejected, but he had given colour to the belief that he was really playing for the Crown. Although his own position had been strengthened by the death of his elder brother, he could not resist the demand of the Commons that the control of the government should be placed in the hands of a nominated council. Nevertheless, he succeeded in packing a new parliament, which met at the beginning of the next year, with partisans of his own; the proceedings of the last or "Good" Parliament were reversed, and Lancaster forcibly protected Wiclif against the attacks of the clerical party, though these were supported by the citizens of London. Conciliatory counsels, however, averted the outbreak of a civil war at the moment when the old king was dying neglected and almost forgotten. Whatever Lancaster's ambitions were, actual disloyalty was not among his sins, and the Black Prince's son Richard, young as he was, succeeded to the throne without opposition in June 1377.

The accession of the young king, a boy of eleven, was accompanied by a general reconciliation, which found its expression in the personnel of the Council of Twelve who were placed in control of the government. Both parties were represented. Though neither Lancaster himself nor his younger brothers, Edmund of Langley and Thomas of Woodstock, were members of the Council, Lancaster's vast estates left him individually the most powerful man in the kingdom. A government thus constituted was hardly fitted to deal effectively with a crisis. The truce with France had come to an end, and matters went ill both in Aquitaine and on the seas. A new parliament was summoned in January which reverted definitely to the attitude of the Good Parliament, turned some of the Lancastrians out of the Council, and claimed definitely that no Act passed in parliament should be repealed without consent of parliament. The House then proceeded to vote supplies expressly for the war, and required the appointment of



ENGLISH LIFE IN THE EARLY FOURTEENTH CENTURY

Drawings from the beautiful Luttrell Psalter (made before 1346). Those in the upper half illustrate the domestic preparations for a great feast in Sir Geoffrey Luttrell's house ; in the lower half are husbandry scenes.

special auditors, who should see to it that the money was expended on the war and on nothing else—the first definite instance of the principle of “appropriation of supply.”

Still the spirit of conciliation was abroad, and Lancaster, in spite of his political defeat, was entrusted with the control of naval and military operations, which as usual he mismanaged. The treasury was exhausted; and to raise more money the Commons agreed to a poll-tax, graduated according to wealth, and ranging from a groat up to six pounds. The tax brought in less than half of what had been expected, and the fleet on which it was expended was shattered by a gale. There was another reconstruction of the ministry, but no improvement in efficiency. Once more additional taxation was demanded, and again the reluctant Commons assented to a poll-tax, which this time was not graduated, but was assessed at a shilling a head on the whole adult population. Although an attempt was made to introduce a sort of local graduation, so that in each district the wealthier men should pay more than the poor, the practical effect was only to make the tax more severely felt in the poorer districts, since the average of a shilling a head over the district had to be maintained. This second poll-tax was the occasion, though not the cause, of the conflagration of 1381, known as the Peasants' Revolt or Wat Tyler's Rebellion.


IV

CROWN, COMMERCE, AND PARLIAMENT

Edward I. established the parliament of the three Estates in the closing years of his reign; but that parliament had not learnt to assert itself generally, and offered no resistance when the earls and the greater barons took upon themselves the office of controlling the king's government. The Good Parliament at the close of Edward III.'s reign shows the Commons taking a much more active part in affairs of state. Petitions and protests were freely put forward by the knights of the shire; and the overseers appointed at the beginning of the reign of Richard II. to control the accounts were neither ministers of the king nor members of the baronage, but two leading citizens of London.

The change that had taken place meant that the Commons had been step by step throughout the reign of Edward III. acquiring the effective power of the purse; because the enormous expenditure, involved primarily by the wars, made the Crown more and more dependent upon supplies voluntarily granted by the Commons; and at the same time the Commons grew more and more jealous of methods of raising revenue which were not dependent upon their goodwill. They had not at first made their control effective. They were strong enough to refuse money unless the king would make satisfactory promises; but they were still without effective means of compelling the

king to carry out his promises when he had made them. For parliamentary supremacy, the first necessary stage was for parliament to have the power of withholding the supplies necessary to the carrying out of the king's policy ; the second step was the application of that power to the control of legislation ; and the third, still very remote, was its further application to the control of the Executive.



A merchant of 1367.
[From a brass at Lynn.]

Accordingly the reign shows the Crown becoming more and more dependent for funds on the goodwill of parliament ; while the doctrine is gaining ground that legislation, to be permanent, requires parliamentary sanction ; though parliament is only beginning to assume the initiative by expressing in petitions the principles which it wishes to see enacted. Its attempts to influence the administration are still more embryonic. Only under extreme circumstances and at the very end of the reign does parliament, as distinct from a baronial faction, take upon itself to attack the king's ministers or to demand powers of supervision.

Edward was perfectly conscious that the policy on which he was embarking when he entered upon the French war involved his own dependence upon parliament, and he took care that parliament should expressly commit itself to endorsing his policy ; although by so doing he encouraged the development of the idea, which as yet existed only in germ, that parliament was entitled to a voice in the direction of policy. At the same time it was an object with him, as it had been with his grandfather, to minimise that dependence. He endeavoured, therefore, to develop independent sources of revenue. Something which may be called a commercial policy had first become operative in the time of his grandfather ; partly because Edward as a nationalist statesman had begun to recognise in commercial expansion one of the roads to national welfare and national strength ; partly because he hoped to obtain from it an increase of the royal revenue which should not involve direct reference to the Estates. Like aims caused the third Edward to

develop a commercial policy so energetic that he has been called the Father of English commerce.

We have seen that until the reign of Edward III. foreign commerce was extremely limited. Every borough and every district aimed at being self-sufficing ; so also did the nation. The enterprising foreigner sought a market for his own goods in England and purchased raw materials from

England; but the Englishman hardly attempted to seek a foreign market for his own goods or to procure from foreign countries goods which he could sell again at a profit at home. The wine and the cloths which he had not learnt to manufacture at home the foreigner would bring to his doors; and if the foreigner chose to bring his goods for sale, he must spend the purchase-money in buying other goods from Englishmen.

But the Englishman was now progressing beyond this passive attitude. He was beginning to produce with an eye to the foreign purchaser; even to exporting on his own

account, instead of merely selling to the foreigner who came to buy. And because Englishmen were prospering they were also inclined to buy more of the goods which were only to be had from the foreigner. It was realised that prosperity comes to those who seek a market. The Crown perceived that



A goldsmith's shop in the 14th century.

if energy were devoted to facilitating the expansion of trade, it could take its own toll at the same time without discouraging enterprise; and the more trade expanded the bigger the toll would be. Hence the value attaching to the commerce with Flanders and the commerce with his own Gascon dominions materially influenced Edward III. in his French policy. English wool growers and Gascon wine growers would flourish; and the more they flourished the more the royal exchequer would extract as the price of the privileges of exporting wool and importing wine. It followed that the king sought to strain to the utmost the royal prerogative of imposing customs nominally for the regulation of trade, and of bargaining with the merchants for their assent to such impositions without referring to parliament. And when parliament realised what was going on, parliament in turn insisted that its own assent was necessary to the imposition of customs. In spite of repeated efforts to evade the principle, Edward found himself obliged to give way. The Crown's right to the "Ancient Customs" in accordance with the statute of 1275 was unchallenged; but it was established during the reign that other duties, even if they became habitual, required the assent of parliament for their imposition; and even if their renewal might be practically relied upon, it was on each occasion made only for a definite period.

In the conditions of medieval society, both the expansion of trade and the collection of revenue were facilitated by the famous institution of the Merchants of the Staple. In modern times, *laissez faire* doctrine condemns the regulation of commerce by the State on the ground that private enter-

prise is hampered thereby. When the State gives the individual protection against violence and fraud it has discharged its proper function. But in the



The towns underlined are "Towns of the Staple"

middle ages the great danger to private enterprise was insecurity against violence and fraud. For security, State or municipal supervision was a necessity. The export trade in English staple products, wool, wool-fells,

hides, leather and some others, was made a monopoly of the merchants of the staple. Membership was open on the payment of fees, and was conditional only on the observance of the company's regulations; while the members traded severally on their own account—not after the fashion of a modern Joint Stock Company, in which the society does the trading and distributes the profits. The trading was confined to specified towns connected with specified ports in England; and also to specified towns on the Continent, though ultimately the monopoly was given to Calais. It was thus possible to compel all traders to conform to definite regulations, and to provide security for the purchaser in respect of the bulk and quality of the goods purchased. At the same time the collection of the customs was very much simplified.

But Edward was not satisfied with the encouragement of exports. He also encouraged imports by offering privileges to traders from Gascony and the Low Countries; to the Gascons, with an eye to the wealth of Gascony rather than of England; to the Flemings, with an eye to reciprocal privileges; to both with an eye to the revenue derivable from customs. Edward is not to be credited with any anticipation of Free Trade doctrines as to the economic advantage of buying in the cheapest market; he probably looked very little beyond the opportunity presented of taking a toll for himself from the traders. The doctrine was fully accepted that money, a scarce and valuable commodity, should not be carried out of the kingdom in exchange for the goods brought in. The foreigner in England could only trade as a member of an association under strict regulation and supervision, at particular times and particular places; and he was obliged to buy goods to the value of those he sold. But he was encouraged to sell as well as to buy; and the volume of trade and the amount of material wealth in the country increased rapidly.

In one particular Edward appears to have been moved by more definite economic considerations. He encouraged foreigners to settle in England and carry on industries which had not taken a natural root in the country. From the foreigners in their midst the English learnt industrial arts which they had hitherto ignored; and during the fourteenth century the English became not merely wool-growers but manufacturers of the cloth which had hitherto been imported from the Low Countries. So much advance was made in this industry that regulations were made to limit or even prohibit the export of wool in order to keep down the price for the benefit of English cloth-makers. Before the end of the century English cloths were in full competition with those of Flanders.

The customs then provided a source of revenue which in previous centuries had hardly been taken into account; but it was one which the king could only to a very limited extent claim as falling within his control. Except as concerned the "Ancient Customs," it was a source of supply which it was technically within the power of parliament to cut off, although in practice an authority to levy particular customs, frequently renewed, was

likely to become permanent as a matter of course if not as a matter of technical right. Thus the impost called tonnage and poundage, a fixed tax upon every ton of wine and every pound of merchandise imported, was first sanctioned towards the close of Edward's reign, renewed for periods of two or three years, and gradually became a practically assured source of income; until in the reign of Henry VI. it was granted to the king for life, and continued to be so granted at the beginning of each reign until the accession of Charles I. Similarly, Edward I. had laid tallages upon the

towns, and bargained with the merchants for subsidies on wool. Both practices had been challenged, but neither had been definitely prohibited; and Edward III. made use of both. But both were finally prohibited in his reign by statute, the tallages in 1340 and the wool subsidies in 1362.



Gold rose-noble of Edward III.

Practically the permanent expenditure so far exceeded what the king could meet out of revenue under his own control that he was in constant need of specific grants from parliament; especially after the ruin of the Florentine bankers, by Edward's repudiation of his debt, made it impossible for him to borrow on a large scale. The form followed was for the king to invite the Estates to grant him what was needful; they responded each according to its own willingness and capacity, the barons, the clergy, the shires and the cities taxing themselves severally. Thus it became the custom with the Commons to make a tenth and a fifteenth the standard subsidy; which on occasion might be raised to two-tenths and two-fifteenths. But the right was reserved of presenting petitions for legislation as a condition preliminary to the grant being made. It did not, however, follow that the statute actually promulgated was a precise fulfilment of the petition presented. That principle was not formally laid down until the reign of Henry V.

In 1341, at the time of the quarrel with Stratford, the king to obtain funds accepted the demands of parliament; yet a few months later he repudiated his promise and cancelled his concessions. But when parliament again met, its formal assent to that cancellation was obtained, and the king did not repeat the experiment. When, five and thirty years later, John of Gaunt on his own authority cancelled the Acts of the Good Parliament after its dissolution, although the parliament immediately following endorsed his action, it was subsequently enacted formally that Acts of parliament could only be repealed by Act of parliament.

Of the legislation of the reign an important portion consists in the various declaratory Acts defining and limiting the rights of the Crown as to

raising revenue ; much as we saw that precise definition was the object of a great deal of the legislation of Edward I. In the same way the direct outcome of the quarrel with Stratford was the final definiteness of the assertion of the principle of trial by peers. To the same category of defining Acts belongs the important Statute of Treasons, which for the first time set forth precisely that the crime of treason consisted in the compassing of the death of the king, the queen, or the heir apparent, and in levying war against the king or assisting his enemies. With these were included the slaying of the king's ministers or judges, and counterfeiting the king's coinage or the Great Seal. In another field, legislation pointed to the increase of anti-clerical feeling marked by the Statutes of Provisors and of Præmunire ; the first directed against the usurpation by the Pope of the right to make ecclesiastical appointments, and the second against the ecclesiastical custom of carrying appeals to Rome. In both cases the principles asserted were those which no kings of England had surrendered until the submission of King John to Innocent III. Even Edward I., however, had only succeeded in resisting papal claims which were new in his own day ; he had not recovered the ground which his father and grandfather lost. But throughout the fourteenth century papal authority and ecclesiastical influence were losing weight ; because for three-fourths of the century the headquarters of the papacy were at Avignon instead of at Rome, and the Popes, instead of standing forth as the theocratic heads of Christendom, were politically to a great extent subservient to the French Crown. Moreover, when at last the captivity at Avignon came to an end, it was followed by the Great Schism, when there were constantly two rival popes, one of whom was supported by one-half of Western Christendom and the other by the other half. The awe and reverence inspired for two hundred years by the successors of Hildebrand faded ; the ground was being prepared for the great revolt against the papacy which culminated in the Reformation, of which Wiclif was already sowing the seed before Edward III. was in his grave.



A bishop's court.

[From a 14th century MS.]

One more feature of the reign remains to be noted in connection with

the relations of the Crown with the baronage. Edward III. carried to a much higher pitch his grandfather's plan of creating a dominant baronage of the blood royal by the absorption of earldoms and great estates in the hands of members of the royal family. The great territorial possessions of the house of Lancaster, itself sprung from the brother of Edward I., passed to the king's third son, John of Gaunt, who became Duke of Lancaster, by his marriage with Blanche, the heiress of Lancaster. At the time of Edward's death there was no one else bearing the title of Duke. Another group of earldoms went to the king's second son, Lionel of Clarence, and passed on his death to the house of Mortimer through his daughter, the wife of the Earl of March. Two other sons survived, of whom one, Edmund, was later made Duke of York, and the other, Thomas, Duke of Gloucester. At the close of Edward's reign the hereditary peers summoned to the Lords' chamber were little more than half as many as those summoned to the Model Parliament; and the process continued during the following reigns. The old principle of preventing the accumulation of great estates was abandoned for that of accumulating them in the hands of the royal kin; with results which presently proved disastrous.



A state-carriage of about 1330.

[From the Luttrell Psalter.]

V

THE BLACK DEATH AND THE PEASANT REVOLT

We turn now to the social conditions and the events which led up to the great Peasants' Revolt of 1381, the story of the revolt itself, and the examination of its importance in the social and economic progress of the country.

We saw that at the time of the Norman Conquest the soil was divided into the demesne lands or private estates of lords of the manor and the holdings of ceorls politically free, though the great bulk of them held their plots—"yards" or "virgates" of thirty acres, half virgates of fifteen acres, or still smaller holdings—by payment of agricultural service, or rent, or both, to the lord of the manor. We saw further that by the reign of Henry II. the bulk of these occupiers holding by service had become serfs bound to the soil, this whole class bearing the general name of villeins; among whom were not generally included those who paid rent but not

service, nor all of those who paid service. With the enforcement of the habit of law and order which characterised the Plantagenet rule, the condition of the villeins steadily improved. They were permitted to commute service for rent, though this did not free them from the technical status of serfdom ;



Penshurst, the hall of a 14th century Baron.

[Built about 1340.]

and it followed that the old forced services were largely replaced by labour for which wages were paid. Thus there grew up a class of wage-earning agricultural labourers, consisting of landless men and small cottars, who were still technically bound to the soil, though in practice some degree of liberty of migration was permitted. The process continued steadily and

almost unconsciously for nearly two centuries; so that in the early years of Edward III. the superior villeins were materially little if at all worse off than the yeomanry, that is free-holders or holders by free tenure, although they were socially inferior; while the inferior villeins made their subsistence mainly as wage-earning labourers, enjoying while in full employment wages sufficient to feed and house and clothe them very much better than their contemporaries in France and elsewhere—though they probably found life hard enough in winter and in seasons of scarcity or pestilence.

But in the years which followed the battle of Crécy, England, in common with Europe in general, was visited by the appalling pestilence known as the Black Death. It appeared in England in 1347 and 1348, and recurred at intervals during the next twenty years. So terrible was the visitation that in the rural districts it may be estimated from the evidence that not less than one-third—perhaps a full half—of the population was swept away. The fields were left untilled, and there was a terrible scarcity of food. The demand for labour greatly exceeded the supply, while the price of provisions rose. The labourer demanded higher wages. High wages and high cost of living reacted on each other; the men would not work except at prices which from the landowners' point of view were extortionate.

In 1350 the government intervened with an ordinance which was ratified by parliament as the Statute of Labourers. The knights of the shire, the most influential section of the House of Commons, were themselves landowners with whom the landowners' point of view inevitably prevailed, though they had no intention of acting unjustly or in the interests of a class. The Statute ordained that food should be sold at the prices ruling before the coming of the Black Death, and that the labourer should work for the same wages. For infractions of the law both parties were to be penalised, those who demanded and those who paid more than legal wages and prices. Further, the law which bound the villeins to the soil was to be enforced, and the labourer might on no account migrate from his manor to seek higher wages elsewhere. But if the landowners had the law behind them, the labourers were for the most part practically masters of the situation. The law was only partially successful in checking the high prices and the high wages. In the circumstances it was inevitable that many of the landowners should fall back upon any technical rights they possessed. In many cases the commutation of service for rent had been merely an act of grace; that is to say, it had not been secured by any proper legal bond. Landlords and their agents strained the technical point of law to claim unpaid service from the villeins.

It is quite superfluous to accuse either landlords or labourers of a monstrous reversion to an obsolete tyranny or of a monstrous attempt to take an immoral advantage of a national disaster. Both could easily convince themselves that reason and justice were all on their own side and not at all on the side of the other party. A bitter class hatred sprang into being,

which may well have been fostered by appalling tales brought back from France of the Jacquerie, the horrible sufferings of the French peasantry, and the horrible doings which attended their revolt and their suppression. Moreover, the peasantry learnt a new antagonism to the existing social order from the consciousness that the greatest of the English victories had been won by men not of knightly rank but practically of their own class, the yeomanry from whom the archers of England were drawn.

It does not appear that the growing discontent and bitterness were due to any extreme destitution among the peasantry. William Langland, the writer of the great contemporary allegory, the *Vision of Piers Plowman*, paints an ugly enough picture of the doings of some of the lords of the manor and their agents; but there is no reason to suppose that such oppression and chicanery were more than occasional. And, on the other hand, Langland does not spare the lash in describing the unthrift of the peasants, their self-indulgence, and their love of shirking legitimate toil. His indignation was begotten of the moral deficiencies which he saw in every class, and must be discounted, like the indignation of embittered moralists in all ages. But the mere fact that the accustomed conditions of labour and of food production were hopelessly disorganised by the great pestilence, and were kept in a state of disorganisation by its occasional recrudescence, necessarily prevented the country from recovering its former sense of easy prosperity; while the moral atmosphere was made worse by the depression and disgust attending the later phases of the war with France. The soil thus prepared was eminently fitted for revolutionary doctrines to take root in.

And revolutionary doctrines were in the air. Without any idea of stirring up the commonalty against the gentry, John Wiclif was playing a part not without its analogy to that of the French Encyclopædists before the French Revolution, four centuries later. As a theologian he propounded the view that "Dominion is of Grace"; whereof the practical interpretation is that power is given by God for the furtherance of His glory, and those who use their power for other ends have no right to it; from which it again follows that power misused may lawfully be resisted and even forcibly taken away. As a Christian reformer of morals Wiclif preached self-denial and taught of human brotherhood. Such doctrines are easily translated into either Socialism or Anarchism.

Nor may it be forgotten that the villeins as a class had a real though not a new grievance in the rankling sense that they were not free men; that they were treated as servile and inferior to free men; that the process by which they had been gradually passing into the ranks of free men and escaping degrading conditions of tenure had met with an ominous check; that even those who were now technically free were in danger of falling back into a servile condition. Then to crown their grievances came the second poll-tax, which appeared as an intolerable and unjust burden upon the poor while it was comparatively unfelt by the rich.

According to tradition an accidental spark fired the flame. A collector

of the unpopular tax insulted the daughter of a peasant, Wat Tyler, who struck him down. Other peasants gathered to support their comrade, and on a sudden all Kent was up in arms, the counties north-east of London following suit. From Kent on the south, from Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, and Hertfordshire on the north, the gathering bands of insurgents marched on the capital.

In many localities actual incidents of villeinage, legal rights of a lord—the “lord” being often a monastery—legal wrongs of villeins, were the motive of the outbreak; there was much clamouring against the name of serf, and the most general demand was that for the right to occupy land at what the peasants regarded as a reasonable rent. The prominence of these facts has obscured another; namely, that the rural population of Kent were not villeins at all but free men not holding by servile tenure; while the eastern counties with their large Danish element were notoriously those in which there was the largest proportion of free tenants. Although the insurrection spread sporadically to other districts, those in which villeinage was most universal were the least conspicuously disturbed. Contemporary annalists declare that the Kentish leader who also bore the name of Wat




John Ball haranguing.
[From Froissart.]

Tyler was meditating a political and social programme of an exceedingly advanced type, aimed not at the destruction of the monarchy but at a very democratic control of the government; in which there was no room for baronage, gentry, lawyers, and prelates. One of its most fervent prophets was the fanatical and entirely honest priest, John Ball, who to-day would undoubtedly have called himself a Christian Socialist. It is therefore a tenable proposition that the revolt was organised and engineered by real democratic revolutionaries, with whom the mere grievances of villeins as such were a secondary consideration, utilised as means to a more important end.

The Londoners opened their gates to the Kentish insurgents; more than half of those who were afterwards listed as ringleaders were Londoners; facts which again suggest that the grievances of villeins as such were not at the root of the matter.

Masses of the Essex insurgents were already encamped outside the city on the northern side. The young king and some of the Council were at the Tower; but both they and the city authorities appear to have been paralysed, and although nearly a fortnight had elapsed since the first outbreak, no defensive measure had been taken. Both the great bodies of



JOHN BALL HARANGUING A CROWD OF REBELS

From a fifteenth century MS. of Froissart's "Chronicles of England." In the front of the crowd, at the left, Wat Tyler is seen.



insurgents pillaged the houses of particularly obnoxious persons and killed a few obnoxious individuals ; but their leaders had other objects than immediate pillage, and on the whole kept their men in hand. When Tyler and his following entered London, they wrecked John of Gaunt's palace of the Savoy and the houses of others who were especially unpopular, besides breaking open and burning the Fleet Prison and Newgate ; but they refrained from looting.

Richard from the Tower gave out that he would meet the insurgent leaders at a conference at Mile-end. He fulfilled his promise, and in effect conceded all the demands which the insurgent leaders formulated. Villeinage and feudal services were to be abolished, and there was to be a general amnesty, though the king would not pledge himself to punish those whom the insurgents stigmatised as traitors. But while the conference was going on there was an outbreak of violence on the part of those who had remained in the city, in the course of which Archbishop Sudbury and Hales the Treasurer were both murdered. It is noteworthy that much of the popular resentment was directed against the aliens, represented by the colony of Flemings.

On the same day the king issued a number of the promised pardons, and many of the insurgents began to disperse. Many thousands, however, still remained with the leaders, who were by no means satisfied with the concessions already made. During the night and the next morning there were further scenes of violence, and the king announced that he would again meet the leaders at Smithfield. The boy of fourteen was no coward, and probably enjoyed the theatrical character if not the actual danger of the proceedings. With an escort of two hundred men in civil array he rode to Smithfield, where the masses of the insurgents were drawn up. Tyler rode out to meet him—insolently enough, it may be presumed. He had a new list of grievances which must be remedied. The accounts vary as to the details of what then occurred ; but it must be remembered that every one of them was written from a point of view vehemently hostile to Tyler. It is agreed, however, that Tyler, for whatever cause, laid hand on his dagger, and the movement was interpreted as a threat to the king's person. Walworth, the Mayor of London, who was riding by the king, drew upon Tyler and cut him down. The cry rang down the ranks of the peasants, " Treason ! they have slain our captain ! " Bows were bent ; it seemed certain that the whole of the king's company would be overwhelmed and slaughtered by the enraged insurgents. But the boy's courage and presence of mind saved the situation. Setting spurs to his horse, before any one could stop him he dashed forward alone across the open space towards the rebel ranks. " Will you shoot your king ? " he called. " I will be your captain and leader. Follow me. " His horse paced slowly towards the open fields to the north. Bows were unbent. Astonished and fascinated, the great array followed, the king's retinue hurrying to join them. But the mayor slipped back to the city and called every loyal citizen to arms. The promptitude

with which the appeal was answered seems to prove that the orderly element had only been waiting for a leader to assert itself. So quickly was a powerful force collected that when it arrived on the scene the king was still holding the insurgents in parley.

With the troop now at his back the king's person was safe ; the insurgents recognised that the fighting odds were no longer in their favour. Richard proclaimed that they all had leave to depart and disperse to their homes ; and they took him at his word. The boy king, and he alone, had

won a purely personal triumph, from which men were warranted in auguring great things for the Black Prince's son.

But the promises Richard had made he probably never intended to fulfil ; nor was it in his power to carry them out save by assent of the Estates. The insurgents had scarcely dispersed, the writing on the promised pardons and charters was scarcely dry, when the king repudiated his promises in most unmistakable terms. Apart, however, from people killed in actual riots, or in conflicts between armed bands of insurgents and loyalists, or as a consequence of such conflicts, it does not seem that many more than a hundred persons were actually put to death. Parliament met in the winter, and emphatically endorsed Richard's repudiation of his promises. Those promises, they said, were invalid and illegal until confirmed by parliament, and parliament absolutely refused to confirm them. No concessions whatever were made in favour of the peasants.

It has often been maintained that, although the revolt was crushed, the peasant rising actually brought victory to the peasants' cause. As a matter of historical fact this does not seem to have been the case. Down to the time of the Black Death a natural movement had been in progress, tending towards the gradual disappearance of serfdom through the substitution of rent and wages for forced services ; a process which under normal conditions was proving advantageous to lords and to villeins alike. The natural process was checked by a cataclysm ; the Black Death made the conditions



Richard II.

[From the contemporary painting belonging to the Earl of Pembroke.]

abnormal ; and of those abnormal conditions the revolt was the last startling phase. It accomplished nothing whatever ; but after it was all over and there was no recurrence of the pestilence, the economic conditions reverted practically to what they had been before the Black Death ; and as they again became normal, the old causes again operated and the old natural process of liberation naturally revived. Prices fell ; the wage labourer was consequently content with a lower money wage ; and again the employer found that a money rent and voluntary paid labour paid him better than forced labour and tenure by service. Hence in the course of the next half century villeinage did practically disappear, forced service became a merely local survival, and the villein became a tenant paying a small fixed rent with security of tenure. The security of tenure had always been his, since the lord had no power to eject the villein from his holding so long as he rendered the recognised services ; and the recognised services were now commuted for a recognised rent, which left the tenant the same security.

As a democratic movement the revolt led to nothing ; and the parliaments remained, as before, representative of the landed and commercial interests.

VI

THE REIGN OF RICHARD II

In the Peasant Revolt the young Richard had displayed the qualities of courage, self-reliance, and readiness in emergency in a very high degree. But he was still only a half-grown boy, the direction of affairs was virtually in the hands of his Council, and the effective head of the government was his eldest uncle, the Duke of Lancaster, who, fortunately for himself, was absent in Scotland at the time of the revolt. But Lancaster's administration through these first years of the new reign continued to be inefficient ; he was extremely unpopular, and the high-spirited boy resented his control. By way, perhaps, of counterbalancing him, his brothers were now made Dukes of York and Gloucester, but the young king did not place himself in their hands, giving his confidence instead to a young favourite, the Earl of Oxford, and more wisely, to an experienced official, Michael de la Pole, who was made Earl of Suffolk—the first instance of a mercantile family being raised to the baronage.

An invasion of Scotland of the usual type, in 1385, on which Lancaster was accompanied by the young king, did nothing to improve the duke's position ; and immediately after it he retired from England, in the hope of enforcing his own claim to the crown of Castile through his wife, a daughter of Pedro the Cruel, who had ultimately been ejected by Henry of Trastamare. But Lancaster's departure did not improve matters for the king, since it gave Gloucester an opening to place himself at the head of the

opposition to De la Pole, whom the baronage regarded as an upstart. Moreover, the king made himself unpopular by the honours and the wealth which he lavished on his favourite, the Earl of Oxford, whom he made Duke of Ireland, whereas Gloucester made it his business to court that popularity which had never been sought by his brother of Lancaster. An alarm of a French invasion roused popular anger against the administration which had rendered such a thing possible; and it was easy enough to make the king's favourite counsellors the objects of public indignation, though Suffolk was perhaps the last person who deserved it. The baronage, headed by Gloucester and supported by the Commons, refused supplies unless the obnoxious "favourites" were removed from their offices; and ominous references were made to the deposition of Edward II.

The king ostensibly surrendered, and according to precedent a Council was nominated to control the administration. But Richard's apparent surrender was merely a temporising expedient. In the following year he called an irregular assembly at Nottingham, attended by the judges, which pronounced that the proceedings of the late parliament were unconstitutional and invalid. Gloucester and his allies at once took up arms "to deliver the king from evil counsellors," according to the familiar formula. Five of them proceeded to "appeal" five of the said evil counsellors of treason, and hence became known as the Lords Appellant. The king and his friends could make no corresponding display of force. The Duke of Ireland succeeded in making his escape from the country; so in course of time did Suffolk. The king himself became practically a prisoner, and the Lords Appellant were complete masters of the situation.

However, they continued their professions of loyalty to the king himself, and summoned what is sometimes called the Wonderful and sometimes the Merciless Parliament. The five "evil counsellors" who had been appealed were impeached; so were the judges who at the Council of Nottingham had pronounced the proceedings of the previous parliament invalid. Other victims were added, although one at least of the Lords Appellant, Henry Earl of Derby, the son of the still absent Duke of Lancaster, endeavoured to check the vindictiveness of Gloucester.

And yet, in spite of the completeness of his defeat, the king in the following year again effected a revolution. In 1388, the year of the Wonderful Parliament, he was not yet of full age. But in 1389 he reminded the Council that he was now twenty-one, and being no longer a minor was entitled to follow his own counsel; he would dispense with their further services. Strangely enough, they acquiesced in the dismissal. Probably the Appellants knew that the use they had made of their power had lost them the popular favour which had at first made them irresistible. At the same time the king was wise enough to avoid their blunder, and to abstain from retaliatory measures, which would have made Gloucester and the rest turn to bay. But he recalled his uncle of Lancaster, on whose loyalty at least he knew he could depend, whatever his faults might be. Lancaster had at

last learnt the futility of his enterprise in Castile, and his presence would effectively muzzle the Duke of Gloucester.

The French war had worn itself out, and the desultory raids and counter-raids on the Scottish border were brought to an end. Richard, after all, made no violent changes in the personnel of his ministers and his Council, and for some years the government was continued on orderly and constitutional lines. To these years belong the amendments to the Anti-clerical statutes of Provisors, Mortmain, and Præmunire which made them more stringent; while the new form taken by the last statute ultimately made it a most effective instrument in the final contest with Rome. These measures were significant of the constant growth of the Anti-ecclesiastical sentiment and of the multiplication of the disciples of Wiclif, who were now known as Lollards. On the theological side this movement was beginning to develop



Ladies hawking.

the advocacy of novel doctrines, which were very shortly to be pronounced heretical; but it is safe to say that most of what passed for Lollardry at this time had but little to do with theology, and was directed almost entirely against the clerical wealth and clerical worldliness which scandalised a laity by no means unprosperous or eager on its own part to renounce the world and the flesh.

Unhappily, Richard's self-restraint and moderation were only assumed, cloaking a self-willed and vindictive spirit. He was biding his time, and in 1397 he thought that his time had come. Gloucester's conduct laid him open to suspicions of treasonable intrigues. Suddenly the king struck. Gloucester was arrested and sent off to Calais under the charge of Thomas Mowbray, Earl of Nottingham, one of the Lords Appellant who, like Henry of Bolingbroke or Derby, had acted as a restraining influence on the other three. At the same time with Gloucester, the other two Lords Appellant, Warwick and Arundel, were arrested. In effect no new charges were brought against any of the three; the real ground of the attack was their conduct at the time of the Merciless Parliament. Arundel was tried and executed;

his brother the Archbishop was impeached and sentenced to confiscation and banishment. Warwick confessed his old guilt and was banished. But Gloucester did not appear to answer the charges; Mowbray announced that he had fallen ill and died at Calais. Public rumour of course affirmed that Mowbray had put him to death by the king's orders; and the circumstances were at least suspicious enough, though the truth of the report was never proved. Perhaps the strongest argument against the belief is to be found in the fact that, if it was impolitic to run the risk of openly putting Gloucester to death as a traitor after fair trial, it was still more impolitic to risk the suspicion of a secret assassination.

Nottingham and Derby, whose conduct from the very beginning had distinguished them favourably among the Lords Appellant, were treated with conspicuous favour, and were made Dukes of Norfolk and Hereford respectively; still, both of them must have suspected that danger lurked behind the king's show of friendliness. A parliament, however, was sum-



Ladies shooting rabbits.

moned in 1397 at Shrewsbury, and Richard found that it represented a marked reaction of sentiment in his favour. The country may well have imagined that the elaborate machinery for the curtailment of the royal power had been warranted when the king was a boy but was superfluous now that he was a man experienced in affairs, who certainly possessed kingly qualities, and, since his coming of age, appeared to have learnt self-mastery and moderation. Even his recent proceedings could hardly be called vindictive. So the Shrewsbury Parliament showed itself ready to re-establish the royal power free from the trammels which had been imposed during Richard's reign. The proceedings of the Wonderful Parliament were formally condemned, while the pronouncements of the Nottingham Council were confirmed. It was even resolved by this assembly that no restraint set upon the king could be legal, and that any one hereafter attempting to reverse its own proceedings would be guilty of treason. Finally it took the fatal step of surrendering its own powers to a committee of eighteen, which would thenceforth be able to act in the place of parliament; the committee being virtually Richard's own nominees.

But Richard was still unsatisfied; the field was not yet clear so long as

Norfolk and Hereford were in the country. The two dukes played into his hands. Norfolk confided to Hereford his own suspicion of Richard's sinister intentions; Hereford communicated this confidence to the king, who invited him to charge Norfolk publicly with what he had said. Norfolk gave Hereford the lie, and the question was referred to ordeal by battle. Thousands of spectators assembled to witness the fight; the lists were prepared and the combatants ready; when Richard suddenly stopped the proceedings and pronounced his own award that both should be banished, Norfolk for life and Hereford for ten years, though without prejudice to his own estates or to his rights of succession when his father, John of Gaunt, should die. And now it seemed that nothing stood between Richard and such an absolutism as no King of England had ever enjoyed.

But his finishing stroke had been an act so arbitrary, so utterly impossible to reconcile with equity, so manifestly and essentially tyrannical, that any pretence of constitutionalism on Richard's part was rendered absurd. For the brief remainder of his reign Richard acted as an unqualified despot. To procure money he raised forced loans and imposed heavy fines upon individuals and upon districts which had been in any way implicated in any of the so-called treasons of the Lords Appellant. With the funds thus procured he raised and maintained a great bodyguard of archers, who in effect formed a not inconsiderable standing army at his own immediate disposal. The old Duke of Lancaster died and the king seized the inheritance. And then he betook himself out of England to quell an insurrection in Ireland.

The last step was fatal. Henry of Hereford, robbed of his duchy of Lancaster, returned to England, landing at Ravenspur in Yorkshire and bringing with him the exiled Archbishop Arundel. He at once proclaimed that he had come to demand only his lawful inheritance of Lancaster. He was promptly joined by the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland. The Duke of York, acting for the absent Richard, gathered a large force. But public sympathy was entirely on the side of the duke, unjustly banished and unjustly robbed; York's musters refused to march against Lancaster. York hurried to the west, while Henry marched in the same direction, gathering fresh adherents, still proclaiming that for himself he sought only his inheritance, though to this demand was now added that of the removal of Richard's evil counsellors. York parleyed; York was convinced; York went over to Lancaster. The few leading adherents of the king in the west were captured and executed.

From Ireland the Earl of Salisbury hurried back to raise forces for the king in Wales; but when Richard himself arrived a fortnight later, it was only to find that Salisbury's levies had dispersed again. Then came the Earl of Northumberland on Henry's behalf with a proffer of terms—the trial of Henry's prominent supporters before parliament, and the appointment of Henry himself as Grand Justiciar. The proposals were obviously impossible; but Northumberland effected his real object, which

was to draw Richard into an ambush of his own followers. The unlucky king was carried off to Flint Castle, thence to Chester, and thence to the Tower. A parliament was summoned, and the king was forced to sign an Act of Abdication.

An Act of parliament was passed setting forth the reasons for the deposition. Henry then advanced and claimed the throne for himself on the somewhat amazing plea of his descent, not from Edward III. through his father, but through his mother from Edmund Crouchback of Lancaster,



Richard II., having landed at Milford Haven, goes to his friends at Conway Castle.

[From a 14th century MS. life of Richard.]

the brother of Edward I.; the pretence being that Edmund was the elder brother, but had been set aside on account of deformity. Obviously the legitimate heir of Edward III., if Richard were set aside, was the child Edmund Mortimer, the great-grandson and representative of Edward's second son, Lionel of Clarence; for it could hardly be pretended that English law or custom rejected descent through the female line. Hence this curious attempt to create a technical claim going back to Henry III. Parliament proceeded to pronounce Henry to be the rightful King of England; but it was the patent fact that technicalities had been set aside, and that Henry was king because parliament for whatever reasons chose that he should be king—not because he stood next to the Crown in blood. Edmund

Mortimer was quietly ignored, although his father Roger, recently slain in Ireland, had been recognised before his death as heir-presumptive by Richard himself.


VII

SCOTLAND

The period of David Bruce's minority in Scotland was mainly occupied with Edward Balliol's attempt to supplant the Bruce dynasty by the help of the King of England, and on terms of subjection to the sovereignty of England. The great King Robert had effected the task of liberation, and the people of Scotland were resolved that,

whatever it cost them, they would not submit to a foreign yoke. After Randolph's death no statesman and no soldier appeared capable of organising the government or of repeating the military triumphs of Bruce and his captains. When Scottish and English armies met in the field, the Scots

THE BRUCES AND STEWARTS



leaders invariably failed to apply the lessons of Bannockburn; and the Scots people would not learn the use of the bow. The victory was always won by the English archers. But if they were beaten in the field, the Scots still carried on the stubborn guerilla warfare at which they had become adepts; and the moment that active English aid was withdrawn from Balliol he was again driven out of the country.

Five years after his return to Scotland, David Bruce as the ally of France invaded the north of England, whereupon his army was routed and he himself was taken prisoner, at the battle of Neville's Cross. For eleven years he remained a captive in England. During that time the government of Scotland was in the hands of his nephew, Robert Fitzalan the Steward, the son of his elder sister Marjory Bruce, and heir to the throne if David should predecease him without leaving offspring. Robert was not a strong ruler, and was powerless to check the dangers of that development of feudalism in Scotland which defied all efforts to establish a strong central government. The nobles were individually too powerful and too jealous of each other to devote themselves to national interests; there were always some among them ready to enter into a "band" against any government

in which they were not themselves predominant ; ready even to intrigue with England for their own ends. There were always others who were ready to reconcile private enmities in the face of an English attack—but for no other reason. But below the ranks of the nobility, the Scottish people, the most independent in the world, were absolutely resolved to fight to the last gasp against English dominion. And it was to this fact that Scotland owed the preservation of her independence.

While the truce lasted between England and France there was truce also between England and Scotland. In 1354



Edward III. and David of Scotland.
[From the Articles of the Peace of 1357.]

terms were also arrived at for the liberation of King David. But in the next year the French war broke out again, the Scots attacked Berwick, and in 1356 the King of England took his revenge in the Burnt Candlemas. This was at last followed by a treaty which set David free but bound Scotland to pay a ransom of a hundred thousand marks. Tremendous as was the taxation involved for a country so poor as Scotland, David nevertheless made matters worse by indulging himself in the most extravagant expenditure. The king even went so far as to propose the purchase of the remission of the ransom by recognising as his heir Lionel of Clarence, the second son of the King of England, in place of Robert the Steward or Stewart ; but the proposal was received by the Estates with a flat refusal which demonstrated once for all the intensity of the national feeling on the subject.

The pressure of taxation, and the king's need of money, gave to the Scottish Estates new powers of control, as with the English parliament. The Scots parliament, however, was not organised like that of England, and tended to delegate its powers to committees which for practical purposes replaced the assemblies of the Estates ; and thus the political functions of parliament came gradually to be exercised by a standing committee known as the Lords of the Articles.

In 1371 David died without legitimate offspring, and was succeeded by Robert II., the first of the Stewart line. Robert's father was Walter Fitzalan, the husband of the great King Robert's daughter Marjory, and hereditary High Steward of the kingdom ; of Norman lineage, connected with the English house of Arundel. For twelve years there was nominally truce with England ; but both at sea and on the borders almost perpetual warfare prevailed in practice, which was officially condemned but was allowed to take its course by both governments. It was with a view

to terminating this unsatisfactory state of things that John of Gaunt had gone to Scotland when the Peasant Revolt broke out in England. Robert himself was anxious to preserve peace, but was unable to restrain the nobles. Raids and counter raids in 1384 and 1385 were followed by Richard's invasion in company with Lancaster; when the Scots lords left the English to follow their own devices, but themselves carried out a very effective counter raid in Cumberland and Westmorland. In the following year the Scots were the aggressors, and the campaign culminated in the famous moonlight fight of Otterburn, celebrated without much regard to strict historical accuracy in the ballads of Otterburn and Chevy Chase. The victory lay with the Scots, who carried off among their prisoners Harry Hotspur, the son of the Earl of Northumberland, though their own leader, James Douglas, was slain on the field. Soon after this there was a new treaty of peace, which was not preserved immaculately but terminated open hostilities on a large scale.

In 1390 the old king died, and was succeeded by his eldest son John, who took the name of Robert III. to avert the ill-luck associated with the names of the three kings who bore the name of John in England, France, and Scotland. To his melancholy reign belong the events celebrated in Sir Walter Scott's *Fair Maid of Perth*, the battle on the North Inch between the clans Chattan and Kay, and the death of the king's eldest son, David Duke of Rothesay, who was popularly believed to have been starved to death by his uncle, the king's brother, Robert Duke of Albany. This event took place in 1402, shortly after the accession of Henry IV. in England, and made the king's second son, the child James, heir to the throne of Scotland.

CHAPTER VII

LANCASTER AND YORK

I

HENRY IV

HENRY Duke of Lancaster was in plain terms a usurper who seized the Crown by violence and secured it, so far as it was secured, by a parliamentary title. The lawful king was deposed and the nearest lawful heir was passed over. No one believed the fiction concerning Edmund Crouchback; a name which in fact merely meant that that prince had worn the Cross of the Crusaders on his back, not that he was deformed. Nobody denied that in England the succession to the Crown had followed the female line. The first Plantagenet had succeeded because his mother was a daughter of the King of England. The last Plantagenet but one had claimed the French Crown because his mother was the daughter of a King of France. If, therefore, Henry's title was valid at all, it was on the ancient principle that the Great Council of the realm was entitled to fix the succession, though precisely two hundred years had passed since it had exercised that power by preferring John to his elder brother's son. The power of deposition was also implied in the circumstances. Since, then, Henry occupied the throne by favour of parliament, it was imperative that he should retain the favour of parliament. The Lancastrian kings did not wish to strengthen parliament as against the royal powers; but they could not escape from the necessity of keeping parliament on their own side.

"Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown"—the more so when the Crown has been usurped. Henry owed his victory very largely to the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland, a Percy and a Neville, with the Arundels and the Staffords; the last family representing the house of Thomas of Gloucester. For the moment all these were loyal to the king they had set up. But within a few weeks Richard's closest supporters were conspiring for his restoration—the Hollands, stepsons of the Black Prince, who held the earldoms of Kent and of Huntingdon, Salisbury and others. The plot was betrayed by their half-hearted confederate, Edward Earl of Rutland, son of the Duke of York. The conspirators were captured and beheaded. But in the meantime Richard himself was dead; there is no real doubt that he had in fact been murdered; and his body was now exposed to public view in order to demonstrate his decease. The fact did not prevent a fictitious

Richard from appearing later as a pretender ; since a report was put about that the corpse exposed had been that of a chaplain of the former king, to whom he had borne an extraordinary personal resemblance.

Next came a rising of the Welsh, with whom Richard had been popular. They were led by Owen Glendower, a gentleman of the house of Llewelyn, who proclaimed himself Prince of North Wales and the loyal vassal of King Richard, whose death he denied. His sway was recognised over the greater part of the principality, and Henry never succeeded in putting him down thoroughly. France and Scotland were astir again, the French court having for excuse the fact that Richard, shortly before his fall, had married a French princess. The Scots gathered a great force, led by Murdach of Albany, King Robert's nephew. At Homildon Hill they were utterly routed in much the same fashion as at Halidon Hill some seventy years before ; Murdach of Albany, Douglas, and two other earls were taken prisoner by the Percies. Henry was badly in want of money, and desperately anxious to avoid irritating parliament by asking for it. The Percies were presuming on the help they had given him, and their achievement at Homildon Hill was by no means to the king's liking. He required them to hand over their Scottish prisoners, and claimed the ransoms for himself.

The Percies took the act as a warning or a challenge, released Douglas unransomed, and entered upon a bond with him and Glendower to overturn Henry, and make young Edmund Mortimer king, if Richard was really dead. Hotspur's wife was herself a Mortimer. Thomas Percy, Earl of Worcester, joined with his kinsmen of Northumberland. Hotspur and Douglas marched to join forces with Glendower ; but Henry caught the northern force at Shrewsbury before the junction could be effected ; and an extremely sanguinary battle ended with a decisive victory for the king. Hotspur was slain on the field, Douglas was for the second time made captive, and Worcester also was taken and executed. Young Prince Henry of Wales, a boy of fifteen, here saw his first stricken field. Shakespeare treated the episode as a dramatist, not as a historian. Hotspur did not fall in single combat with Prince Hal ; a stray arrow killed him.

The Earl of Northumberland had not marched with Hotspur ; he succeeded in making his peace with the king by payment of a heavy fine. But he was still meditating revenge, and in 1405, two years after Shrewsbury, he worked up a fresh rebellion with the aid of the Earl of Nottingham, the son of Henry's old colleague and opponent Thomas Mowbray of Norfolk, and the Archbishop of York, whose cousin, the Earl of Wiltshire, Henry had executed as one of Richard's "evil counsellors." By fair words and promises, however, the rebels were persuaded to disband their forces ; whereupon they were arrested and executed. Northumberland himself effected his escape, but only to fall two years later at Bramham Moor in a third attempt at insurrection.

The danger which had threatened from France soon came to an end, since that country fell into a miserable state of anarchy and internal discord

under the nominal rule of a king who was generally quite insane and at his best was an imbecile. The Orleanist and Burgundian branches of the royal family intrigued and fought for supremacy with every circumstance of treachery and violence. Scotland was paralysed for action by an accident. The old king sent off the Crown Prince James to be educated in France, fearing, perhaps, that he would meet with the same fate as Rothesay at the hands of his ambitious uncle of Albany. The boy did not reach France, as the ship in which he sailed was captured by the English; and young James was detained, and held for eighteen years as a hostage for Scotland's good behaviour. The unexpected blow killed old King Robert; Albany as a matter of course became regent, and Albany did not in the least wish to see his nephew at liberty. After the crushing of two rebellions there was no great danger that a third would be successful; and after Bramham Moor the persistent defiance of Glendower in Wales remained the only constant source whence danger might suddenly spring. There were no more active insurrections. Edmund Mortimer was in the king's hands, so that a revolt in the boy's favour was out of the question.

Throughout the first year of his reign it was of vital importance to Henry to secure both clerical and popular support. We have remarked on the increase of anti-clericalism and the spread of Lollardry during Richard's reign; and it might at first sight appear that clerical and popular favour could hardly be associated. But the popular Lollardry did not concern itself with theology. The followers of Wiclif might be attacked for their heresies without offending popular feeling, and with the entire approval of the clergy. Hence the second year of Henry's reign saw the passing of the Act *De Heretico Comburendo*, by which for the first time death at the stake was introduced as the punishment for heresy. Even while the Act was being passed its first victim, William Sawtre, was martyred. Archbishop Arundel, the prime mover, was constant in urging that in fact Lollardry was an offence not merely against the Church but against society, that it was not merely heresy but anarchism. It was only twenty years since the Peasant Revolt, and the propertied classes felt the force of the appeal. The persecution of heresy did not as yet become systematic; it aroused no antagonism; it satisfied the clergy that Henry was a loyal son of the Church; but it did not mean that the clergy had become popular. The orthodox Commons, who were quite ready to burn their neighbours for unorthodox views on abstract questions, did not in consequence relax the austerity of their opinions as to clerical worldliness, or their conviction that the Church was disproportionately endowed with this world's goods. Twice during the reign proposals were brought forward by the Commons for wholesale confiscations of ecclesiastical property, though their petitions were rejected.

The Commons, in fact, took very good care to make the king feel his dependence upon them. They grumbled over every appeal for financial aid, while the interminable operations against Glendower in Wales were a

perpetual drain upon the Treasury. Henry was obliged at their instance to submit to the appointment of a Council, which at least seriously curtailed his freedom of action. They insisted successfully on their right to examine the account of the expenditure of their grants. They insisted, too, on their exclusive right to originate money grants, when the king had ventured to name the amount of the tax which he thought advisable. The Commons, in fact, during the reign of Henry IV. claimed and exercised an unprecedented amount of control, which the weakness of the king's title compelled him to concede.

In the latter years of the reign, the Prince of Wales took an exceedingly active part in politics; and it was certainly due to his personal energy that the irrepressible Glendower was held in check, and reduced from the position of an almost independent prince to that of a troublesome outlaw. The legends of the doings of the wild Prince Hal immortalised by Shakespeare are not to be simply set on one side. Contemporary chroniclers are quite definite in declaring that his character changed when he came to the throne, that his accession was viewed with some anxiety, and that he was given to a wildness which contrasted with



An abbot travelling.

the personal austerity of his later life. The legend of his behaviour to Judge Gascoigne is almost certainly a fiction, based upon an actual incident in the life of Edward II. But such legends, however inaccurate in detail, can only be accounted for because they were appropriate to the character popularly attributed to the Prince; and such popular estimates are apt to be fundamentally sound. Still it is absolutely clear that the Prince indulged himself only in the intervals of strenuous and responsible work; that he was not a wildly irresponsible boy who merely showed himself capable of better things on an occasional emergency. Henry V. had many of the qualities of a Puritan fanatic, which are by no means inconsistent with a degree of youthful dissipation; and to Henry, as to many a Puritan, came a moment which marked a decisive change in the manner of his life; the moment when his father died worn out by disease, and he himself became King of England at the age of five and twenty.

II

HENRY V

Richard II., Henry V., and Richard III. will remain for all time in popular imagination the kings conceived by Shakespeare. We may explain, we may criticise, we may demonstrate anything we like as logically as we

please, but Shakespeare will remain convincing. Shakespeare elected to draw Henry V. on traditional lines, and there is no character, certainly no male character, in all the plays in whom the great dramatist took a more unqualified delight. He is Shakespeare's "Happy Warrior," though we may find some difficulty in exactly appropriating Wordsworth's lines to him. Shakespeare's play is a panegyric of the hero king.

Nevertheless the historian is apt to resent such panegyrics, to suggest that the ambition of Henry V., like the wrath of Achilles, was the cause of woes unnumbered, and quite needlessly despatched to Hades many valiant souls of heroes. Some historians go further and denounce in Henry a type of false ideals, honoured only by reason of the deceptive glamour which attends the achievement of brilliant feats of arms; finding in him nothing better than a re-incarnation of Edward III. But in fact it is possible to admit that Shakespeare idealised his hero, and at the same time to realise that essentially much of the criticism is beside the mark.

Of Henry's reign there are two prominent features, the persecution of Lollardy, and the French war. Concerning the former Shakespeare has nothing to say; but if we have read Henry correctly, both were the outcome of the same conviction, crystallised in Henry's mind when he became actually King of England, that he was an instrument in the hands of the Almighty. Reigning in virtue of his father's usurpation of the throne, conscious that the throne had been won in defiance of legality, mere legality counted for very little in his eyes. The Almighty had set him on the throne of England because He had chosen him to accomplish His work. The work to be accomplished was for a mind of Henry's type promptly identified with the work which ambition suggested. France had fallen upon evil days and the iniquities of her rulers cried to Heaven. Henry was the instrument whereby those iniquities were to be punished; France was to be brought under a righteous rule, and then probably France and England, led by one Christian king, were to turn their arms against the Turk, drive him from Europe, and recover the Holy Land for Christendom. As for legality, any colour of it would suffice for his purposes; though for form's sake some pretence of legal right had to be asserted. Here was the work of God's appointed champion, and the methods by which it must be carried out were those of statecraft and soldiership. Given the point of view there is little difficulty in understanding that from first to last Henry was perfectly satisfied as to the righteousness both of his ends and of his methods. His persecution of Lollardy was an incidental necessity. It was the stern duty of God's champion to stamp out heresy; the persecution was not as with his father a mere political expedient for conciliating the Church. In carrying out his task the hand of Justice should be ruthless—but it should be the hand of Justice.

Critics have seen in Henry's French war mere wanton aggression inspired by the weakness of the neighbouring country; and a total lack of statesmanship, since the union of France and England as a single dominion,

was wholly impracticable. It was in fact impracticable because it ran counter to the idea of nationalism, an insuperable natural dividing force ; or a force which at the present day seems to be insuperable, because we live at a time when nationalism dominates European politics. But nationalism had not dominated European politics at the beginning of the fifteenth century. England, Scotland, and France had indeed developed the spirit of nationality, but the idea that nationalities, however diverse, could not be effectively combined in a single dominion, would have appealed to no medieval statesman ; and it is somewhat absurd to deny statesmanship to a medieval monarch because he had not grasped the truth which half the chancellories of Europe were still unable to recognise four hundred years afterwards. Only a hundred years before, Edward I. had made with regard to Scotland the same mistake which Henry made with regard to France ; and English historians at least are not in the habit of denying the name of statesman to Edward I.


Henry's attack on Lollardry is apt to escape attention chiefly because it was systematic, brief, and effective. His father had merely allowed the churchmen to strike down a few insignificant persons. Lollardry in high places was winked at. The new king struck at once at Lord Cobham, the one peer who had identified himself with the new doctrines. Cobham was tried, condemned, and thrown into prison. He broke prison and escaped into hiding. His escape was immediately followed by a wild plot on the part of the Lollards, who planned an insurrection. The young king got wind of the plot and effected a night surprise of the mustering rebels, of whom thirty-seven were promptly hanged. It was immediately realised that the law against heresy would be enforced with vigour, and the voices of the Lollards were practically silenced, although it was not till some time later that Cobham himself was captured for the second time, and died a martyr.

But the Crown of France was the great prize which Henry had set himself to win. That country was rent by the two factions of the Orleanists and Burgundians. Each during the last reign had sought the help of the King of England by promising the restitution of provinces in France. Some inadequate help had been given first to one and then to the other. But Henry V. had no idea of being satisfied with what one party or the other would surrender as the price of his support. Before he had been a year on the throne he put forward the old claim of the King of England to the Crown of France ; though this was made ridiculous by the fact that the law of succession on which that claim was based would have placed on the French throne, not Henry, but his cousin the Earl of March. However, he professed himself willing to withdraw that claim if France ceded to him something more than all the territories ever held in France by any Plantagenet, together with the hand of the French princess Catherine. In return the French government made very extensive proffers ; but they could not have balked Henry by anything short of taking him at his word, and con-

ceding the whole of his alternative demand—which was obviously out of the question. He had made it simply because he knew that to concede it was out of the question. He rejected the French terms, and announced solemnly that the responsibility for what was to follow lay with France.

Meanwhile parliament had endorsed the king's designs by making a very substantial grant. There was no difficulty in raising forces, for the war was popular. Nothing was to be feared from Scotland, since Albany and his supporters were afraid of having King James returned on their hands if they offended the King of England, while their enemies were afraid that the captive monarch would be made to pay the penalty if they attacked England. In Wales, though Glendower was still alive, he had now ceased to be dangerous; so Henry had a clear field for his French operations. He could even

THE HOUSES OF YORK AND LANCASTER



count on the loyalty of the young Earl of March; and so long as that was the case conspiracies against the Lancastrian dynasty could not constitute a serious danger.

Such a conspiracy was, however, actually formed by Richard, Earl of Cambridge, brother of the Duke of York of whom mention was made in the last reign when he was Earl of Rutland—the son of the old Duke Edmund of York, the uncle of Richard II. Richard of Cambridge had married Anne Mortimer, sister of the Earl of March, so that as it happened the Mortimer claim to the Crown ultimately passed to his own offspring. March, however, on being invited to join the plot, which without his approval was bound to come to nothing, refused, and carried the matter to the king; and the conspirators were seized, tried by their peers, and executed.


A week later Henry's army of invasion set sail from Southampton, and immediately sat down to besiege Harfleur.

Henry had no idea of miscellaneous raiding. With a military instinct far superior to that of his predecessors, he aimed at a systematic war of


conquest ; of bringing the land into his obedience piecemeal. He anticipated a war of sieges ; but he did not anticipate stout resistance, because Burgundy was half disposed in his favour and would certainly lend no appreciable help to the Orleanists with whom the Dauphin Louis had thrown in his lot. After a three weeks' siege Harfleur surrendered.

Henry's army, however, had suffered very severely, not from fighting, but from disease. Though no attempt had been made to relieve Harfleur, the Dauphin and Orleans had collected a considerable force, and it was clear that Henry, after garrisoning Harfleur, would have an army quite inadequate to carrying out his original programme. The obvious course in the circumstances was to make Harfleur secure and withdraw the rest of the army to England ; but Henry resolved that instead of simply embarking his troops he would march through Normandy to Calais. The motive is not clear. Probably he reckoned

on winning prestige for himself and bringing discredit on the French government by making the march unmolested. He may have had with him, at the highest estimate, eight thousand men, five-sixths of the force being archers, and many of these must have been suffering from sickness. Something very like the Crécy record was repeated. The French army, though very much larger, did not attempt to force a battle, but endeavoured to prevent the passage of the Somme. But when this was effected at an unguarded spot, Orleans felt that he must strike. The march had given time for large French reinforcements to come up, and on the night of October 24th the English found their advance blocked by the French masses.



A medieval siege engine.




A battering-ram and its use.

On the day of battle the English were formed very much as at Crécy ; the French also were dismounted, and in three masses, one behind the other, since the ground did not permit of an extended front or of a flank movement. On their front, however, were two squadrons of horse, who

were intended to charge upon the archers. Between the two armies lay heavy plough land. Neither at first would advance to the attack, but Henry knew that he must force a battle or perish. The English line began to move forward. But the French would no longer be restrained. The cavalry attempted to charge, the French van rolling on behind them. But the archers were prepared with an improvised palisade of pointed stakes. They halted, thrust these into the soft ground, and from behind them began to pour forth their arrows on the advancing masses. The cavalry

were rolled over; the heavy armed infantry pressing forward were flung into confusion. The English archers and men-at-arms fell upon them, hewed them down, and hurled themselves upon the second line, which in turn broke and scattered after a brief resistance. The third line was seized with panic. A




Disposition of English and French forces at Agincourt.

report that the French force had fallen upon the English baggage and was threatening the rear caused the order to be given that every man was to slay his prisoners; an order which it is possible to condone, seeing that the prisoners were at least as numerous as the captors. But the result was a tremendous slaughter. The French slain outnumbered the entire English force, and among them were fifteen hundred nobles or knights. It seems practically certain that of the English not more than six score were killed all told: York and Suffolk were the only noblemen. Henry continued his march to Calais, and was received in London with a wild burst of enthusiasm.

Almost two years had passed before Henry was ready for his second invasion. The first had taught him the magnitude of his task; and the fame he had won at Agincourt made anything more in the shape of foolhardy feats of arms entirely superfluous. This time conquest was to be systematic and thorough. Meanwhile two French Dauphins had died, and a third brother, Charles, now heir to the French throne, was as completely in the hands of the Armagnacs, as the Orleanists were now termed, as his predecessors. Orleans himself was one of the comparatively few prisoners whose lives had been preserved at Agincourt. Burgundy's neutrality at least could be relied on, and he was in fact at open war with the Armagnac government. When Henry landed again in Normandy,

there was no present prospect that the army of France would interfere with him. What he had to do was to subdue Normandy. He set about the conquest city by city. He kept his troops under a discipline almost without parallel in medieval warfare, and punished anything in the shape of outrages on the civil population with a heavy hand. In a couple of months half the towns of Normandy had surrendered, and the French queen had joined Burgundy, claiming the regency for herself in priority to the Dauphin, whom she detested. The conquest of Normandy continued, and while Henry garrisoned town after town he made no infringement on their accustomed liberties or rights.

In the summer he began the siege of Rouen, the capital of the duchy. Summer waned, the autumn advanced, and passed into winter; the warring factions of France both endeavoured to negotiate, and while they negotiated Rouen was drawing near to the starvation point. The only attempt at relief was a raid easily beaten off. The inhabitants of Rouen drove some thousands of non-combatants out of their gates. Henry refused to let them through his lines, and the merciless business of starvation went on, relieved only when the English king provided the miserable people with a Christmas dinner. In January Rouen surrendered, and after that the rest of Normandy gave little serious trouble, though there remained fortresses which still held out for some months.



The siege of Rouen by Henry V.

Burgundy renewed negotiations, but the more that he and the queen seemed inclined to concede, the higher grew the terms demanded by Henry. At last Burgundy resolved to have done with it and to make his peace with the Armagnacs. There was an apparent reconciliation between Burgundy and Charles; but immediately afterwards the Duke was foully murdered by the treachery of the Dauphin at Montereau. In his young successor Philip, and indeed among all the Burgundians, the desire for

revenge mastered every other sentiment. They immediately concluded for their own part a truce with the King of England so far as all Burgundian territories were affected. The queen was on their side, the crazy king and the princess Catherine were both in their hands. In the spring of next year, 1420, they concluded with Henry the treaty of Troyes, under which he received Catherine as his bride, the guardianship of the kingdom during the life of the reigning King Charles VI., and the promise of the succession for himself and his heirs after the king's death, to the displacement of the Dauphin. France was to retain her own laws, customs, and government; there was merely to be an ultimate union of crowns like that which took place between England and Scotland, not in 1707, but in 1603.

A few months later Henry withdrew to England, leaving in charge his next brother, Thomas, Duke of Clarence. His long absence was being felt at home. Nevertheless he was back in six months again; for Clarence by a rash movement brought upon himself an overwhelming defeat and lost his own life at the battle of Baugé, a victory mainly won by a large contingent of Scots who had taken service with the French. New life was given to the party of the Dauphin; through the latter part of the year and the first half of the following year, 1422, Henry was engaged in pushing forward his conquest. In the meantime Catherine had borne him a son. He himself was a young man not yet five and thirty, and it is impossible to guess what he might have effected if he had lived another twenty years in full vigour. But the hand of death was upon him. He contracted a fatal disease, of which he died in August of the same year, leaving instructions that his next brother, John, Duke of Bedford, should act as a regent of France, and his younger brother, Humphrey of Gloucester, as regent of England.

III

THE LOSS OF FRANCE

Whether Henry V., if he had lived to the age of Edward I., could have succeeded in the policy of uniting England and France on the lines of the treaty of Troyes, is sufficiently doubtful; when he died at the age of thirty-four, the possibility of success disappeared. A king with a character and genius equal to Henry's was needed to carry out his work effectively. The man who was actually left to carry it out was hardly the inferior of Henry himself, whether in character or in military or political ability. But he would seem to have lacked the magnetic personality of Henry the Conqueror, and he was not a king. John, Duke of Bedford, though he was trusted and admired on all hands, yet lacked the royal authority; and lacking it, the task for him became impossible. And yet it was not till his death, thirteen years after that of Henry, that the sheer impossibility of it became manifest.

It is clear enough that the conquest of a united France by England could only have been accomplished by a miracle. Henry himself would hardly have achieved what he did if the murder at Montereau had not turned the new Duke of Burgundy into his active ally. If the Dauphin Charles had been an able and vigorous prince, if he had striven for a real reconciliation between Burgundians and Armagnacs, instead of lending himself to the monstrous treachery which almost justified Burgundy in siding with a foreign conqueror, Henry's conquest might have been restricted to Normandy. But even before and still more after Montereau, the France with which the English had to deal was disunited; and while Burgundy was definitely on the side of England, it was always possible that the Plantagenet might overthrow the Valois claimant of the French throne.

But the Burgundian alliance was immediately weakened by the action of Humphrey of Gloucester. The Duke of Brabant was a kinsman and ally of Philip of Burgundy. He had got possession of Hainault by marrying its heiress Jacqueline, who not without reason sought a divorce from him. Gloucester wished to marry her and get Hainault for himself. Philip espoused the cause of the Duke of Brabant. Jacqueline got her divorce, but only from the ex-pope who had been deposed by the Council of Constance. Nevertheless Gloucester married her, and tried to recover Hainault from the Duke of Brabant. It was all that Bedford's diplomacy could effect to prevent an open rupture between England and Burgundy.

Nevertheless for some time the slow process of conquest went on. The unhappy King Charles VI. died just after Henry V.; and the north of France recognised the infant Henry VI. as king, and Bedford as regent. The south recognised Charles VII. Bedford won brilliant victories at Crévant and Verneuil; and in 1428 the siege of Orleans began. Through the winter the siege went on, but it was not destined to be successful. France was redeemed by the heroism of a girl whom the English burnt as a sorceress, since otherwise they must have acknowledged her for God's angel sent for the deliverance of France. Modern wisdom escapes the dilemma by classing her as an unexplained psychological phenomenon; but the Middle Ages explained such phenomena by referring them to the direct intervention of God or the Devil. But however we may elect to interpret Joan of Arc, we may at least be perfectly certain that her interpretation by the English and by Shakespeare was hideously and fearfully wrong.

To the court of Charles VII. at Chinon came a country maid, Jeanne Darc, from Domrémy, in Picardy. To her, she said, had come voices and visions, bidding her arise and save France. For herself she asked nothing but to be suffered to obey the Divine command. Common sense scoffed, but common sense was somehow silenced. She got her way, and sallied from Chinon at the head of an armed force. She reached Orleans and entered it without difficulty, for the investment was incomplete. The garrison became inspired, and upon the English fell a terror of they knew not

what; art magic they called it. The Maid could not be resisted. The English force had never been strong enough to effect a complete blockade; now it could not even hold its own against the onslaughts of the garrison. The siege was broken up. At Pataye, Joan met the English in the open field and routed them. Then through a hostile country she accompanied Charles to Rheims to crown him King of France. Her work as she understood it was now done, but Charles could not dispense with so valuable an asset. He would not suffer her to depart as she herself desired. For a year she continued to lead French forces to victory in repeated skirmishes and sieges; but at last she fell into the hands of the Burgundians, through the treachery, it was said, of jealous Frenchmen. By a French ecclesiastical court she was tried and condemned on charges of heresy and witchcraft. Then she was handed over to the English for the execution of the sentence, and was burnt at the stake to the eternal shame of every one concerned; of the judges who condemned her, of the English who slew her in a fever of superstitious terror, of the contemptible king who left her to her doom without stirring a finger to save her. The death of the Maid of Orleans is the one blot on the fair fame of the Duke of Bedford.

The cause for which the Maid died was still very far from being won. But she had wrought a vital change. She had revived the spirit of patriotism in the French, and destroyed the self-confidence of the English. Success departed from them. They fought on obstinately, but no longer with the old assurance of victory. Burgundy was less than half-hearted, and began to be anxious to put an end to the war. At last, in 1435, there was a conference at Arras, at which it was proposed on the part of the French that England should retain the Calais Pale, Normandy, and Guienne, but should resign the claim to the French throne. Yet English obstinacy rejected the terms. Burgundy in disgust threw up the alliance, and France was at last united in resistance to England, which by the death of Bedford in 1436 lost the one man who might have saved it from the woes to come.

The war dragged on, but it was now one not for the conquest of new territory by the English, but for the recovery of conquered territory by the French. The French offer was renewed in 1439, but England still refused to resign Henry's claim to call himself King of France. The French began to attack Guienne, which had been for a long time in peaceful occupation, free from attack because the French forces had been too thoroughly engaged elsewhere. Guienne, it must be remembered, was not a conquered territory, but had always been technically subject to the King of England as its Duke. But before proceeding further with the story of the loss of France, we must turn back to affairs in England.


Of the three brothers of Henry V., the eldest, Thomas of Clarence, was killed at Baugé. The dying king had desired that the active work of establishing the English crown in France should be entrusted to his next brother, John of Bedford, while the third, Humphrey of Gloucester, was to be regent



Besieging a French town at the end of the Hundred Years' War.
[From Froissart's picture of the siege of Dieppe by Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, 1442-3.]

in England. The infant Henry VI. was to be placed in the care of the Beauforts. The Beauforts were the nearest kin of the house of Lancaster. They were the illegitimate children of John of Gaunt, who, however, ultimately married their mother, Catherine Swynford, and the Beauforts were legitimated by Act of parliament in the reign of Richard II.; an Act which was confirmed in the reign of Henry IV., but with the addition of a clause which barred them from the succession to the crown. The point is of importance, because it still remained possible for the Beauforts to maintain a sort of claim to represent the house of Lancaster on the failure of direct heirs to Henry IV. There were three brothers: Henry, Bishop of Winchester, who became a Cardinal; Thomas of Exeter; and John, Earl of Somerset, from whom descended the other representatives of the name. Henry of Winchester was a prominent member of the Council—a rival of Archbishop Arundel,

THE BEAUFORTS AND STAFFORDS




and an ally of the Prince of Wales during the reign of Henry IV. He became Chancellor under Henry V., and remained in the front rank of English politics until shortly before his death in 1447. Thomas of Exeter was made the actual guardian of the infant king, but he died shortly afterwards. John of Somerset was never personally prominent. His daughter Joan was married to young King James of Scotland, who was liberated and allowed to return to his kingdom immediately after the death of Henry V. Her two brothers, John and Edmund, became successively the Earl and Duke of Somerset; each left a daughter named Margaret. John's daughter became the mother of Henry VIII., while Edmund's daughter was the mother of the Duke of Buckingham, who appears first as the ally and then as the foe of Richard III. But the Beauforts who appear prominently in the reign of Henry VI. are the Cardinal Henry and his nephew Edmund.

The wishes of Henry V. had of course no legal force. The parliament had every confidence in Bedford, and conferred upon him the powers

desired by the dying king. It declined, however, to make Humphrey of Gloucester regent in England—Bedford's supremacy was to be recognised whenever he was in the country—though it made him president of the Council to which the regency was committed. This was the continuation of that standing Council which had been nominated in the reign of Henry IV. that it might act as a constitutional check on the powers of the Crown, though it was destined to become instead the king's privy council of his own nominees. For the present, however, it provided in effect the government of England.

There was no thought of challenging the succession. The Earl of March was above suspicion of any disloyalty. Still, at the instance of Gloucester, he was sent off to take up the government of Ireland, where he died shortly afterwards. The Mortimer heritage and claim to the Crown passed to his nephew, Richard Plantagenet, the son of his sister, Anne Mortimer, and of Richard, Earl of Cambridge. The child had already become Duke of York by the death of his uncle Edward at Agincourt, he being one of the two English noblemen who fell in that wonderful battle. Richard of York was eleven years old when the king died.

Domestic politics produced no events of importance. On the whole Gloucester dominated the government, while there was no love lost between him and the Beauforts. When Bedford died, the young Duke of York was sent to take his place in France, and acquitted himself with very



Cardinal Beaufort's chantry in Winchester Cathedral.

considerable credit. But by this time, if not before, Cardinal Beaufort had become anxious to bring the war to an honourable conclusion, having realised the futility of its continuation; whereas Gloucester courted popularity by heading the extreme war party who were responsible for the rejections of the French overtures which we have noted. He was, however, practically driven out of public life for a time by the conduct of his wife, Eleanor Cobham, for whom he had deserted Jacqueline of Hainault. The lady had apparently "practised against" the life of the young king by necromantic arts, which, however silly, had obviously a treasonable intent, Gloucester himself being the heir-presumptive to the throne. The actual necromancers were put to death, and the Duchess had to parade London robed in the white sheet of repentance. Duke Humphrey was not actually an accomplice, but the affair drove him into retirement for some while. Although the obstinacy of public sentiment persisted in continuing the war, its management and the control of public affairs passed to the Beauforts.

The conduct of war by a ministry who were more anxious for peace than for victory was scarcely promising. The fighting was ineffective, and efforts were made to negotiate peace, even at the cost of resigning the titular claim to the French crown. With a view to peace, a marriage was negotiated between the young king Henry VI. and Margaret of Anjou, the niece of the French king. The mismanagement of the English envoy, William de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk, an ally of the Beauforts, resulted in a betrothal and a truce, but nothing more. The tables were turned now, and every English proffer of terms was met by a raising of the terms on the part of the French. The royal marriage was celebrated in 1446, and in the next year both Gloucester and Cardinal Beaufort died. There is very little doubt that Gloucester was in fact murdered by Somerset and Suffolk—a foolish as well as a criminal performance, in which the Cardinal at least, being practically in retirement, could have had no hand. So long as Henry VI. should be childless, Richard of York was now manifestly the next prince of the blood.

While the truce lasted, shuffling negotiations went on with France, and there was intense disgust when it became known that Suffolk had promised to evacuate the province of Maine. Still greater was the wrath when in 1449 the French renewed the war by invading Normandy in force, and overrunning it almost unresisted. Somerset was sent to take command, but in the spring of next year his forces were overwhelmed at the battle of Formigny. Before the autumn of 1450 nothing remained in France to the English except Guienne and the Calais Pale.

Long before the disaster of Formigny, even before Somerset's expedition sailed, popular indignation had risen to rioting point. Somerset had hardly landed in France when an angry attack was made by the House of Commons on the administration in general and Suffolk in particular. All sorts of charges were hurled against him, some serious

and some absurd, some demonstrably false. Instead of facing trial, Suffolk threw himself on the king's mercy. The amiable imbecile on the throne—he was the grandson of Charles VI. of France if he was also the son of Henry V. of England—thought merely of protecting Suffolk, and attempted to do so by banishing him from the kingdom for five years. Again a storm of popular indignation broke out. Suffolk fled for his life in disguise, but was caught and murdered while trying to cross the Channel. The news of Formigny had just arrived, and the murder was merely a symptom of popular rage.

A month later it took shape in the insurrection known as Jack Cade's Rebellion, which the tradition followed by Shakespeare has hopelessly mixed up with the Peasant Revolt seventy years earlier. In 1450 the complaints formulated by the rebels were all directed against the sins of the Suffolk-Somerset administration. A casual demand for the repeal of the Statute of Labourers was the only reference to social questions, and was merely intended to attract the mob. The moving spirit, Jack Cade, whatever his real name may have been, was undoubtedly an adventurer possessed of considerable education and some military experience. But the insurrection was one of the common folk, and therein lay its one difference at the outset from the risings of the baronage in arms which were the traditional method of dealing with constitutional crises. When the king's forces were called out to disperse the insurgents, they were promptly disbanded again for fear of mutiny. But in other respects the precedents of Tyler's Rebellion were followed. Jack Cade kept his men in hand until they got into London. Then there came a riot which turned the friends of order into the enemies of insurrection; Jack Cade disbanded his forces on promise of pardon, and the pardon was then repudiated. Cade fled, but was caught and killed.

The victory of the government brought over Richard of York from Ireland, whither he had been sent as lieutenant, for some time past, to keep him out of the way. Jack Cade had made use of his name, a fact which aroused some suspicions that he himself had set the insurrection on foot to test public opinion. He was now determined both to dissociate himself from the rebellion, and as next prince of the blood to take the lead in demanding the removal of "the king's evil counsellors." His arrival on the scene meant that the rival parties must now measure their strength together; on the one side Somerset and the queen, carrying with them the king, and on the other side the heir-presumptive and all who were hostile to a government which had proved itself hopelessly incompetent.


IV

THE RED AND WHITE ROSES

Before York arrived, Somerset was back from Normandy, discredited and unpopular, but still in the confidence of the king and queen. The meeting of a full parliament showed that the Commons were entirely on the

side of York; but it would have been difficult to say whether among the peers the greater strength was on the side of York or of Somerset. At this time there was no question of disputing the succession; York himself did not assert his own title as against that of Henry VI. until ten years afterwards. He was satisfied with his position as heir-presumptive, which could only be challenged if Somerset ventured to claim that the legitimization of the Beauforts gave him a prior right as being descended in the direct male line from John of Gaunt. York and his supporters demanded only that the heir-presumptive should be properly recognised in the Royal Council.

The great strength of York, apart from the extent of his own dukedom and earldoms, lay in the support of the great Neville family, of whom the most powerful were the Earl of Salisbury and his son Richard of Warwick, at this time a young man of two and twenty. But the Neville con-



Tattershall, a 15th century castle.

[Built between 1433-1455.]

nection of itself included nearly one-fourth of the lay members of the House of Peers, who at this time scarcely numbered more than fifty all told. York's own wife was Salisbury's sister. The baronage during the past hundred and fifty years had acquired a new character, partly perhaps because, with the systematisation of parliament, the barons with a hereditary right to be summoned individually had become a definite group, who had been permitted to accumulate earldoms and baronies in a few hands. Moreover, there had been another change in practice which counteracted the anti-feudal legislation of Edward I. It had become the practice of many of the gentry,

men of small estate but of gentle blood, to pledge themselves personally to the service of great nobles: a process distinct from the old feudal commendation as practised in England, and in effect assimilating the English system to the feudalism of the Continent.

It was the intention then of York and his supporters to maintain a strictly constitutional attitude, not to stir up civil war; and with the parties thus balanced, Somerset, retaining his personal influence with the king, still retained the ascendancy. York was at last irritated to the point of appearing in arms to demand the dismissal of Somerset; but he disbanded his forces on receiving what he took to be satisfactory assurances, only to find that he had thus placed himself in the power of his enemies. A sort of reconciliation was however effected, because the French were now overrunning Guienne, a province which still itself preferred the English to the French allegiance. It was felt that a united effort must be made to save it. At the end of 1452 an expedition was despatched under the veteran warrior, Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury. But in the next summer Talbot's force was annihilated and he himself was slain in a desperate attempt to force an impregnable position at Castillon. The disaster was irretrievable, and although several towns and fortresses held out stubbornly for some months, all Guienne was lost before the end of the year. The Calais Pale alone remained to England. The Hundred Years' War was at an end.

At this moment Henry VI. sank from his normal condition of feeble incapacity into one of unqualified imbecility; and immediately afterwards the question of the succession was complicated by the birth of a son who now stood between York and the throne. The practical effect was that York's followers were strong enough to secure his appointment as Protector of the realm, the confinement of Somerset in the Tower, and the appointment of sundry Yorkists to high offices of state. York used his power with moderation, and made no attempt to take vengeance on his enemies.

But at the end of 1454 Henry recovered. York surrendered the Protectorship, and Henry at once made haste to reinstate Somerset and his party. The proceedings of Somerset and the queen made it evident that they had no intention of following York's example of moderation, and were preparing to carry out a vindictive policy. York and Salisbury, who had retired to the north, took up arms and marched towards London, declaring their loyalty to the Crown but demanding the arrest and trial of Somerset; and the first engagement of the War of the Roses took place at St. Albans, where Somerset was slain, and the king himself fell into the hands of the Yorkists. It is to be noted, however, that those killed in the battle numbered only five or six score.

Again York used his victory with moderation. A parliament was summoned which was certainly Yorkist, but was not like later parliaments composed exclusively of the adherents of the party which had for the moment prevailed. Another of the king's lapses into imbecility again made York Protector, but only for a few months; and presently the queen felt

strong enough to induce Henry once more to dismiss the Yorkist ministry. Still there was a formal public reconciliation and a hollow truce between the parties for the next three years. Each side was anxious to force the blame of actual aggression on the other.


In 1459, however, Margaret was so palpably preparing for a *coup de main*, that the Yorkists took up arms, and hostilities were renewed. But although Salisbury won a small victory at Blore Heath, Margaret had succeeded in making it appear that York was the aggressor, whereby much of the

support on which he had counted failed him. When the Royalists advanced against him on an autumn campaign, the Yorkist army melted to pieces and the leaders had to take flight; York himself to Ireland, where he had made himself extremely popular during his lieutenancy, and his eldest son Edward, the young Earl of March, with Salisbury and Warwick, to Calais, of which Warwick was captain. In that capacity the future "king-maker" had latterly achieved a high reputation by his successful operations in the defence of the Channel.

A parliament was called, of what was now to become the usual character. It was simply an assembly of the Royalist nominees;

and it opened that sweeping campaign of attainders with which both parties henceforth supplemented their military operations. Instead of bringing persons accused of treason to trial, an Act of parliament was passed by the same process as any other Act of parliament, declaring that a long list of persons were guilty of treason, though the king reserved the right of pardon or mitigation of sentence; a right which on this occasion was freely exercised by the pacific Henry.

But before twelve months had passed, Warwick, who had been concerting his plans with Richard in Ireland, landed suddenly on the coast of Kent, where the Yorkist cause was strongly supported. The Royalists had been lulled into a false security; the Yorkists gathered in force, and London admitted him. Thence he marched to Northampton, where the Royalists were hastily gathering, and put them completely to rout, capturing the person of the unlucky king. At this battle the regular Yorkists' rule was adopted of sparing the commonalty, but giving no quarter to nobles or knights. The battle made Warwick master of the south of England. The



The youthful Henry VI.

[From Lydgate's "Life of St. Edmund."]

north unwisely was left alone. Richard of York returned from Ireland, came to London where parliament was summoned, and startled and alarmed his supporters by at once asserting his own immediate claim to the throne as the legitimate successor of Richard II. Warwick and the bulk of Richard's supporters were, however, strongly opposed to this reversal of York's policy. Richard was forced to accept the proposal, to which the captive king gave his consent, that Henry should retain the crown for the rest of his life, but should be succeeded by York, not by the Prince of Wales. The arrangement was ratified by parliament.

Margaret, however, was by no means prepared to accept the exclusion of her son from the succession. She was still at large in Wales, and forthwith set about mustering the Lancastrians, as we may now call them, in the north. York at once despatched his son Edward, a lad of eighteen, who had distinguished himself at the battle of Northampton, to the Welsh Marches to keep Wales in check; and leaving Warwick in the south, hurried north himself along with Salisbury. But on the 30th December his small force was overwhelmed at the battle of Wakefield. The Lancastrians gave no quarter. Richard himself, his second son Rutland, and Salisbury, were taken and put to death; several of his principal adherents were slain on the field. The war had degenerated into a vindictive slaughter of rival partisans.

The victors marching southwards encountered and defeated Warwick in the second battle of St. Albans, some seven weeks after Wakefield, recovered the person of the captive Henry, and advanced to bargain with the Londoners for admission to the capital. But in the meantime the Earl of March had routed a Royalist force at Mortimer's Cross, and was hurrying to join Warwick. The Yorkist leaders now also hastened to London, but, unlike the Lancastrians, were immediately admitted. The slaughter at Wakefield had removed Warwick's scruples, and, with the acclamations of the Londoners and the troops, Edward IV. was proclaimed king on the ground that the parliament of 1399 had had no power to transfer the succession from the legitimate line of the Mortimers.

The foiled Lancastrians retreated to the north; Edward and Warwick were soon in pursuit. A great battle, fought at Towton, was decisive. After a desperate struggle the Lancastrians were utterly routed with tremendous slaughter, and Wakefield was avenged by the death of all prisoners of any position who were taken. King Henry, who had been delivered from the custody of Warwick at the battle of St. Albans, escaped to Scotland with his queen.

Warwick was left to keep the north quiet while Edward returned to London, and was crowned in state. In November the king called his first parliament, of course a purely Yorkist assembly. It passed an Act of Attainder in which there were more than a hundred and thirty names of the living and the dead; the point of these sweeping measures was obviously the confiscation of the estates of the attainted, and their distribution among

the adherents of the victorious side. Incidentally, the parliament pronounced that the three Henrys had been usurpers, though the benignant Edward was pleased to confirm the charters which the usurpers had granted, and the honours and privileges bestowed by them, except in the case of persons now attainted. The young king then gave himself up to public displays and private dissipations; content apparently to leave politics and government to the cousin who had made him king.



The Duke of Gloucester and the Earl of Warwick in battle.

Next year, however, the energetic Margaret of Anjou was again at work, and kept Warwick busy until the summer of 1463, when her followers were dispersed, and she herself only escaped capture by throwing herself, according to a tradition of good authority, upon the generosity of a robber whom she met in her flight, who conveyed her into safety. A final desperate effort of the Lancastrians was crushed

in the following year by Warwick's brother, Montague, at Hedgely Moor and Hexham.

But a rupture was approaching between the king and his too powerful cousin, to explain which we must briefly refer to French affairs since the expulsion of the English. Louis XI. was now on the French throne, and was engaged in consolidating the supremacy of the Crown over the feudal nobility, mainly by the methods of intrigue. Philip, Duke of Burgundy, however, having by marriage acquired great possessions in the Low Countries, had virtually made himself an independent monarch, being in effect lord of the Netherlands as well as of the duchy of Burgundy in France, and of the county of Burgundy or Franche Comté, which fell within the German Empire. Hence though Burgundy was the name generally given inclusively to the whole dominion, Burgundy itself was the less important part of it, the more important, at least from the English point of view, being the Netherlands. Neither Louis nor Philip was willing to see the strength of the other increased.

Louis, somewhat hastily, had committed himself to the support of Margaret of Anjou and the Lancastrian faction; Philip was naturally inclined in consequence to favour the Yorkists. Warwick was unwilling

to break with Burgundy, but was still more anxious to bring Louis over to the Yorkist side. Louis, realising that, in the language of a modern statesman, he had been "backing the wrong horse," was willing enough to buy the friendship of the *de facto* king of England. Warwick proposed to marry King Edward to the French queen's sister, since Louis had neither a sister nor a daughter of his own to offer. To the Earl's intense disgust Edward ruined the whole negotiation by announcing that he had already married Lady Elizabeth Grey, widow of the Lancastrian John Grey, Lord Ferrars, and daughter of the Lancastrian Richard Woodville, Lord Rivers.

Warwick was angry enough at the trick that had been played upon him, since it showed how slight was his real ascendancy over the king. Still, there was no immediate breach. But Edward proceeded to marry his wife's kinsfolk right and left to heirs and heiresses, thus forming a new family group wherewith to counterbalance the Neville connection; and Warwick's sus-



A bedroom and its appointments in the middle of the 15th century.

picion and distrust deepened though Edward still treated him as his first counsellor and minister. In spite of the marriage fiasco, he was sent on a diplomatic mission to France and Burgundy. The relations between Louis and Charles the Rash, the heir of Burgundy, were exceedingly strained, and Louis proved as anxious to conciliate Warwick as Charles was careless. The seeds were sown of an alliance between the French king and the earl. Meanwhile, by a stroke of good fortune, the unfortunate Henry VI. had been caught wandering about aimlessly in the north, and was lodged in the Tower. The relations between Warwick and Edward were further strained when the latter refused to sanction the marriage of his next brother George, Duke of Clarence, with Warwick's daughter. And now Charles the Bold entered upon a negotiation behind Warwick's back for his own marriage with the English king's sister Margaret. Warwick was again sent off ostensibly to negotiate a treaty with Louis, and returned accompanied by a French embassy to discover that the marriage treaty with Charles was already settled.

Edward remained indolently blind to the danger that was brewing. Warwick in alliance with Clarence was preparing to play the old part of the Lords Ordainers and the Lords Appellants. When nearly two years had passed, half the north suddenly rose under a leader who called himself "Robin of Redesdale," with the usual complaint against "the king's evil counsellors," and the usual demand for their removal. Edward hurried to the north; Warwick at Calais promptly married his daughter to Clarence, crossed to England, raised the south, and marched upon London. Three weeks after Clarence's marriage Edward was a prisoner. To all appearance Warwick's victory was complete, and he was not afraid to release the king after executing Rivers and one or two others of the Woodville group. But a futile Lancastrian rising in Lincolnshire gave Edward his opportunity. He collected a considerable force to suppress the rising, and having demolished the rebels at the battle called Lose-Coat Field, he announced that Warwick and Clarence were implicated in the treason. Since he already had an army in the field, the earl and the duke could only take a hasty flight to France.

Then the craft of Louis XI. came into play and brought about nothing less amazing than a reconciliation between Warwick and Margaret of Anjou, to be confirmed by the marriage of Warwick's younger daughter Anne to Margaret's son Edward, the titular Prince of Wales. Clarence was apparently satisfied by being recognised as the next prince of the blood. Edward had underrated the strength of the Nevilles. Warwick repeated his previous device; Edward was enticed to the north to suppress an insurrection organised there, while the earl himself again landed unopposed in the south and proclaimed Henry VI. Half Edward's troops belonged to the faction not of York but of Neville, and deserted him. Edward in turn was obliged to fly from the country in hot haste to take refuge with Charles of Burgundy. Again Warwick's victory seemed complete, and Henry was brought out from the Tower to be posed once more as king.

But Clarence—"false fleeting perjured Clarence"—was already in communication with the exile. In the spring Edward made a sudden dash from Flanders, and landed in Yorkshire, where he began by announcing that he had returned to claim not the Crown but the Duchy of York. The Yorkists of the north hastened to his standard. By consummate generalship he prevented the Lancastrian levies from effecting a junction, was joined by Clarence, and, having completely misled Warwick as to his designs, suddenly directed his march from the west upon London with the earl in hot pursuit. He reached his goal first, was admitted into the city, shut Henry up again in the Tower, and marched out to fight the earl.

The hostile forces met in a thick fog at Barnet. In the mist Warwick's left and centre attacked each other, each at first thinking that the other was the enemy, and then that they were traitors. The blunder decided the day, which otherwise seems to have been going in favour of the Lancastrians. Warwick was slain on the field, and his forces were completely put to rout.

On the same day Margaret landed in the west. There she rallied her adherents, and was on the march to join another band of her partisans on the Welsh border, when Edward by desperate marching succeeded in intercepting her and forcing a battle at Tewkesbury. There he won the decisive victory which made him indisputably King of England. Margaret herself was taken; the young Prince of Wales was killed, probably in the battle, not, as a later tradition asserted, in cold blood by Edward's youngest brother Richard, Duke of Gloucester. No one of the line of Henry VI. except Henry VI. himself remained alive; and of the Beaufort blood only the young son of Margaret Tudor, Henry, Earl of Richmond, and the young Duke of Buckingham, the son of the other Margaret Beaufort. It was the least of Henry VI.'s misfortunes that he died in the Tower a few days after Tewkesbury, almost certainly by the hand of the Duke of Gloucester, though of course it was announced that his death was a natural one.

V

EDWARD IV

After the victory of Tewkesbury, Edward reigned unchallenged for some twelve years. In the hour of his triumph he was only in his thirtieth year. He had proved that when he chose to exert himself he was not only a first-rate fighting man, but a consummate general, and—always with the same proviso—a master of diplomatic craft and persuasiveness. Incidentally also, he was completely and perfectly unscrupulous. Nevertheless he was fundamentally indolent, a lover of pleasure, unambitious. Since he had chosen to play for a crown, he made a point of winning it; having won it, he intended only to enjoy it at his ease. He did not play the tyrant in general, because doing so would not have conduced to his comfort; but if his comfort demanded an act of tyranny, however monstrous, he committed it without a qualm. He reigned as an absolute monarch without protest on the part of people or barons; because he did not attempt to tax the people, while only a remnant of the old baronage existed, and the new men were his own creatures. Edward's demands for money were so rare that we are at first inclined to wonder how it was that he alone managed to do what the grumblers always declared the king ought to do, and "live of his own." But in the first place his treasury was conveniently filled by the enormous confiscations, the spoils of the final victory over the Lancastrians, and in the second place he made up for any casual deficiencies by the ingenious device of Benevolences. That is, he asked not for loans, but for presents; and the individual who refused his request learnt that if his goodwill to the king was so small his loyalty to the throne fell under suspicion. It was cheaper to pay with a good grace than to resist; and at the same time it was not easy to build up a constitutional opposition on the basis

of Benevolences, since technically no compulsion was brought to bear. From these sources then Edward obtained sufficient supplies for a personal expenditure which was lavish but not particularly extravagant—he had the business instinct—while his public expenditure was even parsimonious. Moreover he was released from the eternal drain of the French wars as well as from the spasmodic expenditure on the defence of his throne against a rival dynasty.

Thus it was but rarely that Edward found it necessary to summon a parliament; and parliaments, when he did summon them, were de-



Edward IV., his son, Edward V., and the court.

generate. In the chaos of recent years free elections had dropped out of fashion. Borough elections had fallen into the hands of the corporations, and the corporations themselves tended to become close bodies. The franchise of the shire courts, which elected the knights of the shire, had become restricted practically to freeholders; and in point of fact election was frequently superseded by the mere nomination of the sheriffs, or else was effectively controlled by local magnates, so that the House of Commons was now very largely a packed assembly. On the other hand, of the old baronial families, the alternate victories of Lancaster and York had left few surviving members in either faction, and their places were to a great extent taken by a mushroom peerage of Edward's own creation. If Edward had chosen to emphasise his position as an absolute monarch, it is likely enough that he would have been able to convert the English monarchy into an almost unqualified despotism. He did not do so, because he had no ambitions which made it worth while to risk trying to do so. The twelve years of Edward IV.'s reign as an absolute monarch are distinguished chiefly by an event which was not political at all, the setting up of Caxton's printing press under the royal patronage. For Edward was a patron of art and literature; intellectually the most cultured monarch who had occupied the English throne, at least for many centuries.

Two other events, however, have to be recorded. The ambitions and the arrogance of George, Duke of Clarence, excited Edward's wrath. The

From these sources then Edward obtained sufficient supplies for a personal expenditure which was lavish but not particularly extravagant—he had the business instinct—while his public expenditure was even parsimonious. Moreover he was released from the eternal drain of the French wars as well as from the spasmodic expenditure on the defence of his throne against a rival dynasty.

duke was arraigned before parliament by the king in person, was condemned, and died in prison when his execution was imminent. There was no adequate reason for murdering him in the circumstances, and the later tradition that he was drowned in a butt of Malmsey wine was probably a pure fiction. Premature deaths were always attributed to violence. Clarence left a son and daughter, Edward, Earl of Warwick, and Margaret, Countess of Salisbury—they were the grandchildren of Warwick the king-maker—both of whom ultimately perished by the axe of the executioner.

The other event was Edward's French expedition of 1475. Edward proposed to make war upon Louis in conjunction with Charles of Burgundy, a prince as erratic as he was ambitious. It was a long time before the English people ceased to hanker for a revival of the glories of Henry V.; and for that purpose parliament did not grudge the king ample financial support. Burgundy—in either sense—was by tradition and by interest a desirable ally. Edward was no mean strategist and had never been defeated in a stricken field. He certainly could not have conquered France, but if he had meant war in earnest he would probably have conducted some brilliant campaigns. But he did not mean war in earnest. He got his money, and carried his army to Calais; but there was no fighting. Louis was prepared to buy him off, and he himself wanted nothing better than to be bought off. Edward cheerfully deserted his ally Burgundy with the excuse that Charles had disabled himself for co-operating in an effective campaign. Fifteen thousand pounds down and a pension of ten thousand a year which Edward described as a "tribute," was the price paid to him at the treaty of Pecquigny; a very substantial addition to his income, which was duly paid.

In the spring of 1483 Edward was seized with a mortal illness, which carried him off in a few days. The chroniclers are unanimous in attributing his premature death when he was only forty to a constitution ruined by luxury and dissipation. He left behind him two young sons, Edward V. and Richard, Duke of York, and several daughters. Of his brothers the only survivor was Richard, Duke of Gloucester, who had been unfailingly loyal to him, and had won a high reputation both as a soldier and as an administrator.

VI

RICHARD III

The need for a regency was obvious. The young king was at Ludlow in the hands of the queen-mother's brother and son, Rivers and Grey; the young Duke of York was with the queen herself in London, so that the advantages lay with the queen's family for securing the regency to her. But they were unpopular, and Gloucester, who was in the north, knew that he could count upon strong support in securing the regency for him-

self. In company with the Duke of Buckingham he overtook Edward and his escort on their way to London, and forthwith arrested Rivers and Grey. The queen-mother took sanctuary at Westminster along with the rest of her children, and the council immediately acknowledged Gloucester as Protector.

But the sudden death of his brother had suggested to Richard ambitions which went far beyond a mere protectorate. His scheme was to declare the children of Edward IV. illegitimate, and to claim the crown for himself. He privately secured the support of some of the great lords who were purchasable, and six weeks after receiving the protectorate he arrested at the Council Board Lord Hastings, a trusted friend of the late king, Bishop Morton, and others from whom he expected opposition. Hastings was beheaded there and then without trial. Then he cajoled or frightened the queen into handing over to him the young Duke of York, who was placed in the Tower along with his brother the king; not of course, nominally, as a prisoner. Next his design was revealed when a certain Dr. Shaw preached a sermon at Paul's Cross, in which he affirmed that the late king's marriage with Elizabeth Woodville had been null and void because he was precontracted to another lady. The congregation received the sermon in amazed silence, but London was practically overawed by the presence of a large number of Gloucester's and Buckingham's retainers; and an assembly which passed for a parliament was induced to petition Gloucester to take upon himself the royal office as the legitimate head of the House of York, in priority to the late king's "bastard" children, and to those of Clarence who were debarred by their father's attainder. After a show of reluctance Gloucester assented, and a few days later was crowned king. The prisoners Rivers and Grey had already been executed. Nearly all the magnates of the realm formally assented by being present at the coronation. Nowhere was there any sign of resistance to the *coup d'état*.

Richard started on a progress through the Midlands. During his absence the two young princes were murdered in the Tower; that is, they disappeared, though their bones were not discovered till nearly two hundred years afterwards. That the boys were murdered no one at the time seems to have doubted at all, though the mystery attending their death was made use of for political purposes in the next reign.

But the supporters of Richard in his usurpation had not anticipated that it would be sealed by a crime at which all men shuddered. For the most part they were terrorised into silence; one at least was frightened into conspiracy. Buckingham, the representative of the line of the youngest son of King Edward III., while his mother was a Beaufort, entered upon a plot which aimed at uniting the Yorkist and Lancastrian interests by the marriage of the young Earl of Richmond, the head of the Beaufort connection, with Elizabeth, the eldest daughter of Edward IV. But Buckingham's insurrection in the autumn was abortive. Premature risings broke it up, and Buckingham himself was caught and beheaded.

Richmond, who had found safety in Brittany since his early boyhood, should have joined the insurrection, and the delay caused by communicating with him was partly responsible for the false start which ensured failure. It was not his fault that when he attempted to cross the Channel he was beaten off by tempests, so that when he managed to reach England it was only to find that he was too late and must hasten back to Brittany. The elements indeed fought against Buckingham; had the cause of Richard been a righteous one, the Duke's overthrow would probably have been attributed to Divine intervention, for his movements had been completely paralysed by terrific rains and floods.

Richard possessed the ability which, under happier circumstances, might have made him a powerful king, held in honour if not in affection by posterity; for like his brilliant brother he had great military and diplomatic ability, and unlike him was an untiring worker, and his administrative skill was well tested. But Edward's numerous progeny barred him from all chance of becoming king except by sheer usurpation; the chance of usurpation presented itself only because the king died suddenly before any of his offspring were of age. Ten years later, Gloucester would have had no chance at all. The temptation to seize the crown presented itself; he yielded to it. The violence of the methods by which he had paralysed opposition, and the weakness of the plea by which he had procured the setting aside of his nephew, drove him to the murder of the young princes as the only means of securing the crown of which he had robbed them. He had committed himself hopelessly to the career of the typical tyrant, upon whom ruthless violence is forced as the only alternative to that ruin which the violence itself not seldom precipitates. The murder of the princes drove Buckingham to revolt; the revolt of Buckingham carried home to Richard that there was not one of his supporters upon whose fidelity he could now count; while among those supporters no man knew when the king's distrust might display itself—whether the caress was merely the prelude to a dagger thrust.

Yet after Buckingham's fall there was a pause. Richard hoped to strengthen himself by combining severity with conciliation. In January he called the only full parliament of his reign. As a matter of course it passed a sweeping Bill of Attainder, not so much in order to penalise enemies as to provide out of the confiscated estates means for purchasing support. The Commons were conciliated by the king's abstention from calling for taxation, by a statutory declaration that benevolences were illegal, and by a measure directed against the corruption and intimidation of juries. The parliament further confirmed the succession of Richard's son, Edward, who had already been made Prince of Wales.

Then this Prince Edward died. There was no prospect of another child being born to the king, who was forced to recognise as his heir-presumptive John de la Pole, whom we shall presently meet as the Earl of Lincoln. If the claim of Clarence's children had been recognised, it would have taken

precedence of Richard's own ; they were set aside, on the plea of Clarence's attainder. John was the son of the eldest sister of Edward IV. and Richard III., who had been married to the Duke of Suffolk.

Richard strove successfully to secure his own recognition from most of the continental potentates ; but France gave shelter to Richmond and to the fugitives from England who were gathering to his support. Henry Tudor, Earl of Richmond, was recognised as their head by the Lancastrians, as being the male representative of the house of Beaufort, through his mother, Margaret Beaufort, who had married Edmund Tudor. Edmund's father, Owen Tudor, was a Welsh knight who had married Catherine of France, the widow of Henry V. This had brought the Tudors into some prominence, but did not, of course, affect the succession to the Crown.

Whatever Richard may have gained through his parliament in the way of popular favour was lost in the following year, when he again resorted to illegal and arbitrary methods of obtaining money. Public opinion, too, was further shocked by the rumour that Richard was contemplating a marriage with his own niece, Elizabeth, daughter of Edward IV. There is some warrant for the belief, in the fact that Richard had abstained, and continued to abstain, from the obvious course of marrying the girl to some nonentity ; and when Richard's queen died, it was commonly supposed that he had made away with her in order to facilitate the scandalous design. Richard found himself obliged to declare publicly his innocence of the purpose attributed to him.

Through the summer, Henry was preparing for an invasion. In August he succeeded in landing at Milford Haven, being secure of Welsh support in virtue of his own Welsh descent. Richard gathered an army, but many of the lords held aloof altogether, and many of those who assembled with professions of loyalty to him were suspected, with good reason, of treacherous intent. The armies met at Bosworth Field. Lord Stanley was approaching, professedly to support Richard, but actually pledged to Henry. Richard's left wing, led by Northumberland, refused to join battle. Richard, in the centre, made a furious attack—so furious that for a moment there seemed a chance of victory. But only for a moment. Stanley's forces fell upon his flank. The battle was lost, but Richard refused to fly, and fell upon the field, fighting desperately. The crown he had been wearing on his helmet was picked up and set on Richmond's head by Lord Stanley ; and on the field of battle the victor was hailed as King Henry VII.

VII

THE PROGRESS OF ENGLAND

The constitutional history of the century preceding the battle of Bosworth shows us first an attempt to limit the powers of the crown, taking as pre-

cedents the Provisions of Oxford and the Lords Ordainers ; then Richard II.'s attempt to free the crown from all restraints and render it despotic ; then the premature subjection of the Crown to the Commons, whose new authority collapsed in the face of civil war. The civil war not only paralysed the Commons, but also shattered the baronage, thereby making it possible for a dynasty of able rulers to recover for the Crown a degree of practical autocracy. But it did not destroy the tradition of parliamentary control.

Neither foreign wars nor civil broils arrested the normal course of economic development. The foreign wars were fought on foreign soil ; the conquest of France and the expulsion from France both involved devastation of France, but not of England. The insurrections under Richard II. and Henry IV. and the War of the Roses were largely in the nature of faction fights ; and though much blood was shed, they were not, comparatively speaking, destructive of property. It is not, indeed, to be supposed that agricultural life or town life and commerce were unaffected ; but only in rare instances was there sacking of towns, and confiscations were directed not against wealthy burgesses but against the owners of wide lands. Hence England, on the whole, was rather prosperous than otherwise ; although we must decline to accept the view of those historians who have persuaded themselves that the fifteenth century was the golden age of the agriculturist and the craftsman.

The return to normal conditions, after the Peasant Revolt, ended the reaction which had checked the passage from tenure by service to paid service and tenure by rent. The villein, as a rule, became either a "copyholder" with a right to his tenement in perpetuity, subject to the payment of a rent which could not be raised, or a free labourer ; not because those rights were extorted from reluctant landowners, but because the landowners found the arrangement profitable. The idea of servitude passed away, and nothing was heard about "bondage" in Jack Cade's insurrection. The copyholder ceased to sympathise with the labourer, when he was himself freed from the fear of enforced services and possibly wished to hire labour. The labourer, on the other hand, could command adequate wages, because as yet the supply of labour did not exceed the demand except in the off seasons. But it cannot be assumed that employment was regular throughout the year, or that the recorded rates of wages represent the average wage received throughout the year by the individual labourer.

There was another outcome of the depopulation and disorganisation consequent upon the Black Death. A great deal of the land was thrown out of cultivation altogether, and much of it was not brought back into cultivation because at the first it was not necessary to grow so much food as before, apart from the fact that there was not sufficient labour available. Whole families of the villeins, nay, in some cases entire villages, had been swept away by the pestilence ; and many villein holdings, reverting to the lords of the manor, were absorbed into demesne lands. The lords then, as a mere matter of convenience, turned over what had formally been tilled

land to pasture, growing sheep on it instead of attempting to restore it as arable. Nobody was the worse, and the sheep did not demand the same amount of labour as tillage; which, in view of the shortage of labour, was advantageous. On the other hand, with the ever-increasing demand for wool, the landlords began to wake up to the fact that wool-growing was a profitable occupation, more profitable than corn-growing when low prices ruled. Out of these things trouble arose presently, but it was not actively felt until some while after Henry VII. was seated on the throne.



An alderman of London, 1474.
[From a brass.]

The policy of Edward III. gave an impetus to commercial life which was actively felt in the towns, and developed the mercantile class and commercial enterprise. With the growth of the cloth-working industry, the "staples" in which the merchants of the staple dealt ceased to be the only goods for which the English merchant sought to find a market abroad. But the individual merchant found innumerable barriers to interfere with his trade in foreign cities. The German towns of the Hanseatic League had been admitted to trade privileges in England on the hypothesis that they would grant corresponding privileges to English traders; but the individual trader was not strong enough to get his rights recognised. Hence the great mercantile company of the Merchant Adventurers received a charter in the reign of Henry IV. granting it a monopoly of foreign trade in other than staple goods, since a company could fight its own battles very much better than isolated traders. There was a jealousy, indeed, between the Merchant Adventurers and the Merchants of the Staple, because the main trade of the former was in cloth, the manufactured article, and of the latter in wool, the raw material; and

the cloth workers sought to check the export of wool in order to cheapen it at home, so that the interests of the two associations conflicted. The fifteenth century, however, saw the Merchant Adventurers steadily and successfully forcing their way into foreign markets.

With the expansion of trade and the increase of manufactures, even in a very limited field, capitalism came into being. That is to say, men found that when they accumulated wealth they could carry on operations on a larger scale; and also that the surplus wealth not required for extending their own operations could be profitably applied by others. In the chartered towns, every one was under the strict supervision and regulations of the craft guilds, but beyond the jurisdiction of the borough men could follow their own devices. Thus it was to a great extent in new unchartered

towns that the cloth-working industry grew up and flourished; and to this, in part at least, may be attributed that decay of some of the older boroughs from which a falling off in the general prosperity has sometimes been inferred. Trade was drawn away from them to the new centres.

The fact that there was a great deal of private wealth is demonstrated by the great expenditure in this century upon building—a form of outlay in which none but rich men could indulge. But it would seem rather that a few men were acquiring great wealth than that the normal standard was greatly raised as a result of the new methods.

The craftsman was tending to become the client of the big trader rather than an independent trader on his own account. The journeyman's chance of setting up for himself diminished, as it became necessary to start business with a substantial stock-in-trade. The old days had departed when the craftsman had required little more than the tools with which he executed the orders that came to him, working upon materials which were provided for him. The man who wanted custom must have wares



A merchant.

[From Caxton's "Book of Chess," 1475.]

to exhibit instead of merely waiting for orders, and wares to exhibit meant capital locked up. So the average journeyman no longer regarded himself as being on the way to become a master craftsman, but expected to remain a journeyman all his days. Thus the fifteenth century saw the beginnings of the opposition between capital and labour, between employers and employed.

With regard to foreign commerce, it must be remarked that England had scarcely as yet developed a carrying trade. In this department she could not compete with the cities of Italy and the Low Countries. It was to encourage English shipping more from a military than from a commercial point of view that the first Navigation Act was passed in the reign of Richard II., requiring that goods should be brought for import either in English bottoms or in the ships of the exporting country. The regulation was, in fact, so impracticable that it very soon became a dead letter. English sailors generally held their own in the narrow seas; but the great development of English shipping for all purposes was the work of the Tudor period.

VIII

SCOTLAND

Scottish history, while the houses of Lancaster and York were occupying the throne of England, is a somewhat dreary record. When Robert III. died, in 1406, his successor on the throne, James I., was a boy of eleven, and was, moreover, a captive in the hands of the English king. From that time until more than two hundred years afterwards, when Charles I. succeeded to the crown of Scotland and of England, every Scottish sovereign was a child when he or she succeeded to the crown, and only one was over twelve years of age. Of the whole series, not one attained to the age of five-and-forty except the last, James VI. of Scotland and I. of England. During the eighty years now under review there were three kings of Scotland. James I. spent the first eighteen years of his nominal reign in captivity; thirteen years after his return to Scotland he was murdered. James II. was then six years old; he was killed by the bursting of a cannon before he was thirty. James III. was eight years old, and was killed in a baronial revolt at the age of thirty-six, three years after the accession of the first Tudor. Each of the three reigns involved a long regency, and a regency commonly meant a prolonged struggle for ascendancy between baronial factions. Under such conditions no country could prosper, and history to a great extent degenerates into a record of deeds of violence.

When King Robert died, his brother, Robert, Duke of Albany—it will be remembered that the king's real name was John—became regent. He was already an old man, almost seventy years of age. Although he has been much vilified, the fourteen years of his rule as regent seem to show him as, on the whole, a praiseworthy administrator. The head and front of his offending was his failure to procure the liberation of his nephew and king; and it is not unreasonable to find for this some excuse in the fact that he failed also for ten years to procure the release of his own son, Murdach, who had been taken prisoner at Homildon Hill. Albany, in fact, managed to keep the peace among the barons, refused to tax the commons, and accomplished nothing serious to the detriment of England. The most notable event of his rule was the great battle of Harlaw, at which Donald, Lord of the Isles, met with a great defeat. The Isles, it must be remembered, were populated by Celts and Celticised Scandinavians; they had not definitely recognised the sovereignty of the King of Scots until the reign of Alexander III., and although the Lord of the Isles in Bruce's day had lent King Robert valuable assistance at Bannockburn, his descendants, and half Celtic Scotland, scarcely looked upon themselves as subjects of the Scots king, and only recognised a hazy sovereignty. If disunited

amongst themselves by tribal rivalries and divisions, still tradition, customs, race, and language set a wider gulf between them collectively and the Normanised "Saxons" of the south and east. The occasion of Donald's rising was a claim to the earldom of Ross; but it has been very commonly looked upon as a bid for Celtic supremacy. Donald raised a great Highland host, and was marching upon Aberdeen when he was met by Alexander Stewart, Earl of Mar. At the "Red Harlaw" there was a terrific slaughter; both sides claimed the victory; but the practical effect was that Donald retired, and the Highlands and Lowlands were never again pitted against each other until the days when the Highlanders were themselves the champions of the house of Stuart.

At the close of his long life, when Henry V. was bringing all northern France beneath his rule, Albany sent succours to the ancient ally of Scotland which played a creditable and valorous part in the French struggle. It was a Scottish force which inflicted the first great defeat upon the English at the battle of Baugé in 1420; it was Scottish troops that bore the brunt of the fighting when Bedford won his victories at Crévant and Verneuil; there were Scots with Joan of Arc at Pataye; and a Scottish historian has remarked, with justifiable pride, that the Scots alone were loyal to the Maid of Orleans to the last.

But all these doings came after the old Duke of Albany was dead. From 1420 to 1424 his incompetent son, Murdach, took his place as regent. Then James I. returned to his country to find it in a ghastly state of misrule and disorder, which he attributed, somewhat unjustly, to the iniquities of his uncle and cousin. His eighteen years in England had taught him a good deal; he resolved at all costs to restore order in his own land; and the first condition of doing so was to establish the royal authority over the turbulent nobility. The house of Albany was popular with the commons, and the king gained no general favour by striking at it. But the policy he adopted was to strike, and strike hard, at the most powerful and the most turbulent. Albany himself, and others of his kin with sundry of the leading nobles, were brought to the block. The king's arbitrary rule stirred up fierce personal animosities against him; but his hand was strong, and his aims were just, whatever may be thought of his methods. He was a vigorous legislator, and his primary objects were those of Henry I. in England—the establishment of a definite law, the diminution of the power of the baronage, some increase in the power of the commons to counterbalance the barons, and the strengthening of the crown. But he did not make himself popular, and he did incur bitter hostility. The result was a plot for his assassination, which was carried out at Perth. The band of murderers broke into the house where he was lying. The king was sitting with the queen and her ladies. He was unarmed, and at the noise of the assassins' approach was hastily concealed in a cellar under the floor. The murderers broke in, searched for him in vain, and retired; the king came out of his hiding-place. When they were heard returning, Catherine

Douglas—"Catherine Bar-lass"—thrust her arm through the staples of the door and held it while the king got back into the cellar; but that slender bolt did not prevent the door from being burst open. Again the room was searched, and the entry to the cellar was discovered. The armed assassins leapt down upon him; the king with his bare hands almost succeeded in slaying one of them, but was himself despatched by their daggers. There is a tragic fitness in the dramatic end of the king who sang his own love-romance in verse which has given him an assured place among the poets.

Among the Scottish nobility no house was so powerful, none held such wide domains, none possessed so high a reputation for knightly valour as that of Douglas. From the good Lord James, the "Black Douglas," the most picturesque of all the Bruce's comrades-in-arms, to the hero of Otterburn and the luckless warrior of Homildon Hill and Shrewsbury fight, the Douglasses were ever "bonny fighters." But in the reign of James II. the house of the Black Douglas waxed so powerful as to be a positive danger to the crown, and even, according to its enemies, to Scottish nationality; since the strife between the Stewart dynasty and its mighty vassal drove the latter into relations with England which at the best were compromising. During the greater part of the young king's minority, indeed, the Douglasses did not take the opportunity to strike for power. The struggle was rather between two high officials, Livingstone and Crichton, who only united for the purpose of striking down one of the Douglasses who threatened to obtain a personal ascendancy over the boy-king's mind. But when William Douglas succeeded to the earldom in 1443, the Douglas activities became ominous. William extended his own dominions by marriage so that half the Lowlands were under his sway; he procured an earldom also for his brother, and he made a "bond" with Crawford, the greatest of the northern earls. An outbreak of English border warfare in 1448 gave the Douglasses renewed opportunity for gaining prestige as soldiers. Over the Douglas domains the royal authority was practically ignored. In 1452, young James, being then just twenty, met his great feudatory with the apparent intention of effecting a reconciliation; but instead of doing so, he lost his temper and stabbed the earl with his own hand. From that moment the feud between the crown and the Douglasses became open. For the next three years something not unlike the English War of the Roses was going on in Scotland; but the conclusion was the overthrow of the great house of Douglas in 1455. By its downfall, another branch of the family, the "Red" Douglasses of Angus, who had supported the crown against the "Black" Douglasses, rose to the front rank.

During the next five years James ruled with vigour, and utilised the dissensions of York and Lancaster for operations against the English, at least whenever the Yorkists were dominant. It was while besieging Roxburgh, a fortress still held by the English, that James was killed in his thirtieth year by the explosion of a cannon. In spite of his wild deed when, at the age of twenty, James murdered William Douglas in a fit of

passion as Robert Bruce had slain the Red Comyn, he gave promise in the few years that remained of proving an exceedingly capable ruler ; but his premature death again plunged Scotland into the woes of a long regency.

Yet, for five years the country was governed with no little skill and statesmanship by Bishop Kennedy ; even after his death, matters went not altogether ill. Perhaps the most interesting event of these years was the marriage of the young king to Margaret of Denmark. Under the marriage treaty, Denmark handed over to Scotland the Orkneys and Shetlands, which had hitherto remained part of the Scandinavian dominions, in pledge of the payment of a considerable sum of money as the bride's dowry. The money was never paid, and thus the islands became part of the Scottish kingdom.

In fact, the whole period of the regency was not in itself disastrous ; but it did not have the same effect as the continuation of rule by a strong king such as James II. promised to be. Unhappily, James III. was not the man to carry out a strong policy. From the time when he came of age he fell into the hands of low-born favourites, despised as upstarts by the whole of the nobility. James himself was born out of due time, a lover of the arts and devoid of those qualities essential to a king who had to rule over a turbulent and warlike nobility and people. In the general dissatisfaction, the king's brother, the Duke of Albany, developed ambitious designs of taking James's place on the throne. He was driven from the country, and intrigued with Edward IV. for a restoration which was to give him the crown as a vassal of England. Instead of carrying out that plan, however, he effected a temporary reconciliation with his brother ; but the obvious hollowness of this drove him to renew his negotiations with Edward, and in 1483 he was in effect again expelled from Scotland. His death in France by an accident at a tournament relieved Scotland of this particular danger. The final disasters of James's reign befell only after Henry VII. had secured the English crown.

CHAPTER VIII

THE MIDDLE AGES

I

POLITICAL ASPECTS

THE landmark which British historians select as setting the boundary between the medieval and the modern is the accession of the house of Tudor. There was, in fact, no sudden and violent change at that particular moment. But in the hundred years or so of which 1485 is approximately the central point, events occurred and movements culminated which differentiate the medieval from the modern world. The political structure of Western Christendom was changed; the boundaries of the known world were expanded; the fetters by which intellectual progress had been bound were broken; and we may pause to inquire what were the characteristic features of what we call the Middle Ages which distinguish them from what we call modern times.

The first and most obvious fact is that Western Christendom was practically acquainted with only quarter of the Eastern Hemisphere, one-eighth of the world known to us to-day, namely, the western quarter lying north of the Equator. All that lay beyond was either a sheer blank or a region of travellers' tales and nothing more. To the inhabited world as known to the Romans was added during the Middle Ages so much of Europe as lies between the Baltic Sea and the Danube, together with Norway and Sweden. In short, the entire civilised world as known to Christendom meant Europe west of what is now Russia, Asia west of the Euphrates, and the Mediterranean coast of Africa.

These were the physical limitations whose disappearance differentiates the medieval from the modern. Next to it we must place a distinction of another kind. Medieval Europe was dominated by the Roman conception of the Empire as a universal political dominion, and by the Christian conception of the Church as a universal theocratic dominion; both involving the idea of the fundamental unity of Christendom in opposition to the common enemy, whether regarded as the barbarian from the political point of view or the infidel from the ecclesiastical. All Christendom, however, setting aside always the Greek Empire and the Greek Church, recognised vaguely one temporal head in the Emperor and one spiritual head in the Pope.

Closely associated with this, perhaps merely another aspect of it, is the fact that medievalism was the outcome of the collision between the elaborate civilisation of the Christianised Roman Empire and the tribal civilisation of the Teutonic barbarians. For the mixture of these two civilisations, resulting from the Teutonic conquest, produced Feudalism. A political organisation based on the Empire, a religious organisation based on the



An English knight in full caparison, 1345.

[Sir Geoffrey Luttrell and his wife, from the Luttrell Psalter.]

Papacy, and a social structure resting on Feudalism, were the fundamental bases of medievalism. .

Next, if we seek to discover what was the fundamental medieval conception of the function of government, we shall find it in the compulsory subordination of the interests of individual persons or communities to the interests of the community in general, as conceived by those in whom the power was vested—a qualification of no small importance. In the medieval idea, there is practically no limit to the right of intervention by fully constituted authority. It is by universal assent warranted in carrying the interference and regulation down to the minutest details. It may regulate a man's clothes, the prices at which he sells or buys labour or goods, his

employment, his very thoughts. There is no question in the medieval mind that authority possesses this right ; though the power to enforce it may be wanting. The modern problems as to the limits of State interference had not suggested themselves. The question which did arise was a different one—whether the authority which claimed the right was precisely the authority which possessed it ; to which the answer could often be ascertained only by an appeal to force. In the language of modern political science, the question where the sovereignty resided was in constant dispute, because the relative amounts of physical force under the control of the different claimants to authority were open to doubt. The one indisputable fact was that the superior control of physical force did not lie with the masses of the population, and therefore the sovereignty did not reside in them. The conflict as to sovereignty still continues in modern times, but on somewhat different lines.

Most notable in the Middle Ages was the political conflict between the ecclesiastical and the temporal claims. The Spiritual endeavoured to dominate the Secular authority ; the Church claimed to control the State. For two hundred years, from Hildebrand to Boniface VIII., the Popes very nearly made good their claim. For another two hundred years they did not surrender it. But the Reformation and the counter-Reformation taken together left the Papacy wholly without control over temporal affairs outside the States of the Church in Italy. As between the secular and the spiritual powers, the question was no longer whether the State should submit to being treated as in bondage to the Church, but whether the Church should be treated as in bondage to the State.

Thus in the medieval world the primary conflict of authorities was that between the spiritual and the secular, the Church and the State, which in modern times, at least in the leading States of Europe, fell completely into the background. But in the field of religion itself there was no such conflict. The modern spirit seeks to distinguish between matters which are and matters which are not proper objects for the compelling intervention of authority ; and in the modern view authority has nothing to say to the private opinions of the individual. What he believes or disbelieves concerns no one but himself, so long, at least, as he does not force his views upon his neighbours. Moreover, what a man believes is that which satisfies his reason ; you cannot make him believe or disbelieve to order ; you can only control his professions. He himself even cannot force himself to believe what he would like to believe. But in the medieval view, false opinions were a proof of moral obliquity. As concerned religion at least, authority pronounced upon the truth absolutely, and no one could be permitted to question its pronouncement. Nor was there any doubt where the authority lay. Rome was the final Court of Appeal. The Reformation was in one of its aspects the repudiation of Rome as the ultimate authority, whether the reformers substituted for it the authority of the Scriptures, or of the Church Universal, or recognised no appeal except to human reason. In

the field of religion the change from medievalism was one from the acceptance of an established ultimate authority to a conflict of authorities or to the repudiation of all authority.

The second conflict was that between the crown and the great nobles, between the centralising and the centrifugal forces; the crown always seeking to extend the single authority over a wide area, the baronage commonly seeking to preserve a congeries of practically independent units with a single supreme untrammelled authority in each. This is crossed by a separate contest on the part of the cities to set up a distinct authority of their own. This battle was not fully fought out during the Middle Ages, and in Britain it followed a course markedly different from that which it took on the Continent. But in the main it stands true that the fundamental political struggle was that between the centralising pressure of



A Royal carriage and its escort about 1480.

the crown and the disintegrating pressure of feudalism; in which centralisation carried the day, but usually, outside of Britain, left monarchy and aristocracy in close alliance and mutual dependence. Thence arose the modern conflict between the monarchy joined with the aristocracy on the one hand, and on the other the commons of the middle class, and ultimately the proletariat, tending to transfer the seat of authority from the former to the latter.

The foregoing generalisations with regard to the Middle Ages must be qualified when we turn our attention to particular countries, and especially in the case of our own country. Geographical conditions kept the British Isles apart from the rest of Western Christendom as they had kept them apart from the Roman Empire. Britain was never completely Romanised, and the Teutonic invader did not in effect find himself in contact with Roman civilisation. Roman influences hardly touched him, and his isolation prevented him from being materially affected by the changes in the Teutonic civilisation of the Continent. The English


stood outside the new Holy Roman or German Empire more completely than the Britons had remained outside the old Roman Empire. To a greater degree they were brought within the ecclesiastical dominion of the Holy See, but still in a very much less degree than their continental neighbours. A Saxon king of England could appropriate to himself the imperial title of "Basileus," implying a claim to equality with the Emperor, and a Pope could designate the Archbishop of Canterbury, "*papa alterius orbis*," implying at least what in a secular dominion would be called vice-regal authority. To the English, as to every one else, the Pope and the Emperor were the two heads of Christendom by courtesy; but the Pope exercised hardly any direct authority, and the Emperor none at all. Thus the people of these islands were able to follow out their development in comparative isolation on national lines, modified but not absorbed by the political organisation of the Empire, the ecclesiastical organisation of the Papacy, and the social structure of continental Feudalism.

Accident united the North English to the Celtic kingdom of the Scots, and drew a dividing line between Scotland and England, from Solway to Tweed mouth; so that Scotland and England developed their nationality separately, while both stood outside the general current which was moulding Europe. Neither the Norman Conquest nor the Angevin Succession bridged the English Channel or effectively destroyed the isolation which enabled them to consolidate their nationality apart. To some extent the Scandinavian kingdoms also remained apart; that is, as States they remained outside the borders of the Empire, though they planted their colonies not only in England, Scotland, and Ireland, but in France, in Sicily, and in Southern Italy. The aggression of the Scandinavians, however, ceased after the eleventh century.

But the national idea was not confined to the British Isles and Scandinavia, the two great divisions which never came within the boundaries of the Empire. During the Middle Ages, France too became an individual nation and the Spanish Peninsula was also nationalised. Both France and Northern Spain were included in the Empire of Charlemagne; and it was only when the Carolingian dynasty which ruled over the western portion of the Frankish dominion gave place to the dynasty of the Capets that France was definitely and permanently separated from the Empire. And France was then already completely in the grip of the feudal system. Hence the consolidation both of England and of Scotland long preceded the consolidation of France. It was not till after the final expulsion of the English that the process was completed. Almost at the same time the similar process was completed in the Spanish Peninsula. The union of the crowns of Aragon and Castile, and the overthrow of the Moorish kingdom of Granada, shaped the Peninsula into the two greater and smaller nations of Spain and Portugal, somewhat as the island of Great Britain had been shaped into the greater and smaller nations of England and Scotland. Thus there were at the last three great national States on the west of Europe,

besides Scotland and Portugal. But a like process of consolidation had not taken place in Central Europe. Germany was still only a collection of Teutonic States professing allegiance and a very limited obedience to one Emperor ; while Italy was a collection of small Latin States, individually far in advance of the rest of the world in culture, but without any effective sense of common nationality. The republic of Venice had built up a great maritime power, and her fleets were still one of the bulwarks of Europe against the Ottoman Turks, who, in 1453, finally overthrew the Byzantine Empire when they captured Constantinople ; but though she might fairly be called an imperial city, Venice did not constitute a nation.

At the very close of our period, Charles the Rash of Burgundy endeavoured to build up what we should call another first-class Power. With the Netherlands and the Burgundies already under his dominion, it was his ambition to construct a heterogeneous kingdom which should extend from the North Sea to the Mediterranean. That design was frustrated, and Provence, as well as the Duchy of Burgundy, was absorbed into France. But what happened instead in the course of the next fifty years was that the Austrian House of Hapsburg built up for its members through a series of marriages a huge dominion which comprised the Austrian duchies of South Germany, the Magyar and Slavonic kingdoms of Hungary and Bohemia, the whole Burgundian inheritance, the Spanish kingdom, and some slices of Italy, besides permanently appropriating the succession to the imperial crown. Although this vast dominion with its numerous nationalities was parted between two branches of the house of Hapsburg, it not only expanded the Spanish dominion, but made the Austrian Hapsburgs a first-class Power exercising a dominant influence over the States of Germany. Consequently, international politics assumed a phase unknown in the medieval period ; so that the keynote of European diplomacy came to be found in the phrase, "the Balance of Power."



A complete suit of Gothic armour, about 1470.

[From the Wallace Collection.]

That is to say, while each State sought a preponderance for itself, it sought also to keep the other States equally balanced. Hitherto England had been concerned only in her private contests with France or with Scotland; now she became concerned to prevent either France or the Hapsburgs from dominating Europe.

Since England was so far the first to consolidate her own nationality, it naturally resulted that she progressed in constitutional development at a very much greater speed than the European States. The conflict of authority between the Papacy and the Crown was less acute because England was out of reach of the Papacy itself, and the ecclesiastical organisation in England was at once less under Papal control and less able to challenge the supremacy of the secular power. In England, never completely surrendered to feudalism, the Crown was able at an earlier stage to concentrate power in its own hands. The baronage in their resistance to absolutism became the champions of popular rights as well as of the privileges of their own order. The Crown followed suit, and in its resistance to baronial encroachments extended the popular rights. And thus at the close of the Middle Ages, England was the one State in which the next constitutional battle was to be fought with the sovereignty of the Commons as the stake; because it was the one State in which the Commons had already accumulated a solid and tangible authority.

II


SOCIAL ASPECTS

When we turn to the social aspect of the Middle Ages, we find ourselves contemplating an era of violent contrasts; of supreme picturesqueness and of extreme discomfort; of gorgeous display and of sordid squalor; of consummate courtesy and of utter pitilessness; of high saintliness and of bestial grossness; of the faith that knows no fear but that of God, and of the superstition in which fear of the Devil is ever dominant. Side by side we see Joan of Arc in her sublime purity and the degraded terrors of her murderers; beside Anselm, William Rufus; the Black Prince serving at his royal prisoner's table and massacring the inhabitants of Limoges.

The contrasts of the Middle Ages are more vivid than those of the present day, not because they were more real, but because they stood in closer proximity. In modern times we compare the conditions of class and class, the luxurious ease of the wealthy with the destitution of the slums. The Middle Ages knew no such wealth, no such luxury, and no such destitution, at least in England. The contrasts of medieval life are of a different order; they are those between its public and its private aspects; between the gorgeousness and what would be to our eyes the meanness of its different phases. The mail-clad knight rode abroad in glittering armour,

but he did not habitually sleep in a bed. He carved the casques of the foe-man with flashing steel, but he ate his dinner with his fingers. The castle or the manor-house owned a spacious hall, but no other apartment which deserved to be called much more than a closet; and few indeed were they who enjoyed the privacy of a separate chamber. Hunting and hawking were joyous pastimes when woods and fields were green and the days were long; but when the sluggard sun rose late and set early, and the hall was lighted with torches, the time was apt to hang heavily in spite of the occasional diversion supplied by some wandering jongleur. A time came when commerce expanded and bur-gesses waxed wealthy, but they would seem for the most part to have had little idea of spending their wealth except on an ostentatious display in costly apparel and rich decorations intended for the public eye, and to have taken very little thought for the amenities or even what we should call the decencies of personal comfort.

Of the whole population only a small proportion dwelt in cities, and even of these a substantial part were occupied in tilling the borough lands. The great bulk of the population was engaged upon agriculture, and how they fared we have little means of knowing with any certainty. The land under ordinary conditions was self-sufficing; that is to say, in normal seasons it produced a sufficiency of grain to feed the entire population. The small peasant-holdings and the common waste lands enabled the smallest peasants to keep their poultry, their pigs, and their cow; and in normal seasons there was little destitution. But a modern labourer in decently steady employment would certainly be better housed, and would regard as practical necessities luxuries which his medieval ancestor never heard of. The most notable change between the medieval and the modern conditions of working-class life is that which set in with the beginnings of the Industrial Revolution only a century and a half ago, a change which created a vast city population; but the one point in respect of which the modern working-man is infinitely and indisputably better off than his medieval predecessors is in the disappearance of those pestilences like the Black Death, whose recurrence in Europe sanitary science seems now to have rendered practically impossible.




An English knight of 1400.

It remains to touch upon the two features of the Middle Ages which appeal most vividly and picturesquely to the imagination. The Middle Ages were the days of the monks and of the armoured knights. During the sixteenth century the knights armed in full panoply disappeared; monasteries and nunneries were suppressed wholesale, or, as in England, vanished altogether; the clergy, regular and secular, ceased to be a prominently picturesque element.

But throughout the ages which preceded the Reformation the monas-

teries were not merely picturesque; they performed functions which were of vital importance. When authority failed to enforce law and order, when violence defied control, the monastery and the convent gave shelter and protection against lawless tyranny. When war and the chase provided almost the only living interests for men of gentle blood, art and learning could still find shelter and encouragement in abodes dedicated to religion and to peace; though the scope of both was rigidly limited, if not actually to the service of religion at least to fields which religion regarded as



A MS. representation of a house.
[From a 14th century romance.]

serviceable. It was the clerks who kept alive the study of law, of philosophy, and of science, though these latter especially were strictly subordinated to theology. To the clerks in the main we are indebted for historical records. And, finally, the Church was the one institution in which, theoretically at least, class distinctions disappeared, and even in practice humble birth was not a bar to high achievement; the one institution also which, whether wisely or unwisely, provided relief for the destitute and needy.

The glory of the mail-clad knight belonged to the days when victories were won in the shock of hand-to-hand fighting and sheer weight was irresistible. He was already doomed when it was found that neither he nor his horse could be protected against the clothyard shafts of the English archer. Defensive armour became so appallingly heavy that it produced immobility, and at last gave the light-armed man the advantage even in hand-to-hand fighting, as was illustrated at the battle of Agincourt. But even more fatal to him, and fatal too in the long run to the archer, was the progressive use of gunpowder. Down to the close of the fifteenth century gunpowder was practically useless in the field, although at Crécy the English had some primitive cannon which they fired off—to the alarm of the Frenchmen's horses, but otherwise apparently without doing any damage. But in siege operations gunpowder was

already playing an important part in the wars of Henry V., and hand-guns are heard of in the War of the Roses. Henceforth, Hotspur's "villainous saltpetre" had to be reckoned with to a rapidly increasing extent, and long before the end of the Tudor period the art and practice of gunnery had become a decisive factor in fighting by land and by sea.

III

INTELLECTUAL ASPECTS

The Middle Ages are, not quite without warrant, condemned as an era of intellectual stagnation, a period with no art, no literature, no science, and no philosophy. The best literature of the ancient world was lost, its temples and its statues were buried in ruins; its pagan philosophies had been ruled out by ecclesiastical dogmas which imposed rigid limitations upon all inquiring spirits, and stamped as impious all investigation of phenomena for which the Church found a supernatural origin, or such as threatened to throw doubt upon her authoritative pronouncements. Knowledge and discovery are necessarily bounded by the limitations of the human intellect; but to these were added the artificial limitations of theological dogmas.



A puppet-show.

Intellectual stagnation, however, is after all an incorrect description of the result. Stagnation is the antithesis of activity, and there was no absence of intellectual activity. Sterility rather than stagnation is the correct word, because the activities were directed into unproductive channels. Nevertheless, revolt had begun long before the fifteenth century; and the British Isles can claim to have been the birthplace of men who gave a great stimulus to intellectual emancipation. Such were Duns Scotus in the latter half of the thirteenth century, as to whom it is uncertain whether his birthplace was in Ireland or in Scotland or the north of England; William Occam, an Englishman who was possibly a pupil of Duns Scotus; and John Wiclif, the pioneer of the Reformation. Even more remarkable than any of these was Roger Bacon, the Franciscan friar, the pupil and friend of the great Bishop Grossetete, the greatest among the pioneers of scientific inquiry, who indeed deserves to be called the father of modern science; the prophet of the great doctrine that religious truth cannot suffer from the increase of scientific knowledge. But in the Middle Ages no man could be more than a pioneer. Emancipation did not arrive until the sixteenth century. Until then, the too independent thinker was assured of condemnation

as a heretic, and the scientific experimentalist of condemnation as a necromancer.

Art, too, was almost restricted to the service of religion, and in that service one branch of it flourished. Architecture found scope in the building of churches and cathedrals; upon them piety lavished wealth, labour, and imagination. The monk, too, in his cloister could glorify God by producing masterpieces of decorative penmanship and wonders of illumination. The art of the painter revived in Italy, but it was still confined to the service of the Church and to subjects which tended to edification. Beyond Italy it hardly spread, and in England was practically unknown.

A people may do without art, but literature of some kind it must have, if only in the shape of folk-tales, folk-songs, and war-songs. But a national literature implies a national language, and that which is preserved by oral tradition alone can only be exceedingly limited. An English literature had not come into existence before the Norman Conquest, except in the form of the songs of the countryside and the ballads, of which only fragments survived in writing; such as the song of the primitive hero Beowulf, the poem of the monastic servitor Cædmon who sang of the beginning of things, the battle lays of Brunanburh and Maldon preserved in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. The men who wrote, wrote in Latin almost exclusively. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is the only prose monument of pre-Conquest English, and that is a mere compilation.

After the Conquest there was not for a very long time a national language; that is to say, the tongue of the ruling classes was Norman-French, and English was the language only of the common folk. The learned wrote neither English nor Norman-French, but Latin. Geoffrey of Monmouth and Walter Map collected and embroidered, or invented, legends concerning King Arthur and others, lively romances to which they were pleased to give the name of history, but their Latin tales did not constitute English literature. Something which deserves to be called the beginning of English literature appeared when the monk Layamon reproduced in an English poem, *Brut*, certain of the same legends. Brut was the mythical Trojan hero who gave his name to the islands of Britain. Layamon's poem was written in the reign of King John. Then for another century and a half the only literature which could be called popular consisted of French romances, prototypes of those which some centuries later perturbed the brain of Don Quixote. England, indeed, produced a real literary figure in the person of one of the best of medieval historians, Matthew Paris; but he, like other men of learning, wrote not in the vernacular but in Latin.

When the fourteenth century arrived, England was ceasing to be bilingual. If Norman-French was the language of the court, English modified by Norman-French had nevertheless become the common language of the gentry and of the common people. Moreover, the intellectual revival of Italy had just blossomed into sudden glory with Dante, and Dante was succeeded by Petrarch and Boccaccio. A wave of culture flowed over



The Hierarchy of the Sciences as conceived by Medieval Thought.

[From the Berri Bible.]

Europe, and the last half of the fourteenth century saw the creation of a true English Literature by William Langland, John Wiclif, and Geoffrey Chaucer in England, and Bishop Barbour in Scotland—for English is the only name which can properly be applied to the literary language of Scotland as well as of England. Wiclif's rendering of the New Testament was the foundation of all subsequent English versions of the Scriptures. In William Langland the people of England first found a spokesman, though in the *Vision of Piers Plowman* his moral scourge spared the peasant no



Geoffrey Chaucer.

[From a contemporary MS. in the British Museum.]

more than the upper ranks of society. Bishop Barbour was no great poet, yet there is often a fine spirit in the verse wherein he recorded the story of the liberation of Scotland, and the high deeds of his hero the Bruce. But in the literary hierarchy, none is on the same plane with Geoffrey Chaucer, the first master "maker" in the English tongue, who for nearly two hundred years remained without a peer.

Langland, Wiclif, and Barbour all wrote in dialect; Chaucer set the standard of English as a literary language. For generations to come he was the master, and all men who attempted to write poetry were his disciples, however far behind him they might lag. But Chaucer is not merely a craftsman in words, a magician in language; not merely a

consummate story-teller; not merely a poet "as fresh as is the month of May," like his own "squyer," clean and sweet, overflowing with joyous vitality, with broad human sympathy, tender and humorous. Chaucer has painted for us the men and women of his day, the typical gathering which assembled for the Canterbury Pilgrimage, in such wise that they are as living and real as if we had met them, touched them, seen them with our own eyes, heard them talk with our own ears. They are alive now every one of them; somewhat differently clothed of course, modified by somewhat different conventions and by differences in the material circumstances of life. The eternal human types belong to the twentieth century no less than to the fourteenth. But when the types are presented to us in medieval array, as they lived and moved five hundred years ago, the Middle Ages become as living and real as the twentieth century. Those familiar faces and figures make their surroundings real and actual. We are no longer guessing what sort of person a knight might have been or was likely

to be ; what manner of a man was a parish priest, a rural squire, a merchant ; what a prioress was like or a bourgeoisie dame of independent means. We know them all, and knowing them we see also that, after all, it is merely the superficial accidents of life that have changed, not its fundamental conditions.

There is another author of the fourteenth century who should not be passed by, the ingenious traveller, Sir John Mandeville, who indeed really led the way in the writing of English prose. For although he originally wrote the story of his travels, of what he had seen, and of what other travellers told him of what they had seen, in Latin, yet he employed the leisure of his later years in translating his work first into French and then into English. The work is not without its value, as a record of Sir John's personal experiences, but still more so as a demonstration of the unbounded credulity of the age. Marvels which would have awakened the genial scepticism of

T O the right noble / right excellent & vertuous prince
George duc of Clarence Erle of warwopk. and of
salsburpe / grete Chamberlajn of Englande & lieutenant
of Irelande oldest broder of kynge Edward by the grace
of godd kynge of Englande and of france.

A specimen of Caxton's printing.

[From the introduction to the "Book of Chess," 1475.]

Herodotus were cheerfully accepted without question by the English traveller.

English literature burst into full blossom with Chaucer, but after Chaucer there came in England for a century and a half none but the most pedestrian of poets. Worthier successors than Lydgate and Gower were born in the northern kingdom, and chief among them the royal poet James I. His claim to the authorship of the *Kingis Quair* has been challenged, but is not to be surrendered without more conclusive proofs than have yet been produced. King James learnt in the school of Chaucer ; it is enough to say that he was a pupil of whom Chaucer himself would have been proud. The name of Robert Henryson also stands high above that of any contemporary English poet.

But although poetry languished, and although the *Morte Arthur* of Sir Thomas Mallory is the one great English prose work of the fifteenth century, the impulse to literary expression was at work. Men began to say in English what a century before they would assuredly have written in Latin if at all. The dispersion of Greek scholarship with the fall of Constantinople in 1453 had something of the effect of an intellectual revelation. And yet, after all, the enormous impulse to the literary production of the centuries which followed was hardly so much the intellectual as the

mechanical one. About the year 1440, Guthenberg in Germany invented the printing-press with movable types, which made possible the multiplication of books, and by its development created a supply of which was begotten an ever-increasing demand. Books were brought within the reach of the many instead of being procurable only by the very few. The last quarter of the fifteenth century saw the introduction of the great invention into England, when, under the patronage of Edward IV., William Caxton set up his printing-press in Westminster Abbey.

BOOK III

THE AGE OF TRANSITION

CHAPTER IX


HENRY VII

I

PROBLEMS OF THE DYNASTY

ON the field of Bosworth, Henry Tudor, Earl of Richmond, was hailed as King Henry VII. Every king of England for three hundred years had been a Plantagenet; had been, that is to say, a direct descendant in the male line from Henry II. This was true even of the Yorkist kings, since the father of Richard, Duke of York, was the son of Edmund of York, who

DESCENDANTS OF JOHN OF GAUNT




was the younger brother of John of Gaunt. Now there was a new dynasty; and the fundamental fact of Henry VII.'s reign was the king's need for securing that dynasty.

Now, if succession through females was barred, Henry could have no claim; for it was through his mother, Margaret Beaufort, that he was descended from John of Gaunt. The heir to the throne in that case was the Earl of Warwick, the son of George of Clarence, the only living Plantagenet prince. If the succession of a female but not the claim through a female was barred, as was argued when Edward III claimed the Crown

of France, the house of York still had the priority over the house of Lancaster because it descended in the female line from Lionel of Clarence, the elder brother of John of Gaunt. On that hypothesis the De la Poles, the sons of Suffolk and of Elizabeth, sister of Edward IV., stood next to Warwick, or before him if he was excluded by the attainder of his father. If a woman in person could succeed to the Crown, the first claim lay with Elizabeth, daughter of Edward IV., and after her with her numerous sisters in order. Further, as a matter of fact, if the descent through females was not barred, there were other descendants of John of Gaunt senior to the Beauforts, apart from the doubt whether the legitimation of that family in the reign of Richard II. covered the claim to succession in any case. Ralph Neville, Earl of Westmoreland, was descended through his mother from the full sister of Henry IV. The royal houses of Castile and of

DESCENDANTS OF RICHARD OF YORK



Portugal might be barred as aliens, but both descended from daughters of John of Gaunt, and this claim was actually to be asserted a hundred years later.

In all these circumstances, it is obvious that Henry could not claim the throne unless by right of conquest or by parliamentary title, like Henry IV. himself. But if he married Elizabeth of York, then the only living person who could challenge the title of their offspring would be the young Earl of Warwick. Therefore, in the first place, Henry made haste to secure a parliamentary title for himself. The first point was that he himself should be personally and authoritatively recognised as *de jure* king of England against all other claimants. For this reason he delayed his marriage with Elizabeth of York until 1486, lest it should be pretended that he reigned only as her consort; and he deferred her coronation for another year. But that marriage appeared to ensure complete security to his offspring, except possibly as against Warwick. And Warwick himself was held a secure prisoner in the Tower.

Nevertheless, Henry's succession was obviously a triumph for the Lancastrian faction, and it was quite certain that there would be attempts

on the part of the Yorkist faction to overthrow him. And it is to be remarked in this connection, that Henry himself had given colour to the doctrine that a woman was personally barred from the succession by taking the crown for himself and not for his own mother. Yorkist plots were certain to be fomented and fostered in the court of Edward IV.'s sister, Margaret of Burgundy, the widow of Charles the Rash and step-mother (not mother) of his heirs, who was prepared to go to any lengths to overthrow the usurper. Margaret did not, however, herself control Burgundian policy, though as dowager she held her own court and enjoyed her own estates.

In a position so open to challenge, it was not enough for Henry that he should reign by grace of parliament, which might withdraw its favour. It was indeed of first-rate importance that he should retain its favour, but the necessity remained for concentrating effective power in his own hands. Such a concentration of power was comparatively a simple matter for Edward IV. in his later years, when he reigned by a quite indisputable title. It was by no means so easy for a king whose title was so uncertain as Henry's. Henry therefore was faced with a constitutional problem which the house of Lancaster had failed to solve successfully.

Moreover, Henry had before him in a new field problems which had to be faced by all statesmen after his time, but had not presented themselves to his predecessors. Spain, by the union of the Crowns of Castile and Aragon, had created a new power. Maximilian, king of the Romans, the son and heir of the Hapsburg German Emperor, had married Mary, the daughter of Charles of Burgundy. She was now dead; but the Burgundian inheritance passed to Philip, the child of this marriage; and Philip would also be the heir of Maximilian. The consolidation of France had been almost completed by Louis XI. Thus there had come into being a group of great powers with diverse and conflicting interests. An international diplomacy was called for which was without precedent; a new European system was coming into being; and England had to take up her place in that system.

II

THE REIGN OF HENRY VII.

Henry had not been long on the throne before there was an insurrection headed by Lord Lovel, who had been a partisan of Richard III. It was suppressed without difficulty. The birth of a son, Arthur, at the end of 1486, served as an incentive to the Yorkists. A youth named Lambert Simnel appeared in Ireland, claiming to be the Earl of Warwick. Ireland was chosen because the house of York had always been popular in that country, where several of its members had been Lieutenants; and the support of the most powerful of the nobility there could be relied upon.

Margaret of Burgundy and John de la Pole, Earl of Lincoln, espoused the cause of the pretender; although Henry paraded the real Earl of Warwick through the streets of London to show that he was not in Ireland at all. Lincoln joined Simnel, and with a following consisting mainly of Irishmen and German mercenaries landed in England. The rebellion was crushed at the battle of Stoke, where Lincoln was killed and Simnel was taken prisoner. Henry, however, adopted the craftily lenient policy



Henry VII.

[From a contemporary bust by an Italian artist.]

upon which he habitually acted. He avoided bloodshed; opposition was smoothed away by his apparent benignity; but fines and forfeitures at once filled Henry's own treasury and crippled his enemies for further activity. Lambert Simnel, a youth of humble birth, was relegated to appropriate service in the royal kitchens. The neutrality, if not always the active support, of the greatest of the Irish nobles, Kildare, was ensured when he found his own complicity in the rebellion ignored, and himself permitted to retain the office of Deputy, that is, of acting-Lieutenant, in Ireland.

Another insurrection on behalf of the captive Warwick or of the De la Pole brothers was improbable. The years immediately following the Simnel fiasco

were mainly occupied with international politics. Henry was extremely anxious to strengthen his own position by an alliance with the Spanish sovereigns, because he expected Spain to become the leading European power, while it was also one whose interests were not likely to conflict with his own. But to Spain, England was useful mainly if not entirely as a check upon France, and her value depended largely on the stability of the new dynasty, which was exceedingly dubious. Ferdinand of Aragon and Henry of England were men of the same type; very crafty, very unscrupulous, very proud of overreaching a neighbour in a bargain, but with a shrewd perception of exactly how far it was safe to go in trickery;

while each could gauge pretty accurately the precise extent to which the other was dependent on his aid. Neither could afford to quarrel with the other, but each wanted to get out of the other as much as he possibly could, and to give as little as he possibly could in return. During the first half of Henry's reign he was more in need of Ferdinand than Ferdinand was in need of him, and one-sided bargains were struck in favour of Spain. At a later stage, when the Tudor dynasty was thoroughly secured, the bargaining turned in favour of England so far as positive engagements were concerned; but both monarchs evinced a surprising skill and plausibility in evading their respective obligations.

Henry wanted a Spanish princess to be betrothed to his own infant son. Spain's price was the active intervention of Henry to prevent the French Crown from absorbing under its control the duchy of Brittany, which now alone of the great feudatory States was almost independent. Henry, forced into open war with France, on behalf of the young Duchess Anne, made use of his needs to obtain generous supplies from his parliaments while he carefully shirked the expenditure either of money or of blood. The Spaniards, on the other hand, found in their contest with the Moorish kingdom of Granada a sufficient excuse for abstaining from active operations in Brittany. Henry's own military operations were restricted to the occupation and garrisoning of sundry fortresses in Brittany, although he was careful to seek popularity for the war among his subjects by pretending to reassert the claim of his predecessors to the Crown of France. But the affair of Brittany was practically settled by the marriage of the youthful King of France, Charles VIII., to the still more youthful Duchess of Brittany. Henry demanded indemnities and compensation before he would evacuate the Brittany fortresses; he made ostentatious preparations for carrying on the war on a great scale, collecting a substantial war-fund. But Charles VIII., being practically secure of Brittany, was now chiefly anxious to carry out ambitious schemes in Italy; so by the Peace of Étapes he bought Henry off at his own price—which was paid in hard cash. The King of England did not again find it necessary to enter upon a foreign war; and the net results of the whole business were that he had filled his treasury and secured for his sagacity the respect of Spanish rulers, with whom he was henceforth able to bargain upon more equal terms.

But he had not done with Yorkist plots. That faction, having no living candidate whom they could put forward with a reasonable chance of success, endeavoured to resuscitate a dead one. If Richard, Duke of York, the younger of the two princes murdered in the Tower, had not been murdered at all but was actually at large, he was unquestionably the legitimate king of England. Nobody could prove that he had actually been murdered. Richard, Duke of York, "Richard IV." of England, came to life as a matter of course in Ireland. According to the confession subsequently put into his mouth, he was Peter Osbeck, familiarly known as Perkin Warbeck, the son of a boatman of Tournai. He had been care-

fully educated to personate the murdered prince. He succeeded in obtaining recognition not only from Margaret of Burgundy, but for a time from the French Court, and afterwards still more definitely and completely from young King James IV. of Scotland, who married him to a kinswoman of his own, which he would certainly not have done unless he had honestly believed that Perkin's claim was genuine.

Perkin appeared in Ireland in 1491, and of course found favour with the Yorkist nobility of that country. But there was no attempt at an



The Hundred Men's Hall at St. Cross, near Winchester.

[An early 16th century hall.]

immediate insurrection in his favour, and in 1492 he was received at the French Court, at the moment when Henry was threatening a great invasion. Charles, however, had no hesitation in dismissing him in order to secure the Peace of Étampes, and Perkin betook himself to Margaret in Burgundy. There his education for the rôle of Richard of York

was completed. There also the Yorkist plots were concocted—and were duly reported to Henry by his own secret agents. Just when they seemed to be coming to a head, the king struck down the principal conspirators in England, including Sir William Stanley, who at Bosworth had commanded the division which secured the victory to Henry.

This was at the beginning of 1495. In the summer, Warbeck was rash enough to sail from Flanders and attempt a landing in Kent, where he was very thoroughly beaten off. Then he tried Ireland, but found that the unusually capable governor, Sir Edward Poynings, had the country too well in hand; and he went off to James IV. in Scotland. James's favour carried him so far that in 1496 he raided England, but still there was no rising in England on Perkin's behalf. Then the Scots king's zeal cooled, and the adventurer again betook himself to Ireland. But the Scots raid had given Henry an excuse for raising a subsidy for national defence; and the folk of Cornwall had a strong objection to being taxed for the protection of the northern counties against the Scots. The Cornishmen rose and marched up to London to demand the removal of "the king's evil coun-

sellors." When they got to Blackheath they fell an easy prey to the Royalist troops. Large numbers of them fell in the futile battle, but the survivors were pardoned with the exception of three ringleaders.

The Cornishmen were under the unfortunate impression that this leniency was a sign of weakness on the part of the king. It was just at this moment that Perkin left Scotland for Ireland. The Cornishmen invited him to come over. He came; but the country did not rise in his favour; on the contrary, the gentry of Devon took arms for the king. Perkin deserted his

followers and took sanctuary at Beaulieu, where he was soon induced to surrender. On his usual principles, Henry put very few of the rebels to death, but accumulated a useful harvest of fines and confiscations. The pretender himself was forced to read a public confession of his imposture, and was then placed in a by no means rigid confinement. A year later he attempted to escape, and this led to

his imprisonment in the Tower, where the unlucky Warwick was also shut up. The two young men were allowed or induced to concoct a fresh conspiracy, or what passed for a conspiracy; when it was "detected" Perkin was hanged and Warwick was beheaded. The Yorkists had no one to fall back upon except the De la Poles, of whom the eldest was now Earl of Suffolk, and was unlikely to prove a dangerous pretender. It had become perfectly clear at last that the Tudor was impregnably established on the throne of England.

A series of marriages and deaths now claim our attention. Joanna, the second daughter and ultimately the heiress of Ferdinand and Isabella, was married in 1496 to the Archduke, Philip of Burgundy, the son of Maximilian. This was to have the effect of joining the Burgundian with the Spanish heritage under the sway of the child of the marriage, Charles—who became famous as the Emperor Charles V.—although the Austrian heritage was transferred to his brother, Ferdinand. This marriage made Henry the more urgent in desiring the union of the younger daughter, Katharine of Aragon, to his own heir, Arthur, Prince of Wales. The marriage treaties were a matter of long haggling and dispute. Six months after the marriage was actually completed, in 1501, Arthur died, and the



The political Game of Cards: a contemporary French satire on the European situation about 1500.

second son, Henry, became heir to the throne. At once it became a primary object with the king to secure Katharine for the young Henry. Such a marriage was contrary to canon law, and there was no wholly satisfactory precedent for a papal dispensation in a precisely similar case. Nevertheless, a dispensation was actually obtained from Pope Julius II., on the ground that the marriage was never consummated; still, the wedding did not actually take place until after the accession of Henry VIII.

The next marriage which had an important bearing on subsequent history was that which Henry negotiated between his eldest daughter, Margaret, and James IV. of Scotland. James had made himself troublesome over the affair of Perkin Warbeck, and Henry was anxious to provide by the marriage a permanent basis for friendly relations with the Northern Kingdom; nor did he shrink from recognising the ultimate possibility, realised a hundred years afterwards,



A shilling of Henry VII.

[Called a testoon from the fact of the head being, for the first time, in profile.]

that an actual union of the Crowns might some day result. So James Stuart married Margaret Tudor, and their great-grandson, James VI. of Scotland, became also, in 1603, James I. of England. Henry, however, failed to obtain from James a decisive promise of the dissolution of the long-standing alliance between Scotland and France.

The death of Henry's own wife, Elizabeth of York, removed from him one who seems always to have exercised a beneficial influence on his moral character. Both Henry and Ferdinand of Aragon conspicuously degenerated, morally, after the death of their respective wives. In Archbishop Morton also Henry had lost an admirable minister, whose influence had probably checked the development of the sordid side of his character. The closing years of Henry's life were mean and ugly, and colour unduly the popular impressions of his whole reign. To them belong unsavoury records of extortion and corruption, and records still more unsavoury; as of the king's possible design of himself marrying his widowed daughter-in-law, and his undoubted proposal to marry her sister Joanna when she had become a widow by the death of Philip of Burgundy, although all the world knew that she was insane.

For full fifteen years of his reign Henry's record had been emphatically a clean one, marred only at its close by a single act of gross injustice, the execution of Warwick, for no crime except that he was a possible figure-head for Yorkist plots. Had he died before his wife he would have been remembered as a great, though hardly as a lovable, ruler; since he lived till 1509 we are apt to think of him chiefly as the meanest of English kings.

III

HENRY'S SYSTEM

When Henry VII. possessed himself of the Crown of England, the future before him was anything but promising. He was king, but on all sides there were possible claimants who could show a better title by descent than his own. For half a century the country had been ridden by factions, torn by dissensions. Its arms had ceased to inspire fear ; on the Continent, since Bedford's death, it had been held of little account ; even Edward IV. had satisfied Louis XI. that nothing serious was to be feared from England. At home there was hardly a recognised seat of political authority. The Crown was discredited by the imbecility of its wearer even before king-making came into fashion. The parliament had been allowed to assume an authority which it had failed to convert into an efficient control. The old baronage had been wiped out and replaced by a new baronage which lacked both power and prestige. The treasury was empty though the country was not poor. But there were three fundamental principles which provided a basis for political reconstruction, principles which had become thoroughly rooted, which no government could ignore without bringing destruction upon itself. Justice must be administered according to the law ; legislation was invalid without consent of parliament ; taxation could be imposed only with the consent of the people's representatives.



Bedesmen, temp. Henry VII.

For the restoration of international prestige Henry adopted the methods not of Edward III. or of Henry V. but of a new diplomacy ; till each of the European Powers was forced to recognise that the goodwill of England could not be neglected. We have now to see how he dealt with the great domestic problem.

It was essential that the nominal authority and the actual power should be concentrated in the same hands ; that both should be wielded by the Crown. Yet the dynasty existed on sufferance. It could not be maintained in the face of popular antagonism or by sheer terrorism ; yet it would survive merely as a pageant, if the Crown were at the mercy of popular caprice. Hence it was imperative that the Crown should at once conciliate popular favour, secure a full treasury, and paralyse antagonistic forces. This complex process demanded exceedingly deft manipulation.

The treasury must be filled, but not by excessive demands on the purses of the commons. The nobility must not be allowed to become dangerous. The Crown must shun all appearance of tyranny. The king then must display himself as above all things a law-abiding man claiming no questionable rights. Henry began his career by being ostentatiously deferential to parliament. Richard had held only one, and Edward for a dozen years had ruled practically without a parliament. Henry during the first half of his reign summoned parliaments repeatedly, took them into his confidence, made them partner of his actions. There were no



Monks and lawyers.

[From a deed of grant to Westminster Abbey by Henry VII.]

arbitrary trials and executions; parliament passed the Acts of attainder. The king's business was only to exercise the royal clemency judiciously. The king did not ask parliament for excessive grants. The national honour demanded war with France, and the nation would do its duty in providing necessary funds. The nation did. A judicious economy made a sufficient show without spending the money. A judicious diplomacy did what the advocates of a scientific tariff seek to do to-day—it made the foreigner pay. By wars and rumours of wars Henry filled his coffers instead of emptying them.

The very uncertainty of the Tudor tenure of the crown was made productive. Every revolt and every plot provided its crop of attainders; but a clement monarch indulged in no vindictive bloodshed; treason was for the most part sufficiently punished by the confiscation of lands and wealth. The royal revenues expanded, and possible enemies were deprived of the sinews of war. Justice was satisfied and no one could hint at tyranny, while the commons, untouched, had no cause of complaint. Again Henry found another source of revenue. For the good of the State and the repression of turbulence, sundry enactments had forbidden, with very little success, the practices called Maintenance and Livery, by which great magnates supported large numbers of retainers. The statutes were enforced and the breaches of them penalised by heavy fines. Thus was turbulence of every kind turned to account by the royal treasury.


The royal justice had failed in the past because the power of local magnates had enabled them to set at naught the ordinary ministers of the law, to the detriment not only of the government, but of justice in general.



THE COURT OF KING'S BENCH UNDER HENRY VI

One of a series of MS. illuminations in the Library of the Inner Temple. Given by permission of the Master of the Bench of the Honourable Society of the Inner Temple.

In fact the local magnates dominated the local courts. Henry found a new way of dealing with them by procuring statutory confirmation of powers occasionally exerted in the past by committees of the Privy Council. Thus a permanent judicial committee was established, bearing the name of the Court of Star Chamber, with powers conveyed to it by Act of Parliament, which court could deal arbitrarily with those offenders who had no fear of the ordinary law or who perverted the administration of the law. The court was debarred from inflicting the death penalty, but its normal process was punishment by fines. Here again there was no tyranny; on the contrary the Crown, so far as forms went, had merely obtained



Henry VII.'s Chapel, Westminster Abbey.

[From a drawing by Herbert Railton.]

parliamentary sanction for what had previously been done, though only occasionally, without parliamentary sanction at all. The hand of the law was very much strengthened and the royal coffers were legitimately filled.

Lastly, the king resorted freely to benevolences, for once disregarding the letter of a statute of Richard III. But there was no compulsion. The king presented to his victims two dilemmas; the first, "If you can afford to aid your sovereign when he is in need of money, you can bear him but little goodwill if you refuse it to him"; the second, traditionally known as Morton's Fork—a libel on the Archbishop, who was not responsible for it—"You live handsomely, therefore you can afford to help the king out

of your abundance ; or else, you live sparingly, therefore you have wealth laid by and can afford to help the king out of your savings." But these dubious methods of raising money were during the earlier part of Henry's reign applied not to the commons but to the nobles. It was only in the later years, when the king's position was already secured, that the machinery of extortion was brought to bear upon the commons.



A gentleman of the time of Henry VII.

In the later years of Henry's reign, parliaments were as rare as they had at first been frequent, because the king had accumulated such a mass of treasure that he had no need to appeal to his subjects for assistance. He left to his son a full treasury, an indisputable title to the throne, and experienced officials who thoroughly understood their business, but had neither the will nor the power to control the Crown. His chosen agents had always been ecclesiastics, or, if laymen, not lords but commoners. His policy had finally destroyed the once dangerously excessive accumulation of power and wealth in the hands of a few great families ; the vast estates were dispersed, while the gentry of moderate estate had been multiplied ; and at the same time the burgess class had been carefully fostered and their wealth also increased. Both these classes had everything to gain by the maintenance of peace, order, and law ; which it was no less in the interests of the Crown to preserve. To the gentry and to the burgesses, arbitrary treatment of the magnates was rather welcome than otherwise so long as they were not themselves victimised ; and thus the Crown was established in a position of greater power, provided that power were judiciously exercised, than it had known since the days of Edward I.

IV

THE COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL REVOLUTION

The Tudor period saw the beginnings of that commercial expansion which was to make the people of England the wealthiest in the world. Hitherto she had not been distinguished by commercial enterprise. She had prospered largely because, since the time of the Conquest, she had never been devastated by a foreign invader, and, since the anarchy of

Stephen, she had been free from the destruction wrought by private wars between the nobles—an immunity to which Europe offered no parallel. For short periods in the reign of John, of Henry III., of Edward II., of Richard II., and of Henry IV., she had been troubled by civil conflicts; but in none of these, nor even in the War of the Roses, had such havoc been wrought as had been suffered by every district on the Continent at the hands of foreign invaders or of warring factions. English commerce had indeed progressed during the last two centuries; but the Netherlanders, the Venetians, the great maritime cities of Italy and the great trading cities of Germany were, commercially speaking, much more conspicuous than England. In maritime activity she was excelled by many rivals, although for military purposes the fleets of her coast towns held their own in the narrow seas.

The great change came, though not immediately, as a consequence of the enterprise of other peoples. England reaped where she had not sown. A Genoese sailor in the service of Spain discovered America when he was looking for India, and the Portuguese discovered the ocean route to the Far East, hitherto cut off from the Western world by the Mohammedan rampart in Asia. The sea, hitherto regarded as a barrier, shutting out the foreigner indeed but shutting the nation in upon itself, was turned into a vast highway where English sailors above all learnt to find a new field for enterprise. But at the outset the prizes went to Portugal and Spain.

This was in some sort an accident as far as Spain was concerned, for it is not impossible that Columbus would have sailed from England instead of Spain but for the fact that his brother Bartholomew, sent to entreat assistance from Henry VII., was captured by pirates, and the great Genoese made his bargain with Isabella of Castile instead. And even so, England was only just behind. The energy of Bristol merchants had already sent expeditions in unsuccessful search for new lands across the Atlantic when Columbus sailed; and it was an English expedition, though one under the command of the Genoese or Venetian captains, John and Sebastian Cabot, which first touched the American mainland—five years after Columbus discovered the West Indies and a year before Vasco da Gama reached India by the Cape route. But Spain had struck upon a region conspicuously productive; whereas the English discoveries in the Far North seemed altogether unpromising. Henry, interested at first, refused to be drawn into heavy and extremely speculative expenditure. English exploration was not pushed, and no serious protest was made when Pope Alexander VI. drew a line from North to South down the map of the world, and pronounced



A 15th century wool merchant.

[From a brass.]

that all which might be discovered on one side of that line belonged to Spain and everything on the other side of the line to Portugal. So in the course of less than half a century, Portugal set up a maritime empire in the East and Spain established her American empire in the West without interference from England. England's own oceanic expansion did not set in till the reign of Elizabeth.

But if England lagged behind at the beginning of that race in which she was ultimately to distance all competitors, it was not because her king underrated the value of commerce. Henry was not in advance of the economic theories of his day, but more than any of his predecessors he realised the importance of increasing the wealth of the country over which he ruled; and he made it the direct aim of his policy to increase that wealth; treating commercial development as an end in itself, an object of State policy, but also applying commerce and commercial regulations as a means to obtaining political ends. There are those who believe that a policy of "protection" is always right, that the home producer should be artificially aided in competition with the foreigner. There are those who believe that protection is always wrong, and that the best aggregate results are obtained by absolutely unfettered competition. But it is common ground that the strongest case for protection arises in those countries whose industries are endeavouring to enter a field of which other competitors are already in possession. This was England's case. At the close of the Middle Ages no one had challenged the doctrines of protection; it was assumed that the foreign competitor should be shut out, or admitted only in return for reciprocal privileges. Henry made it a special object of his diplomacy to obtain privileges from foreign Powers and to reduce to a minimum the privileges enjoyed in England by foreign mercantile corporations. Monopolies hitherto enjoyed by the Hanseatic League were broken through, the Hanse towns were forced to admit English traders, and the Hanse merchants in England found their own privileges practically curtailed.

But it was not merely to obtain or to extend commercial privileges that Henry employed this instrument. When Burgundy gave shelter to a pretender or threatened to be politically troublesome, Henry fought a commercial war with decisive success. The trade between England and Flanders was practically stopped, to the heavy loss of the English wool-trade for the time being, but to the ruin of the Flemish manufacturers, who suffered much as Lancashire suffered from the cotton famine brought about by the American Civil War in the reign of Queen Victoria. Philip was forced to surrender, and the treaty called the *Inter-cursus Magnus* for a while established something very like free trade between England and the Netherlands. At a later stage, when Philip again seemed likely to be troublesome, and accident forced him ashore in England when he was on his way to Spain, Henry extorted from him a new treaty of an altogether one-sided character, which had

subsequently to be modified when it became obvious that the commercial ruin of Flanders would mean the loss of a valuable market for English goods.

A conspicuous feature of Henry's economic policy was the revival of Richard II.'s Navigation Act. As before, however, the object was not so much the commercial one of capturing the carrying trade as that of developing the English marine for military purposes. Although Henry did not create a royal navy, he was alive to the increasing importance of fleets when England's political horizon ceased to be practically bounded by France. English shipping had so far developed that the renewed Acts were not, like the old ones, absolutely a dead letter. Although the Navigation Act was to some extent a check upon commerce, it increased the amount of English shipping and the number of seafaring men, and thereby gave an impulse to the development of English seamanship. Yet even in the sixteenth century such statesmen as Wolsey and Lord Burleigh were inclined to regard the Act as tending indirectly to defeat the end to which it was directly aimed.

Henry's commercial policy was a symptom as well as a cause of the development of commercial enterprise during his reign. A new spirit was abroad, which was exemplified by those "adventures" of the Bristol merchants to which reference has already been made. The companies of Merchant Adventurers were pushing themselves everywhere, without as well as with the direct countenance of the State, thrusting into new markets by illegitimate methods if legitimate means were wanting; their ships were seen in the Baltic and the Mediterranean.


Commercialism was responsible for another change of which the immediate effects were anything but beneficial. Almost throughout the Middle Ages farming had been carried on for subsistence, with very little idea of accumulating profit. But the commercial spirit attacked the landowners, who began to seek to make the maximum of profit out of the land. Accident had turned them to the extension of sheep-farming when it was not worth while to restore to tillage lands which had fallen out of cultivation owing to the Black Death. But when landowners began to seek for profit, and realised that their sheep-runs were paying them much better than their arable land, and that there was an immense market for wool which cost little to produce, they began to turn themselves to the actual conversion of tillage into pasture.



Agricultural labourers.

[Early 16th century woodcuts.]

So began the great process of enclosing, which was twofold. It meant in the first place the legal or illegal appropriation and enclosing of common lands, and in the second place the enclosure of the open fields. It will be remembered that under the old system the cultivated land of which each village and manor-house was the centre consisted of open fields cut up into strips of an acre or half an acre, separated not by hedges but by balks, ridges which were left unploughed. The villein with thirty acres probably had thirty strips none of which were contiguous, although there was a tendency for the lord of the manor to consolidate the demesne lands. The tendency now was for the lord to endeavour to evict the occupiers of strips lying within the demesne lands, in order to complete the consolidation and to provide large enclosed fields for grazing instead of narrow unenclosed strips which could not be put under sheep. The enclosure of



A Common or Open Field in Somerset showing Balks.

[From a photograph by Miss E. M. Leonard.]

commons deprived the peasants of the ground on which they had kept their little supply of live stock. The evictions when they could be carried out with any colour of law, turned the occupiers adrift. The conversion of arable into pasture meant that few labourers were required where many had been employed before. Thus great numbers of labourers found themselves without employment; and the diminution of tillage, the reduced production of food-stuffs, raised the price of food. Hence the country began to swarm with men for whom there was no employment, since the former agricultural labourer could not betake himself to the urban industries, which sought rigorously to exclude new-comers. By the middle of the reign of Henry VII., as we may learn from Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*, the swarms of sturdy vagabonds who might be willing enough to work but could get no work to do were already becoming a serious pest, and for more than half a century the evil was continuously on the increase.

V

IRELAND

Ireland claimed its share of attention from the new monarchy. In the old days it had been an outlying dominion of the Crown, practically remote from England, and playing no part in England itself. Since the failure of Edward Bruce to convert it into a kingdom for himself, it had been difficult enough to provide Ireland with any semblance of a government; but sheer incapacity for co-operation on the part of its chiefs, whether Celts or Normans, destroyed any prospect of its seeking to achieve independence. Within the Pale, English law and institutions modelled on those of England prevailed. Outside the Pale, the Fitzgeralds or Geraldines of Kildare and Desmond, the Butlers of Ormond, and the Burkes who had been De Burghs, went their own way in the south and west, while MacNeills, O'Donnells and O'Connors did likewise in the north. Edward III. had sent his son Lionel of Clarence as Lieutenant; his rule was signalised by the Statute of Kilkenny, a desperate attempt to stop the process by which the Normans were becoming increasingly Celticised. The fusion of the races by intermarriage, and the adoption of Celtic customs and language, were prohibited on the hypothesis that the Irish were an inferior and incurably barbarian people; nevertheless, things went on very much as before.

No English king except Richard II. visited Ireland in person. Richard of York, his uncle Edmund Mortimer, and his grandfather Roger, all served as Lieutenants of Ireland, whither they were sent in part at least to keep them out of the way. But all had made themselves popular, with the result that, in the War of the Roses, Ireland provided a safe refuge for Yorkists and a base for Yorkist pretenders in the reign of Henry VII.; although the rivalry between Geraldines and Butlers kept the house of Ormond on the Lancastrian side. By this time the post of Lieutenant had become an honorary one. Prince Henry, afterwards Henry VIII., was named Lieutenant at the age of three. But the functions were discharged by a Deputy.

The Deputy appointed by Edward IV. had been the great Earl of Kildare, Gerald Fitzgerald, whose relations with Henry VII. were unique. The ablest as well as the most powerful of the Irish lords, he was a man who could himself rule but had no idea of being ruled by anybody else. The King of England thoroughly appreciated his qualities, and despite his turbulence and insubordination, even his notorious complicity in rebellion, retained him in the office of Deputy except when some peculiarly outrageous proceeding necessitated his temporary removal. Henry's attitude is exemplified in an anecdote. "All Ireland," complained a victimised bishop, "cannot rule this man." "Then," quoth the king, "I see this man must rule all Ireland."

THE AGE OF TRANSITION

But in one of the intervals when Kildare was deposed, Henry found an efficient English Deputy in the person of Sir Edward Poynings, a good soldier and an able administrator, who in his brief term of office established



Ireland under the Tudors.

the foundations of a permanent organised government by Poynings' Law, which remained its basis for nearly three hundred years. In England, according to existing practice, legislation was initiated by the ministers of the Crown, though it might be on the petition of the commons, and though it required the assent of parliament. Theoretically the system under

Poynings' Law did not greatly deviate for Ireland from this practice, but the effect was very different. The Irish parliament did not on its own account pass Bills which were sent up for the royal assent; it could only accept or reject without modification Bills which were shaped by the King in Council in England. Since the King's Council looked upon Irish affairs with English eyes, this meant practically that Irish legislation was controlled by English ideas, which were not less pronounced because they were formed in almost total ignorance of Irish conditions. But the great problem for Ireland was not that of legislation but of efficient administration. On the whole, Henry himself aimed at the principle of endeavouring to induce the Irish magnates to range themselves on the side of law and order and centralised government; a policy to which the only alternative was the establishment of a military government emphatically and manifestly capable of enforcing law and order by the strong hand. It was unfortunate that the Tudor governments perpetually vacillated between these two policies, and while they generally leaned to the latter, persistently refused to provide the Deputies with sufficient military force to give it effect.

VI

SCOTLAND

We left James III. of Scotland at the moment when he had triumphed over the baronial factions headed by his brother the Duke of Albany. James, however, lacked the capacity for securing his position. Precisely how or why the new antagonism was aroused is not very clear; but in 1488 there was a new "band" among the most powerful of the nobles, headed by Angus, popularly known as Archibald Bell-the-Cat because he had announced his intention of "belling the cat" in accordance with the well-known fable. In the face of this combination James himself withdrew to the North, where he was sure of support. The insurgents, however, captured the person of Prince James, the heir-apparent, who allowed himself to be used as a figurehead, he being then a boy of fourteen. Angus in the past had held treasonable correspondence with England, though the insurgents now made anglicising tendencies one of their charges against King James. A battle was fought at Sauchie Burn, not far from Stirling, where the royalist force was routed. The king escaped from the field only to be murdered on the same day, though the actual murderer remained unknown.

Young James was at once proclaimed king. His father's death prevented his title from being challenged, while the manner of it imposed upon the Lords the need of a particularly careful display of constitutionalism.

The result was that the newly constituted government abstained from violence, and could fairly claim credit for devoting itself to the general establishment of order.

It was not long before the young king showed himself capable of assuming the reins of government. He was a prince of brilliant accomplishments, mentally and physically vigorous, romantic and chivalrous of temperament, alive to the duties of a ruler, but dangerously impulsive. For twenty years Scotland advanced under his rule, and became a flourishing and orderly State not wholly negligible in European politics.

That James was a strong king is sufficiently demonstrated by the absence of any of those great contests with baronial factions in which each of his three predecessors had been involved. Before he was twenty years old it is true that there were troubles, and that Angus again entered into treasonable relations with the King of England. But there was no recurrence of these alarms. The one serious internal conflict which occupied Scotland was that with the Lords of the Isles, the ancient feud of the Western Celts with the supremacy of the Crown. In this contest James was completely successful, and during the latter part of his reign secured not only the submission but the loyalty of the chieftains of the west.



James III. of Scotland.

[Taken from a painting of James and his son at Holyrood.]

The relations of James with England were habitually what is called strained. Border raids and piratical encounters at sea provided an eternal cause of complaints and counter-complaints. We have seen James espousing the cause of Perkin Warbeck and finally settling down into comparatively friendly relations with Henry VII., who never wanted to quarrel with him. But even after his marriage with Margaret Tudor there were occasions when only a skilful diplomacy averted war between the two nations. In the different phases of his relations with Henry VII. James did not show himself a particularly far-sighted politician, but he did prove himself an efficient ruler. Similarly he proved his natural soundness and efficiency by great improvements in the administration of justice, and by careful endeavours to foster Scottish commerce. He too was moved by the educational spirit which was abroad, and insisted upon the education of his subjects at grammar schools, besides establishing a new university at Aberdeen and introducing the printing-press. Most notable also was his

zeal for the creation of a navy, a project to which Robert Bruce had devoted attention and energy, but which had remained in abeyance since his day. If James had died before the battle of Flodden was fought, if he had not given way to the fatal impulse which brought about that great national disaster, he would probably have been remembered by posterity as the greatest royal benefactor of Scotland since the days of Bruce. But on that fatal field half his work was undone. That, however, is a story which belongs to our next chapter.

CHAPTER X

THE DEFENDER OF THE FAITH

I

THE CARDINAL

IN strong contrast to Henry VII., stained, to the public eye, by the sordid craftiness of his later years, stood the brilliant young prince who succeeded him on the throne; a goodly youth, a champion in all manly sports, of a notable versatility, highly accomplished, a scholar and a lover of letters, the whole nation acclaimed Henry with enthusiastic anticipations. His first actions added to his popularity since he at once struck down the worst agents of his father's extortion, the notorious Empson and Dudley. It mattered not much to the public that the actual charges on which they were put to death could scarcely be sustained. They met with their deserts, and no one inquired too curiously into the technical justification. The pomp and festivities of the young king's marriage with Katharine of Aragon encouraged the general rejoicing.

The European monarchs also rejoiced. Ferdinand of Spain and the Emperor Maximilian were extremely experienced politicians, who hoped to find in the young monarch's warlike ambitions a means whereby they could use his innocence to achieve their own ends at his expense, their immediate object being the depression of France. There was in England an inclination to revive the martial glories of the past at the expense of France, and before long it seemed that the old schemers would have their way. Henry was drawn into a league, and plunged into a French war in 1512. His prize was to be the recovery of Guienne. This was the bait offered him by Ferdinand and Maximilian, though neither of them had the slightest intention of helping him to get it.

The first expedition despatched for the attack on Guienne was a mere fiasco. But the failure brought to the front the minister who, in the public eye, was to dominate Henry's policy almost throughout the first half of his reign. Thomas Wolsey, the son of a grazier, or of a butcher according to his enemies, had been sent to Oxford at an early age; and having distinguished himself there, entered the household of Lord Dorset as a tutor. By Dorset he was brought to the notice of Bishop Fox, one of the great ecclesiastical ministers of Henry VII. Fox introduced him to the king,

who soon discovered his unusual abilities. When young Henry came to the throne Wolsey was attached to the Council, probably as the right-hand man of Bishop Fox, who remained the official representative of the old king's policy; while the war party who hoped to carry the king with them was headed by the Earl of Surrey, Thomas Howard. But Henry had an unflinching eye for character, and he perceived in Wolsey precisely the man he wanted—

a man ambitious for England and for himself, but one whose birth and conditions precluded him from becoming dangerous to the Crown; a man with an infinite grasp of detail and an infinite capacity for labour, but with a breadth of view which completely removed him from the class of merely capable officials. Wolsey's conception of policy appealed to the king, and Wolsey would relieve him of all the troublesome part of carrying it out.

Since the war had been embarked upon, it was Wolsey's immediate policy to carry it through with efficiency.

There were to be no more fiascoes, and a vigorous campaign was arranged for 1513, in which the king himself took part. His zeal for military glory was rewarded by the capture of Terouanne and Tournai. But the great event of the year was the battle of Flodden.

The relations between James IV. of Scotland and his brother-in-law were strained in spite of the treaties of friendship struck in the previous reign. There were mutual charges of piracy between English and Scottish sea captains; there were quarrels about border raids; there were squabbles about the alleged dower of Queen Margaret. James had always refused to repudiate the old alliance with France, and his fatal passion for knight errantry was roused by the French queen's appeal to him to strike a blow



Cardinal Wolsey.

[After the portrait by Holbein.]

on English ground as her knight. The bulk of the Scottish nobility were always ready for a fight with the English, and Henry had hardly sailed for France when James crossed the Border with a great army.

The defence of the kingdom had been left in the hands of Queen Katharine and Surrey. James advanced to Flodden Edge in Northumberland, having secured the



The Battle of Flodden.

[Showing the English feint march towards Berwick.]

land, having secured the castles on his rear which threatened his communications. Surrey, having gathered a considerable force, challenged the Scots to descend from the strong position they had occupied and fight him on the plain. The Scots were completely masters of the situation, and declined. Surrey, whose movements were masked by the hilly country, marched north towards Berwick, leaving the Scottish army on his left, then wheeled, crossed the river Till so as to cut off any retreat of the Scots army, and advanced southwards again towards Flodden. James might have held his own ground and laughed at Surrey; but in a moment of infatuation he chose instead to descend from his position and give battle. The conflict resolved itself into a furious hand-to-hand struggle. The wings of the Scottish army were broken, the centre was enveloped,

the flower of the Scottish nobility were cut to pieces, and James himself was slain as Harold and his brothers had been slain at Senlac. The effective military force of Scotland was utterly ruined; and Scotland, with a babe in arms for its king, was once again plunged into the miseries of a prolonged regency. It was fortunate for her that Surrey was quite unable to follow up his victory by a counter-invasion.

Henry's successes had by no means been to the liking of Ferdinand, who

saw that a continuation of the war was not unlikely to secure to the English king the lion's share of the spoils. Therefore he drew off Maximilian, and those two deserted their English ally and made peace on their own account with France. But Wolsey had learnt in the school of Henry VII. to pursue his objects by diplomacy rather than by war, and he counteracted the desertion of Ferdinand and Maximilian by negotiating an alliance between England and France, regardless of the traditional sentiment of hostility between the two countries. His immediate intentions were frustrated, because although the French king, Louis XII., married the English king's younger sister, Mary, his consort having just died, he himself died three months afterwards, and was succeeded by his cousin, Francis I., who was slightly younger than King Henry.


In the course of the next four years both Maximilian and Ferdinand died; with the result that Charles, the grandson of both of them, succeeded to the entire heritage of Spain, Burgundy, and Austria, and was very shortly afterwards elected Emperor. Thus in 1519 three potentates dominated the world, of whom the eldest was eight-and-twenty and the youngest was nineteen; and the domination of this same trio lasted for more than five-and-twenty years. The skill of Wolsey's diplomacy from 1515 to 1519 cannot be appreciated without an elaboration of detail and an intricacy of explanation impossible in these pages. We must be content to say that he outmanœuvred both Ferdinand and Maximilian in their own game of diplomacy, and encouraged the former to check the aggressions of Francis in Italy, while he successfully kept England out of war. The one remaining important factor on the Continent was the Pope, Leo X.; and Wolsey succeeded in making all the Powers realise that his own diplomatic ability made it extremely dangerous for any of them to incur the hostility of England.

The accession of Charles V. to the Empire made the rivalry between Charles and Francis one of the two dominant features of continental politics. The other was the rupture of Christendom, following upon Luther's revolt against the Papacy; but this did not immediately come into play. In 1520 Wolsey found both Charles and Francis eager to secure the English alliance, while it was his own object so to avoid committing himself to either, that England might be able to act as arbiter between them, and might extract her own advantage out of that position. Hence that year witnessed the ostentatious display of cordiality between the kings of England and France at the famous meeting of the Field of the Cloth of Gold—and also a quite unostentatious meeting in England between the English king and Charles. The meetings left the real situation practically unaltered. Henry was the good friend and ally of both the continental monarchs, but neither of them knew which he would support if they should come to blows.

While the collision was still approaching, the immense ascendancy which the Crown had achieved in England was demonstrated by the fall of the Duke of Buckingham the nobleman who stood nearest to the

Crown in virtue of his descent both from the house of Beaufort and from the house of Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester, the youngest son of Edward III. The king can have had little enough to fear from him ; but he was representative of the hostile attitude of the nobility to Wolsey, whose arrogance was particularly insulting in their eyes. The Duke had used language which could be interpreted as implying treasonable sentiments. He was tried by his peers and was condemned without hesitation, though the pretence that there was any real treason was merely ridiculous. It was made manifest that the peers at least were entirely subservient to the Crown.

By the end of 1521 Charles and Francis were at war in spite of all Wolsey's efforts. A few months later, England, as the ally of Charles, had declared war upon France. Wolsey in the interval had been disappointed



Francis I. and Henry VIII. at the Field of the Cloth of Gold in Picardy in 1520.

[From a contemporary French sculpture in marble.]

by a papal election in which he had been passed over. Eighteen months later there was another papal election, and Wolsey was again passed by in favour of the Cardinal de Medici, who took the name of Clement VII. On both occasions Charles had promised to use his influence in Wolsey's favour, and on both he conspicuously failed to do so. Wolsey himself had always been rather inclined to favour Francis rather than Charles, but had taken the course which he knew his master would prefer. But after the election of Pope Clement, he was probably planning for a revival of the French alliance. In his own day he was certainly credited with having been intensely set upon the acquisition of the papal crown. Possibly he did not realise that he was a greater power as Henry's minister than any pope could be ; but possibly also he was already conscious that a minister of Henry held office by a precarious tenure.

In 1525 the French king met with a great disaster and fell into the hands of his enemies at the battle of Pavia. England had put little energy into the war, but Henry was anxious to take advantage of Pavia to wring Guienne from France. He wanted money for the purpose. The war was



The army of Henry VIII. about 1513.
[From a contemporary MS. in the British Museum.]

not in the least popular in the country, and Wolsey feared that to ask parliament for supplies would be exceedingly risky. Instead, he resorted to what was called the Amicable Loan, which was nothing more or less than an illegal tax. Perceiving ominous signs that a storm of resentment was brewing, Wolsey dropped the Amicable Loan and called for a Benevolence. London met the demand by an appeal to the statute of Richard III. by which benevolences were declared illegal. The king saw how matters stood, and rose to the occasion after his own fashion. He withdrew the demand, claiming and receiving credit for a noble generosity, while Wolsey, execrated by the people, became a secret object of the royal displeasure; not because of what he had done, but because of what he had failed to do. Wolsey tried to pacify the king's resentment by presenting him with his palace at Hampton Court. The king accepted the present, and the Cardinal's favour was outwardly unimpaired.

But the fiasco over the loan reduced the French war to an absurdity. Wolsey achieved his own present end, a pacification with France, which was to pay a heavy indemnity. The defection of England forced Charles to make peace. Events were steadily tending to bring England and France into close friendship and to isolate Charles. But Charles was left in a dominating position in Italy, a position alarming to the Pope; the antagonism of Pope and Emperor led in 1527 to the capture and sacking of Rome by Charles's troops, and the Pope was held in the hollow of the Emperor's hand. But before we pursue the story of the reign further, we must examine the progress up to this period of the movement to which we give the name of the Reformation, which was now becoming a foremost factor in European politics.

II


THE DAWN OF THE REFORMATION

The Reformation in one of its aspects was a part of that intellectual movement which is covered by such terms as the Renaissance or the Revival of Learning; terms which refer primarily to the revolt of the human intelligence against bondage to the *ex cathedra dicta* of authority in every field. That revolt involved the right of the individual to inquire, to criticise, to judge, and to form conclusions, or at least to choose the authority to whose judgment he will submit himself. In another aspect it was a spiritual revolt against the interposition of any meditating agency between the individual human soul and its Maker. In a third aspect it was a moral revolt against the corruption which was born of the abuse of practices not in their original nature demoralising. In a fourth aspect it was merely another chapter in the world-long struggle between Secularism and Clericalism, between an organisation claiming authority in virtue

of its guardianship of the *arcana* of Divine knowledge, the hidden wisdom of the Almighty, and the frankly human organisation of the State; and in this contest the State was the aggressor, and reclaimed for itself much which it declared the Church to have acquired upon false pretences. But in all its aspects it displays one common characteristic, the rejection of the authority of the Holy See. A great and far-reaching reformation or reconstruction was possible and actually took place within the Church, which continued to acknowledge the papal authority; but "the Reformation" in the technical sense means the schism between the Church which still clung to Rome and the diverse Churches and sects which separated themselves from her. The Reformation for which the government of Henry VIII. was responsible had very little to do with any of the first three aspects; it was with the fourth that the State concerned itself; but it was with the other three that the national life was most vitally concerned.

Although the Reformation in the technical sense of the term implies the rejection of the Roman obedience, the movement which culminated in the Reformation had no such object in view. Even the theological speculations of Wiclif and Huss, which had prepared the way, were not consciously directed against the papacy. Emperors, kings, and princes, who fought against popes with the weapons of the flesh, did not, until the eleventh hour, challenge the spiritual supremacy of the Roman pontiff. They habitually looked upon themselves as faithful sons of the Church, and Henry VIII. himself obtained from Pope Leo X. the complimentary title of Defender of the Faith. The man who probably did most to undermine the papal authority, the supreme representative of the critical spirit, the man of whom it was said that "he laid the egg which Luther hatched," Erasmus, remained to the last attached to the principle of papal authority. The men who in England fought hardest to reinstate the papal authority, after it was overthrown, had been brought up in the new school; and in the early stages of their careers they had been looked upon as advanced reformers. The first reformers believed that reform could come from within, and that purification of doctrine and practice could be attained without shattering the organisation which had hitherto seemed inseparable from Christianity itself.

Moral standards in the fifteenth century were low, and the Church did nothing to raise them. After the Great Schism had been brought to an



Erasmus.

[From a German medal of 1519.]

end, the papacy itself had recovered some of its prestige ; but at the close of the century it again sank to pitiable degradation, reaching its nadir when the Borgia Alexander VI. was elevated to the papal throne. No vice was too foul and no crime too black for the man whom Christendom acknowledged as the successor of St. Peter. Nor was the spirit of religion fostered by his successors, the militant politician Julius II. or the refined pagan Leo X. When the head is corrupt, the limbs are not likely to be healthy. We have no need to turn to the partisan diatribes of anti-clerical fanaticism, or to the inevitable exaggerations of Protestants in the hour of their persecution



John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester.
[After the drawing by Holbein.]

or of their victory, to realise that the Church was in desperate need of reform. We may be content, so far as England is concerned, to call the evidence of John Colet, Dean of St. Paul's, the founder of St. Paul's School, the friend of Archbishop Warham ; of the saintly Bishop Fisher and of Erasmus ; the evidence of Sir Thomas More, who himself, like Fisher, died for his loyalty to the Church ; the evidence of Henry VII.'s great Archbishop Morton. The higher ecclesiastics, often against their will, were forced into politics and drawn away from their religious duties. Laxity of discipline was prevalent in most monastic establishments, and rank immorality in some of them. The lower clergy were uneducated, and their teaching was commonly a wretched travesty of Church doctrine. Gross superstitions fostered by fraudulent

conjuring tricks were the vulgar substitutes for religion. The redeeming fact was that the best of the clergy and the best of the laity were alive to the evil, and before the close of the fifteenth century were applying themselves to its remedy. The paralysing grip of moribund conventions was being challenged on all sides, and the general intellectual movements had received a great impulse from the revelation of the forgotten literature of Greece consequent upon the dispersion of Greek scholarship after the fall of Constantinople. In England, characteristically enough, the light of the new Greek scholarship was turned first upon the New Testament, and the intelligent criticism of Colet and Erasmus began to vitalise a still orthodox interpretation of the Scriptures. A vigorous educational reform was fostered by the greatest of the Church dignitaries. Warham, the successor of Morton, Bishop Fox, and Bishop Fisher, and not

least by Wolsey himself, the brilliant "boy bachelor," with whom indeed education was a passion. They founded schools and colleges, and set in them teachers who were enthusiasts of the New Learning; and they believed that education was a panacea for all the evils from which the Church was suffering, which would complete a cure without impairing her authority, changing her doctrines, or altering her organisation. The purification was to be wrought by sweet reasonableness.

But elsewhere the study of the Scriptures was generating very different ideas. Zwingli at Zürich was finding biblical warrant for doctrines akin to the heresies of Wiclif and Huss, and in the university at Wittenberg, in Saxony, arose Martin Luther, bringing not peace, but a sword.


III

THE EUROPEAN SCHISM

The occasion of Martin Luther's challenge to the papacy was the desire of Pope Leo X. to procure funds. A method of raising funds not infrequently employed had been the sale of indulgences. The theory of the Church was that the penitent sinner might obtain from the Church, but not without the mediation of the Church, absolution and pardon for his sins, subject to the performance of the penance imposed by the Church, as the expression of the sinner's penitence. The penance imposed not infrequently took the form of some expenditure on behalf of the Church. Indulgences were in the original idea pardons granted without the imposition of any other penance than the price of the indulgence. But unfortunately in the eyes of every one concerned, the pope, his agents, and the public, the sale of indulgences assumed the appearance of a simple commercial transaction whereby absolution could be bought cheaply, the necessity for repentance being overlooked, to the material profit of the papal treasury. The lay princes, who might otherwise have protested against the abstraction of their subjects' money by Rome, made no objection when they received a substantial commission on the sales.

But to Luther the whole thing appeared a monstrous blasphemy. When the papal commissioners were coming to Saxony, he publicly denounced indulgences, and persuaded the "Good" Elector of Saxony, Frederick, to forbid the sale in his dominions. This was in 1517. Such a matter might have ended by the immediate citation and punishment of Luther as a heretic. But Leo had more important matters on his mind than the opinions of a university professor. Luther, having issued his challenge, realised that the theological conceptions upon which he had acted, and in which he intensely believed, were incompatible with the recognised teaching of the Church, and were in fact closely akin to those for which Wiclif and Huss had been condemned as heretics. If

he and they were right, the Church was wrong. If the Church was wrong, the existing system was based upon a lie. Luther resolved to fight at all costs for the truth as he conceived it. He proclaimed the truth ; but at the same time he gathered a large amount of lay support in all ranks from the princes of the empire downwards by challenging the whole system by which the States were laid under contribution for the benefit of the papal exchequer.



Martin Luther.

[From the painting by Cranach.]

In 1519 young Charles V. became emperor. Towards the end of 1520, Pope Leo issued a Bull condemning Luther. Luther burnt the Bull. A Diet, or assembly of the Imperial Estates, met at Worms. Luther was cited to it under safe conduct, to be heard in his own defence before the secular arm should enforce the will of the pope. In the face of the whole world Luther proclaimed his uncompromising adherence to the faith that was in him. "Here stand I. God help me. I can no other." The irrevocable word had sounded at the moment when Christen-

dom was ready to hear. Fearful lest the bold monk should be treated as Huss had been treated a hundred years before, Luther's friends kidnapped him and hid him in the forests of Thuringia. But his work was already more than half accomplished. Although the diet condemned him and he was put to the ban of the empire—in other words outlawed—he carried with him an immense force of public opinion. From that moment Germany was divided into two camps, and the division was soon to spread all over Western Christendom.

Charles himself had declared for the papacy ; so also had the King of England, who regarded himself as an expert theologian. But Charles could not afford to develop the policy of the Edict of Worms which had condemned Luther ; to do so would have involved Germany in civil war, of which his rival Francis would not have hesitated to take advantage. The religious question was left for the time being to take care of itself. A great revolt of the German peasantry, although vigorously condemned by Luther himself, who was a strong advocate of the civil authority, was inevitably attributed to the spread of the new religious doctrines, in the same sort of fashion as the English peasant revolt had been associated

with the teaching of Wiclif. The revolt had a reactionary effect upon the intellectual reformers in England, very much as the French Revolution exercised a reactionary influence upon English Liberalism at the end of the eighteenth century. But in Germany itself, Luther was in fact so uncompromisingly on the government side that Lutheranism was unshaken. At the diet of the empire held at Speier in 1526 the principle was accepted of leaving the several States to settle their own religious affairs "as each thought it could answer to God and the emperor." The Empire as such was not to take sides. Charles and the pope were, in fact, just engaging in that quarrel which brought about the sack of Rome by the imperial forces in the following year and practically placed Clement under the control of the emperor.

With the alliance of the papacy thus again secured, Charles reverted to the policy of repressing Lutheranism, and a second Diet at Speier in 1529 again took up the attitude of the Diet of Worms. The Lutheran princes entered the Protest, which gave to the Lutheran party the title of Protestant, a name which was at first applied to all who accepted the Lutheran Confession of Augsburg, which was drawn up in the following year; but in common parlance the term was presently extended to cover all those who rejected the Roman

obedience, whether they were in agreement with Lutheran doctrines or not. The Protestants at this time felt the attitude of the anti-Lutherans to be so threatening, that they united themselves in the League of Schmalkald. A war of religion seemed on the verge of breaking out, but the aggression of the Turks on the East impressed responsible persons with the necessity for preserving a religious truce. During the sixteen years which passed before the death of Luther himself, there was no outbreak of religious war in Germany. But such a war was always possible, and the possibility was a constant factor in the politics and diplomacy of the period.

It has to be borne in mind, further, that while Luther was the head and front of the revolt against Rome, that revolt was following a somewhat different course in the schools of theology, whose headquarters were at Zürich and Geneva. The reformers themselves were to be divided into two main camps under the standards of Lutheranism and Calvinism when the Swiss school was dominated by John Calvin. But as yet divisions had not crystallised. The fundamental fact was that the ultimate



The Pope struggling with Calvin and Luther.
[From Jaime, "Musée de Caricature."]

seat of authority had been suddenly brought into dispute, while all men seemed to require that some ultimate authority should be established. The Reformation did not at this stage mean anything like the recognition of the right of private judgment; but it meant that every man sought for the establishment of an authority which would be in agreement with his own private judgment. There was, in short, a common desire for a settlement which would have involved at least a high degree of uniformity. The obvious method of achieving a settlement was by means of a General Council of the Church; therefore every one professed to desire the holding

of a General Council. But no one was prepared to accept a Council in which views adverse to his own were likely to prevail. Each party and each potentate wanted to secure the predominance for themselves. The ultimate outcome was the Council of Trent, which was opened in 1545 and closed in 1563; but its constitution so absolutely ensured papal predominance that the reformers repudiated its authority from the outset, and it was resolved into a council of the papal branch of the Catholic Church, which condemned all who were outside its own pale as schismatics, arrogating to itself alone the title of Catholic. In spite of the fact that other branches of the Church entirely repudiated this papal claim, popular parlance accepted the terminology and treated the terms Papist and Catholic as synonymous. The his-



The Music of the Demon.

[A contemporary Catholic caricature of Luther.]

torian is practically reduced to accepting the popular names of Catholic and Protestant; nor is there any reason why they should be regarded as misleading, so long as it is clearly understood that they are used merely as party labels without any implication of their theological accuracy.

IV

THE BREACH WITH ROME

A reformation, as we have seen, was in actual progress in England. The "intellectuals" found favour in high places; the leading churchmen belonged to the group, and the one English layman with a European reputation, Sir Thomas More, was greatly sought after by the king—rather to his own annoyance. Moreover, the intellectualism was broad-minded,

not self-centred ; and it strove honestly and zealously to educate the people. The churchmen themselves were conscious of being excessively absorbed in temporal affairs, and many of them were sincerely desirous of a relief therefrom, although Wolsey was himself a conspicuous example of the worldly prelate. Of the monasteries specifically, we shall have to speak later. The standard of clerical morals was not particularly depraved, and the general tendency was certainly towards the higher standards. It was a long time, too, since the Church had set itself to do battle with the secular authority. Aggressive heresy was suppressed, but with a comparative gentleness. It might, in short, have been fairly anticipated that sweet reasonableness was destined to triumph.

It is no doubt probable that the undercurrent of Puritan zeal would in any case have proved too strong for mere liberalism ; but it was the action of the king himself which swept England into the revolution. Henry, after some fifteen years of married life with Katharine of Aragon, determined to marry one of her maids of honour, Anne Boleyn. This involved the nullification of his marriage with Katharine, which again required the papal assent. When Henry found that the papal assent was refused, he resolved to take the law into his own hands, which involved the repudiation of the papal authority and the substitution of that of the Crown. The complete subordination of the Church



The overthrow of the Pope by the Reformation.
[From a drawing by Lucas Cranach, 1521.]

to the State was the logical corollary, and the methods by which that subordination was carried involved a complete breach with tradition entailing an internal struggle which ended by ranging England on the side of Protestantism.

Henry's ostensible motive for seeking what is always, though incorrectly, called a "divorce" from his wife, was a conscientious conviction that the papal dispensation which had sanctioned his marriage with his brother's widow was invalid—such a marriage being contrary to the moral law of God, as distinguished from the law of the Church, to which the dispensing power of the pope applied. Church law forbade, for instance, the marriage of first cousins ; but no one pretended that such marriages were in themselves immoral, and the pope's dispensing power was unquestioned. But every one recognised the marriage of a brother and sister as immoral, and

no one pretended that in such a case the papal dispensation would be valid. Henry's contention was that marriage with a brother's widow was in the same category as marriage with a sister. But Henry was not content with the obvious remedy which should have satisfied conscience, namely, that he should live as a celibate instead of as a married man. He was determined to marry again, which he could not do unless the marriage itself were nullified. For re-marriage there was a very strong political reason. Of the children born to him by Katharine, male and female, only one had survived, the Princess Mary ; and the succession of a woman, even if it should be undisputed, as was by no means likely, would certainly be fraught with dangers in the future. So far statesmanship endorsed Henry's desire. But it is further perfectly certain that Henry was bent not merely on re-marriage, but on marriage to Anne Boleyn, that lady being astute enough to reject his advances on any other terms, although statesmanship could not possibly approve.

Wolsey found that his master expected him to subordinate all other considerations to procuring the divorce. But Katharine was the aunt of the emperor, and after 1527, Pope Clement dared not incur the emperor's wrath by acceding to Henry's wishes. Wolsey, on the one hand, desired the divorce, but, on the other, he did not desire the marriage with Anne Boleyn ; consequently he incurred the hostility, both of the queen herself and of the Boleyn party.

Now, if the case were to be settled by Clement in Rome, it was tolerably certain that he would not venture to give Henry the verdict he wanted. It was possible for Wolsey to take the responsibility upon himself, since by the king's desire he had been appointed papal legate, and in virtue thereof was the supreme ecclesiastical judge in England. But Wolsey had no mind to be made directly responsible, especially as there was no security against an appeal from his decision as legate to Clement himself. His aim therefore was to procure a court which he could control, but whose judgment the pope would be committed to accept. Thus the affair would be practically in Wolsey's hands, while the ultimate responsibility could still be laid on Clement. But all that he could succeed in procuring was a commission consisting of himself, with another legate appointed *ad hoc*, Cardinal Campeggio ; while the decision of the commission was still to be referred to Rome for confirmation.

Between the emperor and the King of England, Clement's most earnest desire was to evade giving any decision at all. He procrastinated to the utmost of his power, and instructed Campeggio to do the same. Katharine was determined to fight to the last gasp. Although the commission was sanctioned early in 1528, the proceedings of the court were not opened until June 1529. It was manifest that popular sympathies were entirely on the queen's side ; while the Boleyn party were doing everything they could to undermine Wolsey's influence with the king. Before the proceedings could be completed, a consummation which Campeggio was

careful to delay, Clement revoked the whole case to Rome. Charles and Francis came to terms and the prospect disappeared of utilising French pressure to counterbalance the emperor. Wolsey had failed to do what the king wanted, and the king struck. Campeggio had hardly embarked



Henry VIII.

[After a portrait generally attributed to Holbein.]

when a summons was issued against Wolsey for acting as legate in breach of the Statute of Præmunire. Wolsey was deprived of all his offices, though at the beginning of the next year he was reinstated in the Archbishopric of York and was permitted to retire to his diocese. Some months later he was arrested on a charge of treason, and died at Leicester Abbey on the way to London. One voice only had been raised in his

defence, when his former secretary, Thomas Cromwell, opposed in the House of Commons a bill which had been introduced to deprive the Cardinal of office for ever.

Before Wolsey had actually fallen, his ruin was assured. Had the legatine court annulled the marriage with Katharine, Henry would have married Anne, and the cardinal would have been sacrificed to the new queen. If the divorce proceedings failed, Henry was determined to bring pressure to bear on the pope, for which Wolsey would have been a most inappropriate instrument. The pope was to be made to feel that he could not ignore the wishes of the King of England without paying a heavy penalty.

An anti-papal and anti-clerical policy was likely to be popular, and Henry resolved to take the nation into partnership, to make it share the responsibility for his policy. Only twice during the twenty years of his reign had he called parliament; for the next ten years, parliament was to be the instrument whereby the king obtained his ends. The assembly which met at the end of 1529 was not dissolved till its seventh year, and is variously known as the Seven Years or Reformation Parliament. It was not till some time after Wolsey's death that any one person again became prominently the first minister of the Crown; but it is certain that Thomas Cromwell, Wolsey's former secretary, was very soon taken into the royal favour; and it is probable that he at once secured the royal confidence and shaped the king's policy. For, though Henry chose the ends which he set before himself, he was not, when left to himself, skilful in his application of means. Whenever he went behind the cardinal's back, he failed; and when he forced the cardinal to act against his own judgment, he went wrong. After Cromwell's death, he showed no real grip of government. Hence it may be assumed that throughout the decade in which he appears conspicuously as a strong man, he was guided by a more astute politician than himself.

This year 1529 and its predecessors introduce to us three men, all of whom were to become exceedingly prominent. First in order of time comes Stephen Gardiner, a cleric brought up in the New Learning, who in 1528 was employed in the negotiation with Pope Clement. In his diplomatic capacity he had done something more than hint to the pope that the recognition of his authority in England was at stake, and that he might find England prepared to dispense with a pope who obstinately ignored her just demands. Gardiner was rewarded with the bishopric of Winchester, vacated by Wolsey; possibly Henry at this time intended him to go to Canterbury when old Archbishop Warham should die.

But before that time arrived Henry had discovered a man much better suited to serve as his instrument in the campaign which he contemplated. Gardiner had in the interval shown an independence and a loyalty to his order which hardly commended him to the king. Thomas Cranmer, on the other hand, was avowedly an Erastian from the outset; that is to say, he always asserted the supremacy of the civil power, and the clerical duty of

submission to the civil power ; and this was precisely the attitude desired by Henry for the primate of the English Church. Cranmer was a Cambridge scholar of considerable attainments, inclining to new ideas, impressionable, of a tender but adaptable conscience. An accidental conversation with Gardiner and Foxe, the king's almoner, caused the Cambridge divine to be brought to the king's notice—he had suggested that the best way of settling the divorce affair was to take the opinion of the European universities on the question of the validity of the dispensation granted by Julius. If they condemned it, the king's courts could settle the matter without further reference to the pope. The king sent for Cranmer, detecting in him precisely the man he wanted, and at once employed him on a series of continental missions which brought him much in contact with several of the Reformation leaders.

The third personage was Thomas Cromwell, reputed to be the son of a Putney blacksmith, a man who had certainly spent a good many years in Italy and in the Low Countries as an adventurer, possibly as a soldier, certainly as a trader. On his return to England he added the practice of the law to his other pursuits. Wolsey had come across him, employed him on business of his own, and finally made him his secretary. He had somehow found a seat in the last parliament, and appeared again, as we have seen, in the parliament of 1529. As a politician he was deeply imbued with the ideas crystallised in the *Prince* of the great Florentine, Machiavelli. Now he became the master-builder to whom Henry entrusted the carrying out of his policy.

The first business of the parliament was, as we have seen, the attack upon Wolsey ; the second was an attack on some quite obvious clerical abuses which even the clergy themselves hardly pretended to defend. No further action on its part was called for till two years had passed ; but in the interval the king himself had struck a hard blow at the clergy. He called their attention to the fact that they as well as Wolsey had been guilty of a breach of the Act of Præmunire in recognising the cardinal's legatine authority. Technically the thing was true ; the authority had been granted and exercised at the king's desire, but without the sanction of parliament. He therefore invited Convocation to procure pardon for the clergy by paying a fine of a hundred thousand pounds, which to-day would be represented approximately by a couple of millions. They were at the same time required to recognise him as " Protector and only supreme head of the Church in England." The clergy lay absolutely at the king's mercy, and were



Thomas Cranmer.
[After Holbein.]

obliged to accept that objectionable title, though with the saving clause, "So far as the laws of Christ permit."

Meanwhile, however, to the king's annoyance, the Universities had returned answers strictly according to their political leanings. It was quite impossible effectively to claim that the learning of Christendom had decided in favour of Henry's views.

So parliament was set to work again. In the first place, the pope must be definitely threatened, and, in the second place, the clergy must be completely brought to heel. To the former end was directed the Annates Act, which authorised the king to suspend the payment of what were called Annates to Rome. The Annates were a tax, amounting to one year's income, payable by each of the higher clergy on taking up an appointment. Owing to a misapprehension, it was universally believed till quite recently that the clergy themselves petitioned for the abolition of the Annates, but this has now been proved to be an error.

Against the clergy was directed a petition known as the Supplication against the Ordinaries. This was a grand remonstrance against the legislative powers of Convocation in ecclesiastical matters, and against the procedure of the ecclesiastical courts. Convocation replied that they were themselves dealing with the questions of procedure, while the canon law could not conflict with the civil law. They were prepared to go so far as to promise that in future their ordinances should not be promulgated until they had received the royal assent. The king, however, was resolved that the independent ecclesiastical legislation should cease. The "submission of the clergy" was extorted from Convocation; by which they entirely surrendered the right to make new canons except with the king's authority, while a portion or the whole of the existing canon law—the language employed is ambiguous—was to be submitted to a Royal Commission. The blow killed old Archbishop Warham, and caused the chancellor, Sir Thomas More, to resign, since he would not be a party to the claim of the civil authority to usurp a spiritual authority over the Church.

Now at the end of 1532, Francis of France was making a display of friendship to England in order to bring pressure to bear on the emperor for his own ends. Henry felt so secure of the support of Francis that he privately married Anne, probably in November. There were signs of a weakening on the part of Clement, who wished to avoid alienating France as well as Henry. But French diplomacy achieved its end, Charles made the concessions which satisfied Francis, Clement was relieved from the fear of France; and although he assented to the appointment of Cranmer as Archbishop of Canterbury in place of the deceased Warham, a threat was made public of excommunication against Henry unless he again recognised Katharine as his queen, which for some time past he had refused to do. Henry therefore was left with the alternatives of complete submission or point-blank defiance.

Henry chose defiance—and vengeance. His position was decisively

affirmed by the Act in Restraint of Appeals, the final confirmation of all past pronouncements and all past legislation directed against the Roman jurisdiction. Following this up, the new Archbishop convened a court to try the question of the validity of the marriage with Katharine of Aragon. Katharine denied the jurisdiction and refused to appear; the court pronounced that her marriage had been invalid, that it had never at any time been a bar to another marriage, and that by consequence the secret marriage to Anne Boleyn was valid and legitimate. Cranmer's action was absolutely in accord with the principles which he had always professed,

Anglici Matrimonij.



Sententia definitiva

Lata per sanctissimum. Dñm. nostrum. D. Clementem. Papā. vij. in Secro Consistorio de Reuerendissimorum Dominorum. S. R. E. Cardinalium consilio super validitate Matrimonij inter Sanctissimos Henricum. VIII. & Catharinam Anglie Reges contracti.

PRO.

Eadem Sanctissima Catharina Anglie Regina,

CONTRA.

Sanctissimus Henricus. VIII. Anglie Rex.

Clemens Papa. vij.

Heading of the Papal Bull against the dissolution of Henry's marriage with Catherine.

principles which in a layman could have excited neither surprise nor indignation, though the cleric who acted upon them was necessarily, in the eyes of nearly every member of his order, a traitor to his spiritual office. Convocation, however reluctantly, declared against Katharine. The pope did not immediately issue an excommunication, but he declared that the judgment of the English court was void. Henry rejoined by confirming the Annates Act—the Annates themselves were not remitted, but appropriated to the Crown—and the Act in Restraint of Appeals, both of which had been held temporarily in suspense. Early next year, Clement definitely pronounced his own judgment affirming the validity of Katharine's marriage. The door to reconciliation was bolted and barred.

V

THOMAS CROMWELL

When parliament again assembled in the following year, 1534, it proceeded to re-enact the recent anti-papal statutes and to abolish the one remaining tribute to Rome, known as Peter's Pence. Also it gave the "submission of the clergy" a statutory form and secured to the king what is called the *congé d'élire*, whereby the Crown nominates to all the

higher ecclesiastical appointments and the chapters are graciously permitted to elect the Crown's nominees. Further, it passed an Act of Succession fixing the succession on the offspring of Anne Boleyn, who in the previous September had become the mother of Princess Elizabeth. The voiding of Katharine's marriage *ipso facto* stamped the Princess Mary as illegitimate. The Act authorised the exaction of an oath of obedience, which commissioners were appointed to present. The form of the oath involved the acknowledgment that the marriage had been invalid, as well as acceptance of the rule of succession. Sir



Thomas Cromwell.

[From Holland's "Herölogia."]

Thomas More recognised the parliamentary right to fix the succession, but refused to admit that the marriage had been void. Bishop Fisher of Rochester took the same line, and both were sent to the Tower.

Henry and Thomas Cromwell were both exceedingly alive to the necessity of obtaining every possible pronouncement in favour of their position, because the divorce had been extremely unpopular. It was just at this time that the pope's final rejoinder was received, and was answered by a declaration of Convocation that "the Bishop of Rome has in England no greater jurisdiction than any other foreign bishop." The Church was to repudiate the Roman authority, whether voluntarily or not, no less emphatically than the State. The series of statutes was rounded off by the "Act of the Supreme Head," which gave statutory confirmation to the previous declaration of Convocation.

Not ostensibly anti-papal or anti-clerical was the Treasons Act passed by the same parliament in the same year. Cromwell was in fact planning,

through constitutional forms, to make the English monarchy a despotism. Such division of authority between the spiritual and temporal powers as had previously existed was already wiped out; the whole power was concentrated in the State, and the ecclesiastical supremacy was vested in the Crown. The Treasons Act was a new weapon for striking down all resistance. Treason had hitherto been, in theory at least, a matter of overt acts. The new statute made treason of words, and even of silence, which were capable of bearing a treasonable interpretation. Thenceforth if a charge of treason were brought it would be all but impossible to resist it, since it was the standing rule of the law to require not proof of guilt but proof of innocence.

More and Fisher, maintaining their refusal to take the oath of supremacy in the prescribed form, were both beheaded for treason in the summer of 1535. The heads of certain monastic establishments which followed the lead given by More and Fisher were also put to death, and their houses suppressed. Thomas Cromwell's reign of terror under colour of the law was openly initiated when he struck down the two most admired Englishmen of the day, and crushed those religious houses which enjoyed and deserved the highest reputation in the country.

It was in this year that Cromwell appeared unmistakably as the brain which directed and the hand which executed the king's policy. He was appointed Vicar-General; in other words, the king delegated to him his own authority as supreme head of the Church. At the same time he became the king's foreign minister, so far as such a term could be applied, although his control of foreign policy was much less complete than Wolsey's had been. It was his primary aim in this field to unite England with the Lutheran princes, as Cranmer desired a religious union with the reformers; but both were held in check and in effect frustrated by the orthodoxy of the king, who was antagonistic to all theological innovations unless he recognised in them some political necessity which he could translate for himself into terms of conscience; a process which never presented any difficulty to him. Cromwell never succeeded in associating England with the Protestant League, and finally lost his head when his anxiety in that cause led him to cross his master's matrimonial tastes.

The minister had tried to make the king a despot through constitutional forms and with popular support. But the first condition of a despotism in England was the provision of a full treasury which should make the Crown independent of voluntary supplies. Royal extravagance had thoroughly exhausted the mighty stores accumulated by Henry VII., and a new source of supply was needed. Cromwell found it in the immense wealth of the Church, as Henry VII. had found it in the wealth of the baronage. That wealth had always excited popular jealousy, but some decent excuse had to be found for confiscation. Cromwell as vicar-general instituted a visitation of the monasteries. His commissioners spent three months in their investigations, collecting but hardly sifting all the evidence which told against the

monastic establishments, and not troubling themselves about the evidence in their favour. The result was that they were able to present Cromwell with a portentous report condemning a number of the small establishments as hotbeds of vice, and many of the larger houses as seriously lacking in discipline and requiring stringent supervision. On this basis a bill was presented to parliament, and cheerfully accepted, which condemned the smaller houses *en bloc*, though about eight per cent. were excepted from the condemnation. From what remains of the evidence, there can be little doubt that a fair and full enquiry would have quite warranted the suppression, but the enquiry was neither fair nor full, and the picture actually presented, lurid and appalling, was indubitably a gross exaggeration of the facts. The revenues were confiscated, though some compensation was granted; and the vicar-general issued, for the regulation of the greater houses which were as yet untouched, injunctions, of which it can only be said that they must have been intended to make the monastic life intolerable and to drive the monasteries to a voluntary self-suppression.

In all this there was no attack on religious doctrine, a subject on which men's minds were much engaged. An undercurrent of Lollardry had always survived official hostility. In Germany and in Switzerland doctrines were challenged which the Church had taught for centuries. Whither should men look for direction? The preparation of an official translation of the Bible into English had been authorised; but it was time for some sort of official pronouncement on the dogmas which were being called in question. This was provided in 1536 by the issue of the Ten Articles "for stablishing Christian quietness," drawn up nominally by the king himself and sanctioned both by parliament and by convocation. The Ten Articles admitted no innovations in doctrine, but drew a distinction between practices which were necessary and essential, and those which were "convenient," that is, required by public policy only.

But the Articles did not "establish Christian quietness." The disturbance and alarm created in the people's minds by the whole course of recent events could not be stilled by a mere declaration in favour of orthodoxy. In the north especially the dispersed monks found sympathetic listeners. The monasteries had been popular landlords, and the poorest classes of the community owed much to them as the only professionally charitable institutions in the country. An insurrection broke out in Lincolnshire which was sharply suppressed, but was followed by the much more alarming rising known as the Pilgrimage of Grace.

The leadership of the movement was laid upon Robert Aske, a lawyer of good family. By him it was organised with consummate ability; a great force was rapidly raised and held under an admirable discipline. But it was Aske's one desire to insist that the agitation was absolutely constitutional, absolutely loyal, and directed only against intolerable innovations and against the "evil counsellors"—that is, Cromwell and the advanced bishops, such as Cranmer and Latimer—who were "destroying religion."

All over the north Aske and his followers were welcomed and applauded. If they had marched upon London, it is not impossible that the whole country would have risen in their support. But when they came to the river Don they were met by the Duke of Norfolk at the head of a small force. Aske wished to avoid bloodshed ; Norfolk opened negotiations,



England and the Lowlands of Scotland in Tudor times.

and the insurgent leaders were tricked into a belief that their demands had been conceded. The government was merely playing for time, intriguing with the northern gentry, and secretly bringing up forces. The deluded insurgents dispersed, and then began to realise how they had been deceived. Against the will of Aske, some of the more headstrong spirits rose in arms and appealed to violence. But the government now held the

military control, seized the excuse to cancel the pardon which had been granted, and smote the insurgents with a heavy hand—not only those who were responsible for the new disturbance, but those who had taken part in the original rising. Aske and others of the leaders were executed, and the same fate befell the heads of sundry abbeys and priories who were held to have been implicated.

A new formulary of faith was issued, commonly known as the *Bishops' Book*, and the English version of the Scriptures known as *Matthew's Bible* was officially authorised. But the real use of the rising to Thomas Crom-

well was the opportunity which it gave him to employ charges of treasonable complicity for a further suppression of the monastic establishments in the north. Meanwhile other events of importance had been occurring. Anne Boleyn, like her predecessor on the throne, presented her husband with one daughter, and a second child which died immediately. The king tired of her, and fixed his favours on a lady-in-waiting, Jane Seymour, who was not to be tempted by illicit advances. Anne was unpopular, flighty, and exceedingly unguarded in her actions, besides being singularly tactless. Charges were brought against her of gross immorality; they were proved to the satisfaction of a court constituted with an eye to the appearance of strict impartiality. It could be confidently asserted both of Henry



Queen Jane Seymour.
[After Holbein.]


and of Cromwell that they never brought any one to trial unless they felt secure of a conviction, whether they relied for that conviction on evidence or upon other motives in the judges. Anne was condemned; an ecclesiastical court was somehow convinced that some prenuptial proceedings either on her part or on Henry's made her marriage to him void, and pronounced accordingly. Anne was executed, and the king was left with a second illegitimate daughter. Such was the grotesque outcome of those divorce proceedings which Henry's apologists justify on the ground that a male heir to the throne was a political necessity.

Queen Katharine was already dead. The day after Anne was beheaded, Henry married Jane Seymour. A year later she bore him a son who was beyond all cavil the legitimate heir to the throne. Having thus done her duty, she was fortunate enough to die; and the king realised with some reluctance that it was still advisable to multiply his legitimate offspring, especially as the infant was sickly. For two years to come, various projects were proposed for a political marriage; which culminated in Cromwell's selection of Anne of Cleves, the Duke of Cleves being associated

Anna Boleyn Queen.



The Lady Mary after Queen.



QUEEN ANNE BOLEYN AND THE LADY MARY, DAUGHTER OF HENRY VIII,
AFTERWARDS QUEEN MARY

From drawings by Holbein.



with the German League of Protestant Princes, though not actually a member thereof.

Meanwhile Cromwell had been turning his attention in another direction. The country was restive under the ecclesiastical policy, and there was a possibility that the insurrectionary spirit might resort in desperation to an attempt at restoring a Yorkist dynasty. Margaret, Countess of Salisbury, the sister of the unlucky Earl of Warwick, had been married by Henry VII. to a knight named Pole, who, it should be noted, had nothing whatever to do with the family of De la Pole. Her eldest son was known as Lord Montague, and her younger son, Reginald, afterwards famous as Cardinal Pole, was already prominent in the ecclesiastical world on the Continent. One of Edward IV.'s daughters had been married to Sir William Courtenay, and her son was Marquis of Exeter. Exeter and Montague were on terms of intimate friendship. Hence it is not surprising that Cromwell discovered a conspiracy. The country was sown with his spies, and he had no sort of difficulty in procuring what passed for evidence of verbal treason whenever it suited his own convenience. Exeter and Montague were executed at the end of 1538. The old Countess of Salisbury was spared for the moment, but only for the moment.

The Exeter conspiracy gave Cromwell his final opportunity. An Act was introduced for the entire suppression of the monasteries in view of the manifest complicity in treason of which some had been guilty, their general failure to satisfy the disciplinary ideals of the vicar-general, and the common absence of any sufficient reason for their continued existence. Perhaps the most astonishing thing about the great spoliation of the Church was the recklessness with which the confiscated wealth was squandered. A fraction of the proceeds was appropriated to educational purposes, and a larger fraction to the defences of the southern seaboard. But the great bulk of the estates were given away or sold at low prices, in many cases to persons of burgher extraction who were eager to become enrolled among the landed gentry. A large new class of country gentry was thus created, which in the second and third generations was to become a factor of considerable political importance. Meanwhile the prominent fact was that for the old monastic landlords was substituted a new race in whom the commercial instinct was highly developed, men who were determined to make the most of their acquisitions, untrammelled by any sentimental consideration.

The final suppression of the monasteries was the coping-stone of Cromwell's ecclesiastical policy; that of his constitutional policy was the Royal Proclamations Act, by which parliament conferred the force of law upon royal proclamations issued with the assent of the Privy Council. As the Privy Council had long ago been transformed into an instrument of the Crown, to all intents and purposes the Crown now had complete control both of administration and of legislation, though it still remained without authority to impose taxation. The king was also given authority to fix the course of the succession by will.

Cromwell in 1539 was still supreme ; yet he had warning that the opposition to him personally was still powerful. He could not afford to identify himself too closely with the school of advanced reformers. This was sufficiently demonstrated by a victory of the opposite party when the Act of the Six Articles was passed, very emphatically re-asserting six ecclesiastical doctrines which were impugned by all schools of Protestants. Manifestly at great risk to themselves, Cranmer and others of the advanced bishops offered a strenuous resistance to the measure, though they held themselves bound to obey the statute when it became law. The victory was perhaps not so decisive as it seemed ; for although the penalties imposed by the Act were of a most merciless character, Henry very decidedly discountenanced any attempt at its extensive application.

But, as a matter of fact, Cromwell had already finished the work for which the king wanted him. His fate, like Wolsey's, was sealed by a royal marriage question. His representations induced Henry to fix upon Anne of Cleves as his fourth wife ; there was apparent danger that the Emperor and the King of France were on the verge of making up their quarrels, an event which might bring trouble upon England, and gave the Lutheran alliance a new desirability. But when Anne arrived in England, she was found to be quite without those charms of person which she had been represented as possessing. Henry was disgusted with her and still more annoyed with his minister. So he had no sooner married the lady than he discovered a pre-contract which provided a sufficient excuse for nullifying the marriage. Precisely at this moment there came a renewed rupture between Francis and Charles. Henry felt that he had been doubly duped, and he turned upon Cromwell. The mighty minister, the most dreaded, perhaps, who had ever held sway in England, was suddenly arrested at the council table, attainted under the Treasons Act, and sent to the block.

VI

SCOTLAND AND IRELAND

The story of Scotland during these years falls into two divisions, the period of the minority of James V., and that of his personal rule. After Flodden, the infant king's mother, Margaret, the sister of Henry VIII., was made regent. A year later she married the young Earl of Angus, who had just succeeded old Archibald Bell-the-Cat ; but in the meantime a powerful section of the lords resolved to place the regency in the hands of the Duke of Albany, the son of that Albany who played so active a part in the reign of James III. The duke, it must be observed, was to all intents and purposes much more of a Frenchman than a Scotsman ; but he stood next in blood for the succession to the two infant princes, of whom the younger, a posthumous child, did not long survive. Family relationships played so im-

portant a part, and are at the same time so confusing, that it is advisable to grasp them clearly.

Next to the throne, then, was John Stewart of Albany—Stuart was the French spelling of the name ultimately adopted by Queen Mary. Next to Albany stood the Hamilton Earls of Arran; the mother of the actual James, Earl of Arran, was the sister of James III. Next to the Hamiltons themselves were the Stewarts of Lennox, the mother of the present Earl of Lennox being a sister of Arran. These Stewarts themselves were not of the royal family. The house of Albany will presently disappear; but we shall find the nearness to the throne of the houses of Arran and Lennox playing later on an important part in various political complications.

During the succeeding years, Albany, from the time of his arrival in Scotland in 1515, nominally held the regency, and was predominant while actually in the country. While he was not in the country, the factions of Arran and Angus struggled for supremacy. There were frequent hostilities with England on the Borders. English diplomacy was largely engaged in fostering the feuds of the Scottish nobles; Arran, with James Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow, representing the party which clung to the French alliance and the hostile attitude towards England, while the Douglas party were the hope of Wolsey and Henry. There is no doubt at all that Henry cherished the desire of turning Scottish factions to account in order once more to assert the obsolete English claim to the sovereignty of Scotland. He appears never to have grasped the fact that while there were Scottish nobles who were ready to make promises and to receive gifts, a threat to enforce English supremacy was the one absolutely certain means of uniting Scotland in an attitude of defiance.

Albany himself finally threw up the cards and left Scotland for ever in 1524. It is curious to find Arran now leaning to the English policy, with Angus on the other side. Angus obtained the upper hand, and for a time was supreme in Scotland, while he held the young king in an extremely irksome tutelage which inspired him with an intense hatred towards the Douglasses. In 1528 the king escaped from the hands of his guardians, and the moment he asserted himself, though he was but seventeen at the time, he found himself at the head of a powerful following. Men who supported Angus in a struggle of factions supported the king against him. Before the year was over the Douglasses were driven out of the country.

It was the policy of James to ally himself with the churchmen, while his attitude towards the nobility was one of repression. Of the King of England and his designs he was with very good reason extremely suspicious; and these circumstances combined to make the Crown definitely hostile to the progress of the Reformation. An anti-English policy in Scotland always meant the drawing closer of the French alliance; and in 1537 James married the French princess Madeleine. The bride, however, did not long survive the marriage, and in the following year James took to wife Mary of Lorraine, a daughter of the house of Guise, now one of the most

powerful in France. Mary herself was a woman of great ability, and she soon allied herself with David Beaton, the famous cardinal, who succeeded to the influence which had been exercised by his kinsman the Archbishop of Glasgow, and developed an extreme zeal as a persecutor of heretics. On the other hand, the king's treatment of the nobility, directed to strengthening the power of the Crown, was tending to drive the latter body into direct antagonism with James's clerical supporters. Hence we shall presently find the nobility to a great extent supporting the Reformation, and the reforming party looking to England for support.

In Ireland the arrangement made by Poynings did not in fact very greatly affect the government of the country at the time. In England,

government worked to a certain extent mechanically; that is to say, the general administration of justice and the ordinary enforcement of law went on as a matter of course, even when rival claimants were fighting for the crown. In Ireland the problem was to make any systematic administration work at all. A strong deputy like Poynings himself could make his hand felt and



An Irish groat of Henry VIII
[The first Irish coin on which the harp appears.]

impress upon the great men a certain respect for authority. So also could a strong man of an altogether different type such as Kildare. But authority had to be personified in a strong ruler; in the abstract, it counted for nothing. When Kildare died, his son, who was made deputy, proved less efficient than his eccentric but capable father; so the Earl of Surrey was sent over to take the country in hand. The victor of Flodden had been elevated to the dukedom of Norfolk, the title held by his father in the reign of Richard III., and "Earl of Surrey" became the courtesy title of the eldest son of the Duke of Norfolk.

Surrey, like his father, was a capable soldier, and was in frequent employment when larger forces were required on the Scottish borders than those of the Wardens of the Marches. His frank opinion was that force must be vigorously employed if Ireland was to be brought into order. But his idea of an adequate force was more than Henry was disposed to allow him. So the policy of governing by the sword was rejected. The other policy, of persuading the Irish chiefs to range themselves on the side of law and order, was tried. Unfortunately, their natural instincts were all on the other side. When Kildare was sent back as deputy, they merely concluded that matters were to go on as before. At last Kildare was summoned to England and was shut up in the Tower. A rumour reached Ireland that the ex-deputy had been put to death, whereupon his son, known to fame as Silken Thomas, raised an insurrection. There was much raiding and counter-raiding between loyalists and Geraldines, and nearly a year passed before the distinctly incompetent deputy, Skeffington,

succeeded in capturing the strong fortress of Maynooth, where the garrison were for the most part hanged, so that the "pardon of Maynooth" became a byword. Silken Thomas was persuaded to surrender, but was ultimately executed as he had not received definite promise of a pardon. His captor, Lord Leonard Grey, was made deputy, and having promptly proved himself much more than a match for Desmond in the south and O'Neill in the north, he again set out on a policy of conciliation, treating the English party with a very high hand. Consequently he found himself accused of treason, and his attainder was followed by his execution. Grey had failed disastrously, chiefly because of his arrogance and high-handedness. That the policy of conciliation was a sound one is the natural conclusion to be drawn from the rule of his successor, St. Leger. A combination of tact and firmness, and a shrewd appreciation of the varying characters of the men with whom he had to deal, enabled St. Leger to establish an unprecedented degree of order and peace. But the root of the trouble lay in the fact that successful government depended almost entirely on the personal character of the Deputy. A series of St. Legers might have solved the Irish problem for the Tudors, and have delivered posterity from an exceedingly perplexing heritage; but unhappily there were no more St. Legers forthcoming, and trouble revived in the ensuing reign.

VII

LAST YEARS

In the last years of the reign of Henry VIII., England's relations with the continental powers and with Scotland again become prominent. Cromwell had completely established the royal supremacy in England, where Henry was virtually absolute. The Church's power of resistance to the royal will had been completely shattered, and Henry had no inclination to permit any extension of religious changes. He did not choose that Archbishop Cranmer should be hurt, and although the party led by the Howards and by Bishop Gardiner were on the whole predominant, they were not allowed to make active reprisals for their repression under Cromwell's régime. The Howards, indeed, seemed to have achieved a triumph when the king was persuaded to take for his fifth wife Catherine Howard, the niece of the Duke of Norfolk; but the triumph was short-lived, since the new queen was very soon found guilty of gross misconduct, this time on quite unquestionable evidence, and was executed. Henry took for his sixth wife Catherine Parr, widow of Lord Latimer, a lady with leanings to the reformed doctrines, but endowed with a tact which enabled her to retain the favour of her royal spouse and so to outlive him.


Abroad the fear of a reconciliation between Charles and Francis had

enabled Cromwell to hurry Henry into the Cleves marriage. That was a danger which had now finally disappeared. Moreover, Henry was again

free to revert to Wolsey's balancing policy ; that is, there was now no inherent reason against a revival of amity with Charles, since his aunt Katharine had been dead for some years. Moreover, there was no love lost between Henry and the Lutheran League, especially since the Cleves fiasco ; although, on the other hand, there was no more chance of a reconciliation with the present pope, Paul III., than there had been with Clement VII. So long as Charles kept on good terms with his Protestant subjects, they would not be driven into the arms of Henry ; but there was no reason why the emperor should not be on good terms with him at the same time.

Now the relations were strained between Henry and Francis ; partly because the French king delayed the payment of certain long-standing indemnities due from him, and was somewhat ostentatiously drawing closer the bonds of alliance with the King of Scots. Border raids and public recriminations continued, though England and Scotland were nominally at peace. That nice scrupulosity of honour which some historians have managed to attribute to Henry was illustrated by his approval of a scheme for the kidnapping of King James, who was given to private rambles in search of adventure ; but the king's council, to its credit, rejected the surprising proposition. A particularly extensive English foray, however, at the end of 1541, gave James warrant for preparing a great invasion in the following autumn. But the organisation

of the Scottish army was chaotic ; its commanders were inefficient, and James himself was not present with it. The great force was entangled in the morass called Solway Moss, and was cut to pieces by a very much



Suit of armour for fighting on foot, King Henry VIII.

[Tower of London.]



THE HOLE OF AL
BERNINNY'S CAMPE

The Siege of Boulogne by Henry VIII., 1544.


[From an engraving in "Vetusta Monumenta" after a contemporary painting which hung in Cowdray House, Midhurst, until its destruction by fire in 1793.]

smaller body of English under the command of Wharton, the energetic warden of the marches. The Scots king's health had already completely broken down; the blow of this great disaster killed him. A fortnight after the battle, as he lay on his deathbed, news was brought to him that his wife had borne him a daughter. "It came with a lass, and it will go with a lass," he said, and turned his face to the wall. His words were an allusion to the fact that the Stewarts had succeeded to the Scottish throne through a daughter of the Bruce. A week later he was dead. So pitifully began the tragic reign of Mary, Queen of Scots.

But for Mary's birth, Henry might have thought the opportunity a fitting one for attempting to capture the Scottish crown. More wisely, he in fact proposed, like Edward I., to betroth the infant queen to his own heir-apparent, a scheme to which the one serious objection was the conviction of most Scots that such a union would in effect mean the subjection of Scotland to England. A Scots prince might have married an English princess with comparative approval. A number of the Scots lords taken prisoner at Solway Moss were released on promise of supporting the king's design—promises which were as easy to break as to make. Cardinal Beaton and the queen-mother established their ascendancy, and headed the irreconcilables who desired a close alliance with France to counteract the English influence. The treaty which Henry had actually proposed fully warranted the most determined nationalist opposition, since he had required not only the establishment of a Council of Regency which would have been virtually under his own control, but also the importation of English garrisons into Scotland.

The open countenance given by Francis to the Scots threw Henry into the arms of Charles, who was already at war with the French. In 1543, English troops were despatched to Picardy, and a great campaign against France in conjunction with Charles was being planned for the ensuing year. Scotland was seething with intrigues, for Beaton was exceedingly unpopular, partly because of his fierce persecution of Protestants; and it was almost as easy to stir up hostility against French influence as against that of England. The zealots even proposed to Henry plans for the assassination of the cardinal; but he gave them to understand that although such a design was meritorious, it was not one to which he could lend official countenance. It sufficed for his present purposes to keep the country in a state of chaos, and in the spring of 1544 a great English fleet sailed up the Firth of Forth. Leith was sacked, Edinburgh was pillaged, and the surrounding country was devastated. Then the English troops retired; Henry's serious business was in France.

Here Henry's troops were operating with success; but he declined to embark on the emperor's plan of campaign, which was calculated entirely in the emperor's own interest. Francis negotiated separately with his two enemies. Henry refused to make peace except in conjunction with his ally; Charles, less scrupulous, made terms on his own account



THE ENCAMPMENT OF THE ENGLISH FORCES NEAR PORTSMOUTH IN 1545

Part of an engraving of a contemporary painting (lost in the destruction of Cowdray Castle) showing the beginning of the action between the English and French fleets in June, 1545. The fleet shown is the English.

at the peace of Cr epy. But Henry had taken Boulogne, and was now determined to fight Francis single-handed rather than abate any of the demands with which he had entered upon the war. Francis found encouragement in a rout inflicted on the English by the Scots at Ancrum Moor, and prepared a great armada for the invasion of England. But the English fleet was too strong to be attacked, and the French fleet was presently broken up by an outbreak of the plague. Ancrum Moor did not prevent an English force from again spreading devastation in Scotland. Francis realised that England was ready to go on fighting until he would come to satisfactory terms, and peace was made in the summer of 1546. France agreed to pay up the English claims, and Boulogne was to remain in England's hands for eight years as security. At the same time Henry had the satisfaction of learning that Cardinal Beaton had been duly murdered in Scotland, and the assassins held possession of the castle of St. Andrews, from which they could defy the punitive efforts of the government.

There are certain other characteristics of the reign to which brief allusion must be made. Henry had come to the throne with a treasury far better provided than any one of his predecessors, thanks to his father's peculiar economic methods. That inheritance he squandered, and he sought for a remedy in the spoliation of the Church. Yet those vast spoils were squandered in turn. Henry took refuge in the most ruinous of all financial expedients, the repudiation of debt and the debasement of coinage. In the last few years of the reign, the actual value of the coins issued from the mint fell to only about a seventh of their face value; that is, they contained only about that proportion of the silver which they were supposed to contain. Their purchasing power fell accordingly, a fact otherwise expressed by saying that prices rose. Wages did not rise in proportion, and the wage-earning population suffered correspondingly. Only the debased coinage as a matter of course remained in circulation, and foreign commercial transactions were plunged into ruinous disorder. The process of enclosure extended and increased with the redistribution of the monastic lands. Agricultural



An arquebusier.

[From an early 16th century MS.]

depression became worse and worse, while the sturdy vagabonds increased and multiplied, and trade of every kind suffered. It was not till finance was vigorously taken in hand by the ministers of Queen Elizabeth that the chaos wrought by Henry was remedied and the recovery of a real prosperity became possible. The depreciation of the coinage, it may be remarked, was made the more serious when the influx of silver and gold from the new Spanish territories in America began to make itself

felt, because the increased supply of the precious metals lowered their value in exchange. Hence the middle years of the century were in many respects a period of very serious depression, felt perhaps more acutely in the sixth than in the fifth decade.

When Cardinal Beaton was murdered, Henry's race was already almost run. He had been definitely authorised to fix the course of the succession, which was to go first to Edward and the heirs of his body, next to Mary and the heirs of her body, next to Elizabeth and her heirs, and next to the Greys, the heirs of Henry's youngest sister, Mary. This Mary, it will be remembered, had for a short hour been the queen of Louis XII. of France. She had then become the wife of the king's intimate companion, Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk. Their daughter Frances married Lord Dorset, who afterwards became Duke of Suffolk, and was the mother of three



A pikeman.

[From an early 16th century MS.]

daughters, of whom the eldest, Lady Jane Grey, was destined to be a nine-days' queen. Henry's will ignored the claims of the Scottish royal family, through his elder sister, Margaret, and also the claims of her daughter by her second marriage with the Earl of Angus. This daughter married Matthew, Earl of Lennox, so that the Lennox Stewarts of the next generation, of whom the eldest was the unfortunate Henry, Lord Darnley, stood a remote chance of succession both to the English and to the Scottish throne, though on distinct grounds, since Earl Matthew himself stood in the line of the Scottish succession, and his wife in that of England.

Henry had settled not only the succession but the form of the government which was to take control if he died during his son's minority. He

had nominated the "Council of Executors" (of his will) who were to form this provisional government. The body was carefully selected, so that to all appearance the two parties, represented on the one side by Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford, Henry's brother-in-law, and by Cranmer, and on the other by the Howards and Bishop Gardiner, should be evenly balanced, and the equilibrium preserved until Edward came of age. But at the last moment the Howards spoilt the scheme, to their own destruction. Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, and his father, the Duke of Norfolk, were charged with treason. There was evidence enough of guilt under the very wide interpretation of treason permitted by the Treasons Act. Surrey was sent to the block, a doom which seems to have been by no means undeserved, though much unmerited sympathy has been wasted upon him because he was also a poet. Yet it was scarcely a condonation of technical treason and of a painfully deficient sense of honour that he introduced blank verse into England. Norfolk himself only escaped the same fate as his son, though he was probably innocent of any treasonable intent, by the happy accident of Henry's death before the hour for the duke's execution had arrived.

Martin Luther was already gone; Francis of France followed Henry to the grave two months afterwards. Of the great personalities who had dominated Europe for so long, Charles V. alone remained.

CHAPTER XI

IN DEEP WATERS

I

PROTECTOR SOMERSET

SURREY'S conduct was probably responsible for the fact that the Howards and Gardiner were not finally on the Council of Executors to whom Henry left the management of the realm. The whole strength lay with the progressive section, headed by the Earl of Hertford, the young king's uncle. Brief but energetic intriguing procured for Hertford the office of Protector of the Realm, while the Council distributed honours and peerages among themselves. The Protector became Duke of Somerset, the name by which he is best known.

Somerset was a man of intellectual tastes and many admirable ideals, combined with a quite exceptional incapacity for adapting means to ends. What he wanted was usually right; the way he set about trying to get it was invariably wrong. He wanted a union with Scotland. He wanted what hardly any one else dreamed of, a wide religious toleration. He wanted an advance beyond Henry's position, by the admission of doctrinal innovations such as Cranmer had unsuccessfully striven for during the last reign. He wanted to remedy agricultural depression and the evils of vagrancy. But in almost every case the methods he adopted tended to defeat his own ends.

The immediate problem was that of Scotland, where the Anglophile party, the party of the Reformation, had just achieved the assassination of Cardinal Beaton. He had his choice between giving an active support to that party, which would have secured him in return their adhesion to his own policy of marrying the little Queen of Scots to the young King of England; and, on the other hand, of leaving Mary of Lorraine's government to win by French help, and relying upon the inevitable reaction against French influence to give him his opportunity at a more convenient season. He could have followed the second line without alienating the Scottish reformers. The course he adopted was that of allowing the regent Arran and the queen dowager to triumph by French assistance, and then intervening to compel Scotland at the sword's point to accept his marriage policy. He marched into Scotland, thereby uniting the entire nation against him. At Pinkie Cleugh, near Edinburgh, he inflicted a tremendous

and bloody defeat upon the Scots, then sacked Edinburgh, ravaged the country, and retired. He had made no preparations for garrisoning the south, and the practical effect of Pinkie was to draw closer the bond between Scotland and France; whither the little queen was sent, to be brought up at the French court, betrothed to the French dauphin, and ultimately married to him. Somerset had successfully destroyed an anglicising party in Scotland by explicitly reasserting the English claim of sovereignty. He had, however, achieved a military glory which won him popularity in England and increased his already overweening self-confidence.

Meanwhile the Council, within which the advanced party had practically silenced opposition, was moving towards the adoption of reformed doctrines. Even Henry had gone some way in sanctioning the abolition of notoriously gross abuses in the current religious practices, including the destruction of what were called "abused images." The term was now practically extended to include almost anything which might conceivably lose its merely symbolical meaning and be transformed by super-

stitution into an actual object of worship; and a crusade against such images was carried on which degenerated into wanton violence and irreverence. The injunctions issued were resisted by Gardiner, and by Bonner, Bishop of London, as being notoriously opposed to the wishes of the dead king, which the Council was bound to observe until Edward VI. should come of age and formulate his own policy. The remonstrances of the two bishops were answered by their confinement in the Fleet prison.

When the victorious Somerset returned from Scotland, parliament met. The Protector's paternal benevolence was demonstrated by the repeal of a series of the harshest statutes of the preceding reign—the Treasons Act, the Six Articles Act, and with them the old Acts against the Lollards. On the other hand, some of the religious foundations which Henry had omitted to suppress were now absorbed in spite of the opposition of even the reforming bishops. In answer to the petition of Convocation itself, parliament sanctioned the marriage of the clergy, and the administration of the cup to the laity in the Sacrament of Holy Communion, both of which had been ex-




A portrait medal of Edward VI., 1547.

[In the British Museum.]

pressly prohibited by the Six Articles. Further, a general pardon set the two recalcitrant bishops again at liberty.

During the following year, although there was no actual introduction of new doctrines, the party of the advanced reformers was exceedingly active. On the plea of preventing unseemly controversy, preaching was forbidden except to licensed preachers; but as only those were licensed who held, and gave vent to, extremely advanced views, the general effect was extremely inflammatory, and again Gardiner's opposition caused him to be sent to the Tower. At the same time a number of foreign Protestants, especially of the Swiss school, were flocking into the country, owing to



Part of the Coronation Procession through London of Edward VI., 1547.

[From an engraving of a contemporary painting at Cowdray House, Midhurst, destroyed in 1793.]

their dissatisfaction with the religious compromise which Charles had decreed by what was known as the Interim of Augsburg. The emperor had crushed the Protestant League, it must be remarked, at the battle of Mühlberg, but was at odds with the pope, and was at the same time endeavouring to concentrate in his own hands an effective political power over the empire, which was arousing the keen hostility of the princes.

When parliament met again at the end of the year, its main business was the passing of the first Act of Uniformity, requiring the clergy to adopt a new Book of Common Prayer. This prayer-book of 1549 had been prepared by a commission in which Archbishop Cranmer undoubtedly had the strongest influence; but it was composed upon such broad lines that the most advanced and the most reactionary of the bishops alike found themselves able to use it without violation of conscience. The Act of

Uniformity was opposed, as it seems, not because the new prayer-book itself was objected to, but because it was imposed upon the Church by parliament.

At this time trouble came upon the Protector through his brother William, the Lord Admiral. The admiral resented his own exclusion from a position of practical equality with the Protector. That he was an ambitious and unprincipled intriguer is beyond question. He was at last charged with treason, and there is no room to doubt that if he had had a fair trial he would have been condemned with perfect justice. But the Protector was persuaded to proceed by Act of Attainder instead of by trial, and the execution of his brother gave his enemies a handle against him.

Enemies he had in plenty, owing them to the combination of virtues and weaknesses in himself. His arrogance and autocratic bearing gave offence on one side and his popular sympathies on another. Half the Lords of the Council and half the members of parliament belonged to that numerous class who had profited by the distribution of monastic lands, and sought to make further profit by the extension of enclosures, which they were now carrying on with a lordly disregard of law—safely enough, since its administration rested in the hands of men of their own class. The whole of that class was roused against the Protector when he appointed a commission of enquiry, and based on its reports bills for remedying what was a manifest and flagrant evil. Parliament would have nothing to say to the bills, yet Somerset was apparently quite unconscious that danger was brewing.

Now with the summer came two popular insurrections, one in the west country, the other in the eastern counties. The latter was agrarian without qualification; the former was complicated by religious motives. In the eastern counties the monasteries had not been popular landlords; even in the old days of Wat Tyler, popular indignation had been very largely directed against them. For this and for other reasons Protestantism found its stronghold among them, as did Puritanism in the following century. Religion had nothing to do with this insurrection, which was headed by a tanner, Robert Ket, and was directed entirely against illegal enclosures. It was avowedly a movement not to protest against the existing law, but to procure its enforcement. In the west, on the other hand, the agrarian grievance was probably at the bottom of the matter, but the existence of that grievance was attributed by the rural population to the suppression of the monasteries and the substitution for them of the new greedy lay landlords. The popular sympathies were therefore wholly antagonistic to the reformers and the Reformation. Thus with them the introduction of the new prayer-book was the spark which kindled the conflagration. To the Cornishmen the old Latin services were familiar if unintelligible; but their native tongue was still, as it seems, a Welsh dialect, and a new English service was unfamiliar as well as unintelligible.

On the agrarian question the personal sympathies of the Protector were

with the insurgents, and he displayed no enthusiasm in putting them down. The rest of the Council took a different view. The eastern rising was stamped out by John Dudley, who had been made Earl of Warwick when the Council were loading themselves with honours at the beginning of the reign. The western rising was crushed by Herbert and Russell. Warwick headed the opposition which now turned upon Somerset; and the Protector found himself wholly without support among the magnates of the realm. He yielded, was deposed from the protectorship by parliament, and was deprived of a portion of his estates; but after a brief sojourn in the Tower was again set at liberty.


Meanwhile St. Leger's rule in Ireland had been brought to a close by his recall. There were signs of a recrudescence of disturbance due to various causes, and not least, perhaps, to the religious conservatism of the Irish, who very much more than the English were under the influence of the clergy. The policy of the strong hand again found favour with the government, and St. Leger was replaced by Sir Edward Bellingham. No better man perhaps could have been found to carry out a policy of stark justice untempered by sympathy. Bellingham established his mastery with complete success, but in doing so he destroyed all possibility of reverting successfully to a policy of conciliation. There was no chance of resisting the stern Deputy, but a new hatred of English domination was created; and Bellingham's own death in 1549, the year of Somerset's fall, left Ireland without the masterful hand which could hold it in control.

II

JOHN DUDLEY

It is necessary, though it is not always customary, to recognise a real distinction between the period of Somerset's rule and that of his successor in the control of the government, John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, who is best remembered by the title of Duke of Northumberland, which he subsequently appropriated. Somerset had in him much of the visionary. His conception of religious toleration was far in advance of his time; his conception of union with Scotland went much further than the mere union of Crowns which actually took place little more than half a century after his fall—it was rather such a union as the treaty of 1707 sought to achieve. His attitude on the agrarian question was more akin to that of Sir Thomas More than to that of any man of his own class. He made no attempt to sweep England suddenly out of her traditional beliefs into a zealous Calvinism. The prayer-book for which he was responsible carried with it the repudiation of no doctrine which was held as an article of faith by the most stubborn adherents of the ancient ways, nor did it carry with it the affirmation of anything positively abhorrent to the followers of John Calvin. There was

no religious persecution in his time; not one person was sent to the stake. Gardiner was placed in confinement, not on account of his religious opinions, but because he set himself in open opposition to the government. The Act of Uniformity was an order to the clergy, and did not touch the laity. The final acts of spoliation were at the worst the logical conclusion of the proceedings of the previous reign by which no layman had refused to profit; nor did any layman, however orthodox, surrender one scrap of the booty which he had gained thereby. Unfortunately for his own reputation, Somerset was personally greedy, and set a particularly bad example in the appropriation of what had been Church property to his own enjoyment; but that is the worst that can be said of his ecclesiastical proceedings from what may be called the Anglican point of view. It was not till the time of his successors that the attempt was made to transform the English Church into a Calvinistic body and to impose Calvinistic doctrines and practices upon the community—an attempt which was partially stemmed mainly by the persistency with which Cranmer acted as a drag on the extremists.



Mummings at a feast about the middle of the 16th century.

The man who supplanted Somerset was anything but a visionary. He was clever, with that kind of cleverness which is happily apt to overreach itself, a politician with no aims except self-aggrandisement. There is no reason to suppose that he had any religious convictions; at the moment when he stepped into Somerset's place, it seemed perfectly possible that he would lead a reaction. But he saw no advantage for himself in that course. Among the men who had identified themselves with the new ideas he saw no rivals to fear now that Somerset had fallen. Cranmer was assuredly not the man to challenge his leadership; whereas reaction would mean the reappearance in public life and activity of the ablest ecclesiastical politician living, Bishop Gardiner; and not only of Gardiner, but also of the old Duke of Norfolk. Warwick had no intention of relegating himself to a secondary place. His policy was clear. If the Reformation was to go forward, the party of the future was the party which drew its inspiration

from Geneva. It was Warwick's business to identify himself with that party as its champion.

Bishop Bonner had already for the second time been imprisoned, and besides his imprisonment had been deprived of his see, which was given to Nicholas Ridley, who was at that time the man on whom Archbishop Cranmer most leaned. By degrees excuse was found for treating other prelates of the old school in similar fashion, their sees being conferred in every case upon reformers of the most advanced school. It is interesting to observe that the grim champion of the Reformation in Scotland, John Knox, came very near being appointed to an English bishopric. He had been taken prisoner by the Scottish government when the castle of St. Andrews was captured, and on being released from his captivity in France, where he had been sent to the galleys, betook himself to England; since it would have been merely courting destruction to return to Scotland, where the French and clerical party were now entirely predominant.

The strength of the Swiss school made itself felt in a revision of the Prayer Book which took effect in 1552. The first Prayer Book had been so carefully vague that it was possible alike for those to make use of it who held the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation or the Zwinglian doctrine that the Communion service is purely commemorative. In the new volume which was sanctioned by parliament the forms and expressions laid down could no longer be reconciled with adherence to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, although a mystical character in the Sacrament was still implied if not positively affirmed, while the precise nature of the mystery was undefined. Further than this Cranmer and Ridley would not go. The manifest intention was still to allow the largest possible latitude of interpretation short of the Roman doctrine that the substance of bread and wine is transformed into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ by the Act of Consecration. The extreme reformers had to be content with the explicit rejection of the sacrificial doctrine of the Roman Mass, accompanied by the retention of ceremonial observances which many of them were inclined to stigmatise as idolatrous or tending to idolatry. The authorisation of the new Prayer Book was accompanied by a second Act of Uniformity, imposing penalties for non-compliance not only upon the clergy but upon laymen also. Forty-two Articles of Belief, which vary very slightly from the Thirty-nine Articles afterwards embodied in the Book of Common Prayer, were issued separately in 1553, by the royal authority, without express sanction of either parliament or convocation.

In matters of religion, then, the new government did not reverse the policy of Somerset, but applied it with increased violence and more in accordance with the views of the extremists. In other respects Warwick's aims were directly antagonistic to those of the Protector. Somerset, in spite of his treatment of his brother, had been opposed to the employment of those weapons of arbitrary power which had been forged by Cromwell. Warwick's first parliament made a new Treasons and Felonies Act which

included as treason, or as felony punishable by death, the gathering of assemblies disturbing to the public peace or aiming at the alteration of the law; and brought sundry offences against members of the Council under the same category as similar offences against the king's person. The new Act was presently utilised against Somerset, who after his release had been readmitted to the Council. Since he exerted himself in opposition to the more rigorous members of the body, fears arose lest he should gather to his standard a moderate party which would restore him to power. He was arrested on the charge of compassing the death of Warwick and others. Since he had brought himself within the toils of the law concerning felonious assemblies, Warwick, who had now taken the title of Duke of Northumberland, made a show of magnanimity by withdrawing the charge of compassing his own death—which would have been exceedingly difficult to prove and was quite unnecessary to securing Somerset's destruction. The former Protector was condemned on the charge of felony, and was executed at the beginning of 1552, amid remarkable manifestations of sympathy from the populace whose welfare he had sincerely at heart, however ineffective had been his attempts to promote it.

III

THE SUCCESSION

Northumberland had not achieved popularity. The fact was clearly implied when still a new Treasons Act was introduced at the time of Somerset's death. The Commons were ready to restore "verbal treason" to the Statute book, but, with pointed reference to the evidence produced against Somerset, they demanded that the evidence of at least two witnesses should be held necessary to condemnation. The plain fact was that the fall of Somerset in 1549 had introduced changes of policy and a change of persons in the government, but no improvement at all in administration, while the changes of policy had not commanded popular assent. The national finances were in appalling disorder, the fleet which Henry VIII. had created was falling to pieces, and the government had been obliged to surrender Boulogne to France without getting the indemnities for which it had been held in pledge. When a new parliament met in 1553, it showed very little inclination to adapt itself to Northumberland's views, in spite of the fact that every effort had been made to pack it with satisfactory representatives. Northumberland's influence was indeed supreme with the young king; but Edward, though of an extraordinary precocity, had always been extremely delicate. Northumberland knew that he was dying, and that he himself had not time to secure his position before a successor to Edward should be seated on the throne.

The law had settled indisputably who that successor was to be.

Parliament had not only authorised Henry VIII. to fix the course of the succession by his own will; it had also expressly ratified that course as he laid it down. The question of legitimacy was suspended and Mary was nominated the heir to Edward VI.; failing Mary, her half-sister Elizabeth. After Elizabeth under the will stood Frances Grey, who was now Duchess of Suffolk, and her daughters. If the will were challenged, the question of legitimacy at once took the first place. Every adherent of the old religion was bound to look upon Mary as Henry's legitimate child. If, however, the decisions of the English Law Courts were relied upon, Mary and her sister were both illegitimate, and in that case it was manifest that the legitimate heir was Mary Stuart, not any of the Greys. Even on the hypothesis that Mary Stuart was barred as an alien, the Lennox Stewarts, being English as well as Scottish subjects, were not similarly barred and came before the Greys.

Nevertheless, Northumberland conceived a desperate plan of placing Lady Jane Grey upon the throne as his own puppet; to which end he procured her marriage to one of his sons, Guildford Dudley. Mary's succession was absolutely certain to mean his own ruin, since she was passionately attached to the Roman Church, besides having been treated personally with extreme harshness during his own tenure of power. As a substitute, Jane Grey was more likely to serve his purposes than Elizabeth. His plan, then, was to claim that the dying king could subvert his father's will and himself nominate his successor. Edward's Protestantism was as fervid as Mary's Romanism, and Northumberland found no great difficulty in persuading him to fall in with the scheme in view of the danger to Protestantism attendant on Mary's accession. It was no such easy matter to persuade the Council. Its members had indeed little enough to hope from Mary; Lady Jane Grey would suit most of them much better. But it was next to impossible to find any sort of constitutional justification for the scheme, which was doomed to disastrous failure unless the nation acquiesced, as it was exceedingly unlikely to do. Still Northumberland succeeded. Reluctant members of the Council suddenly realised that their lives and liberties would be in immediate danger unless they threw in their lot with Northumberland: so they gave their assent subject to the approval of parliament. The judges declined to draw up the necessary Letters Patent without parliamentary authority, until they received their orders under the Great Seal together with a formal pardon in case it should subsequently be held that they had acted illegally. The Letters were signed by members of the Council and others; among them Cranmer, who refused until he was induced to believe that the judges had declared the whole proceedings to be legal, and the Secretary William Cecil, who afterwards averred that he had signed merely as a witness. Fifteen days later the king was dead. Two more days passed before the fact became known, and on the fourth day Lady Jane Grey was proclaimed queen.

All that cunning could accomplish Northumberland had done. He alone

had soldiers available; not a member of the Council could move against him. He had control of the pulpits, which were perhaps the nearest equivalent of the time to our newspaper press, and could count on impassioned appeals against the succession of a papist. For his puppet he had a child of sixteen, the new-made bride of a son of his own. Yet it was from this same child that he received the first check. When the great men of the realm came to her and declared to her with one consent that she was the lawful Queen of England, with plenty of plausible demonstrations, what could she do but believe them and accept, however reluctantly, the responsibilities laid upon her? But when Northumberland would have claimed that her husband should be crowned king, she flatly refused. Guildford Dudley might be her husband, but he assuredly had no right to the Crown of England. Northumberland discovered that the puppet might prove dangerously independent, if the path which he meant her to follow should be crossed by the path of her duty as she conceived it.

Ominous too was the silence with which the Londoners received her proclamation, a silence broken by a voice from the crowd saying, "The Lady Mary hath the better title." Ominous, again, was the escape of Mary herself, who had received the news of her brother's death just in time to enable her to ride hard out of the reach of the men who had been despatched to secure her person. Ill news poured in. The forces with which two of Dudley's sons went in pursuit of Mary turned against them, and the Dudleys had to ride for their lives. The country was rising in arms.

The duke was in a dilemma. If he remained in London to overawe the Council, the whole country would declare for Mary. If he went forth himself to crush revolt the Council might turn against him. He chose the second risk as the lesser. Five days after his departure, watched in grim silence by the Londoners, the Council declared for Mary, proclaimed her queen at Paul's Cross amid general acclamations, and sent a messenger post-haste after Northumberland ordering him to lay down his arms. The message was superfluous. The traitor had realised that in spite of all his intrigues he stood alone, deserted. The bubble was pricked. He had played a gambler's throw and lost, and in the hour of defeat he showed himself pure craven. He threw himself on the queen's mercy; and she would have spared even him in her magnanimity had she not yielded to the unanimous voices of her counsellors. In deference to them and to the



Lady Jane Grey.
[After Holbein.]

pressure of public opinion, Northumberland himself and two of his accomplices were sent to the death which they very thoroughly deserved. Lady Jane was sent to the Tower. Bishop Ridley, who had preached a fervid sermon in favour of Queen Jane, was imprisoned ; so were a very few more ; but the generous extension of pardons was almost without parallel. None could have guessed from the commencement of Mary's reign that she would be singled out among English monarchs to be labelled with that cruel title by which posterity has known her.

The completeness of Mary's victory is in no wise astonishing. There was absolutely no conceivable ground for challenging her title except the fact that Cranmer's ecclesiastical court had pronounced her mother's marriage invalid, a plea which was equally effective against the only other child of Henry VIII. Had there been a male claimant to the throne it might have been urged that there was no precedent for the occupation of the throne by a woman ; but every other possible claimant—Elizabeth, Mary Stuart, Jane Grey, even Lady Lennox—was also a woman. No one could pretend for an instant that Lady Jane had been put up with any object whatever except that of securing the ascendancy of Northumberland, and that ascendancy was already becoming intolerable. The people of England had acquiesced in deflections of the succession, but those changes had always been born of rebellions which represented a strong national opposition to flagrant misgovernment. Here there was nothing of the kind. The usurpation was attempted in order to maintain a thoroughly bad government in power. The extreme Protestants might indeed feel that a Romanist restoration must be prevented at any price ; doubtless Northumberland had hoped that such was the dominant sentiment of the country. But the reformers had moved forward far in advance of popular sentiment ; the public at large were prepared to acquiesce in whatsoever religious forms might be imposed upon them by authority. It was the Marian persecution itself which created in England the deep-seated hatred of "popery." Protestantism had rooted itself firmly in a portion, but not in the major portion, of the nation, which was quite prepared for a return to the position as it had been under the Protector or even under Henry VIII. in his last years ; and the nation had no reason to anticipate that the reaction would go further, no particular sympathy for the advanced Protestants who might suffer. And at the outset of Mary's reign there was every appearance that the national anticipations would be justified.

IV

MARY

It was inevitable that there should be a reaction, but there was no sudden and sweeping attack. Ample time and opportunity were given for Protestants, lay and clerical, to leave the country if they felt themselves

too deeply committed to remain in safety ; of which not a few, including John Knox, took advantage. Ridley was imprisoned, not for his religious opinions, but for his active promotion of treason. Cranmer and Latimer chose to invite arrest and deserve full credit for their courage ; but they, who had been privy to Gardiner's imprisonment for years past, had certainly no ground of complaint. For the rest, Gardiner and Norfolk were of course released, and it was obvious that the party so long suppressed would now have the upper hand ; but there was no vindictive treatment of the other side.

Anxiety, however, soon began to grow. The queen would marry, and much would depend on her choice of a husband. Her choice fell on her cousin Philip, the Prince of Spain, the son of the still reigning Emperor Charles V. The marriage was exceedingly unpopular, since men felt that such a union was in danger of subordinating English to Spanish interests, and also of strengthening the Romanist reaction. How far the country was prepared to go was shown by the parliament, which formally asserted Mary's legitimacy and repealed the ecclesiastical legislation of Edward VI., but declined to touch Henry's legislation at all ; while the Commons petitioned the queen not to marry a foreigner. The queen's advisers, how-



Queen Mary.

[From a miniature painting by Luis de Vargas, 1555.]

ever, including Gardiner, found her so determined on this head that they were obliged to content themselves by insisting on the insertion in the marriage treaty of every possible safeguard against the exercise of Spanish influence.

It was not by any means only the Protestants who detested the Spanish marriage. Within a fortnight of the signing of the treaty an insurrection had broken out, headed by Sir Thomas Wyatt, which was ostensibly directed against the marriage. Wyatt's undoubted intention was to depose Mary, set Elizabeth on the throne, and marry her to an English nobleman, the young Edward Courtenay, Earl of Devon, who was descended from Edward IV. Of complicity on Elizabeth's part there was no sort of proof. The common-sense of all such conspiracies required that the figurehead should be able to proclaim innocence with righteous indignation if matters went wrong. That rule applied to all operations involving breaches of the law or of what passed for international law. Elizabeth herself, Mary Stuart, Henry of Navarre, and Philip of Spain, nearly always managed to

be in a position to repudiate any personal association with illegalities committed in their name; and yet we can be tolerably certain that they generally knew precisely as much as they wished to know of what was going on.

For a long moment it seemed possible that Wyatt's insurrection might develop into a general rebellion. The troops sent against him deserted with the cry "We are all English." London was in a panic, and the Council appeared to be at their wits' end. Mary's own masculine courage and audacity stemmed the tide. Wyatt, unable to cross the bridge at Southwark, moved up the Thames, crossed at Kingston, and so marched towards the city. But his long straggling column was cut in two. The portion which reached Ludgate was already exhausted and was overcome with no great difficulty, Wyatt himself being taken prisoner. Wyatt, who stoutly declared Elizabeth to be completely innocent, was executed; so were about a hundred of his followers. Suffolk, the father of Lady Jane Grey, was implicated, in spite of the generosity with which he had been treated in Northumberland's affair. He too was now deservedly executed, together with his hapless daughter and her husband Guildford Dudley. Elizabeth was sent to the Tower, but was shortly afterwards released, though she was held under very strict surveillance throughout the reign.

In the summer Mary and Philip were married. The parliament which met between the rebellion and the marriage showed the state of public feeling by refusing to restore the persecuting acts directed against heresy, or to exclude Elizabeth from the succession; on the other hand, the tendencies of the government were disclosed when those of the clergy who had availed themselves of the statute passed in the previous reign to take to themselves wives were deprived of their benefices.

A new parliament which met in November was more complaisant. There was a formal reconciliation with the papacy, when the queen's cousin Cardinal Pole was received as legate and solemnly pronounced the absolution of the repentant nation. Gardiner from the pulpit confessed his own sin in the past; for, indeed, he had taken an active part against the Pope in Henry's quarrel, although in other respects he had resisted the Reformation. National repentance, however, stopped short of the restoration of ecclesiastical property, and it was soon to be made clear that a part of the nation had in no wise repented. The reaction for the moment, however, was triumphant. The new parliament restored the persecuting Acts, and repealed the whole of Henry's anti-Roman legislation, always excepting his confiscations of Church lands.

In January 1555 began the great persecution which converted the people of England to a passionate Protestantism. It was sanctioned by parliament and pressed forward by the Council collectively, though not without opposition from some of its members. It was not encouraged by Spain, for Charles V. had learnt by experience that persecution is unpopular, and it was the policy of Spain to minimise the unpopularity of the Spanish

marriage. During the first year it was probably directed largely by Gardiner, and throughout that period it was consistently marked by the selection of conspicuous victims, pointing clearly to the idea that such drastic action would achieve its end without any prolonged and miscellaneous persecution; and it is only fair to remark that, throughout, the most vigorous of its agents, the restored Bishop of London, Bonner, made strenuous efforts to induce the victims to recant and be pardoned rather than to send them to the stake.

But there is one outstanding fact which marks the Marian persecution apart from all other persecutions which have taken place in England. In every other case the pretext was political. In this one case there was no official pretence of any other purpose than the suppression of false doctrines. For more than two centuries afterwards, Romanism was penalised by English governments cruelly and sometimes even savagely, but always on the plea that Romanism was a political danger—the plea on which Christianity itself had been persecuted during the first three centuries of the Christian era. The Marian persecution put forth no such plea, and for that reason it has been indelibly stamped on the British mind as the one example of a religious persecution; though to this reason must be added another, that it was the one persecution in which the stake played a prominent part, and the stake appeals to the imagination more luridly than any other method of persecution. The three hundred martyrs of Mary's

reign made an infinitely more vivid impression on the popular mind than all the rest of the martyrs English or Irish, Romanist or Protestant, who have suffered for conscience' sake; more vivid even than the twenty thousand Huguenots who were slaughtered in the massacre of St. Bartholomew.

First of the martyrs was Rogers, reputed to be the author of the great translation of the Scriptures known as Matthew's Bible. He was followed by men renowned for their saintliness: Rowland Taylor of Hadley, and Bradford. Then came the bishops Hooper and Ferrar, and in the autumn Ridley and Latimer, and then the man who for more than twenty years had been primate of all England, Archbishop Cranmer. Him the world has chosen to despise. To the extreme Protestants he has appeared as a Laodicean, a temporiser; those who take the high Anglican view of the priesthood cannot forgive the man who, holding the highest office in the Anglican Church, deliberately acted on the principle that the Church is subordinate to the State. Cranmer alone among the martyrs gave way in



Stephen Gardiner.
[After Holbein.]

the terrible ordeal and recanted ; but to Cranmer came the reward of the sinner who repents, for at the last in utter abasement of soul he repented and repudiated his recantation ; nor did any one of the martyrs suffer the last torments with a more unflinching courage. The roll of the victims in the first twelve months numbered about seventy, nor was there ever much variation in the persistence of the persecution. But after Cranmer no person of prominence was sent to the stake ; all were humble folk, harmless, with no widespread influence while they lived, whose martyrdom made a hundred converts for every one whom they had made in their lives. Mary



The martyrdom of Latimer and Ridley.

[From Foxe's "Book of Martyrs," 1563.]

had not shrunk from the terrible duty, as she conceived it, of saving the souls of her people from eternal flames by destroying the bodies of a few in earthly fires. She lived long enough to feel, or at least to fear, that the sacrifice was in vain ; for instead of extirpating what she had accounted heresy she had ensured the victory of Protestantism.

Save for the splendid heroism of the martyrs, the tragedy of Mary's reign is unrelieved. There was no relaxation of the agricultural depression, no mitigation of the financial chaos. France and Spain were at open war in 1556 ; Charles V. had just abdicated and Philip was King, Lord of the Spanish and Burgundian dominions, while his uncle Ferdinand held the Austrian possessions of the house of Hapsburg, with Hungary and Bohemia, and the Imperial Crown remained with the Austrian branch of the house.

England was dragged into the French war, which was unpopular because it was the direct outcome of the Spanish marriage. Moreover England was in such a strait that she could put neither an effective fleet on the seas nor an effective army in the field. The crowning disaster came when at the close of 1557 Calais was besieged by the French and was forced to surrender in the first week of the new year. Calais, treasured by Englishmen as we treasure Gibraltar, was lost after it had been held for something over two centuries. Of Mary's many bitter griefs the bitterest was the loss of Calais. Ten months later she passed away, the most tragically pitiable figure among all the sovereigns who have ruled over England.

CHAPTER XII

THE ELIZABETHAN RECONSTRUCTION

I

THE QUEEN

ELIZABETH, the daughter of Henry VIII. and of Anne Boleyn, was five-and-twenty years of age when she came to the throne. At that moment she found herself with an empty exchequer and a ruined fleet; with a country engaged in the interests of Spain on a French war which could only be disastrous. Financial dishonesty and the debasement of the coinage had disorganised trade; agricultural depression was at its worst, having been aggravated by bad seasons. Pestilence too had been at work, and the country had been sickened by the religious persecution. Since the death of Cromwell, no statesman had emerged whom the world could recognise as an efficient guide and support for the young queen; there were clever men in Queen Mary's council, but those whose honesty was to be relied on were not amongst that number. The outlook would have been black enough for a new king whose title to the throne was beyond cavil. It seemed still blacker for a girl of five-and-twenty whose title was very far indeed from being indisputable.

For there was a claimant, a possible claimant, in whose favour the whole power of France might be exerted in conjunction with that of Scotland. Mary Stuart, now nearly sixteen years old, had just been married to the Dauphin Francis. As a matter of legitimacy she was beyond all question the heir of Henry VII. unless Elizabeth herself was legitimate. But Elizabeth could not possibly be legitimate in the eyes of any Romanist, because in the eyes of any Romanist Henry's marriage with Katharine was valid, and his marriage with Elizabeth's mother was void. Moreover, apart from the question of Rome, the mere fact that Mary Tudor had taken priority of Elizabeth without any formal act of legitimation was incompatible with the theory that Elizabeth was herself legitimate. In plain terms, the queen's title rested on the fact that she had been nominated to the succession by her father's will, with the express sanction of parliament; a sufficient title as it proved in the eyes of the nation, but entirely futile in the eyes of legitimist upholders of divine right. For nearly thirty years of Elizabeth's reign, the existence of Mary Stuart and her title to the throne remained a cardinal factor in policy. So vital was it now that the Spanish court

assumed that if she were sane, she must recognise that the security of her own crown depended entirely on her retention of the goodwill to Spain.

Nevertheless, to the intense indignation and disgust of the Spanish ambassadors, Elizabeth, with a complete disregard of the wishes of Spain, established an administration as capable as England had ever known, and followed out her own perfectly independent policy. She had her father's genius in the selection of ministers, and had already chosen for her chief counsellor a consummate administrator who was at the same time exceptionally shrewd and absolutely trustworthy. William Cecil was no idealist, but he was perhaps the most level-headed opportunist who ever served an English monarch. Cecil and Elizabeth saw with unerring clearness of vision that she, not Philip, was in fact mistress of the situation. Philip could not afford at any price to allow Mary Stuart to become Queen of England. For Mary was already Queen of Scotland; she would in the natural course of events become Queen of France; and if she became queen of England also, France, England and Scotland, united under a single crown, would form a power destructive to the Spanish ascendancy in Europe, completely severing Spain from the Netherlands by sea as well as by land. Hence, whatever Elizabeth might do, it was absolutely imperative for Philip to maintain her on the English throne. She was under no necessity for seeking his support, since for his own sake he was bound to give it.

On the other hand, the fact that Mary was the prospective queen of France gave Elizabeth additional security within her own realm. The nation had had a very unpleasant taste in the last reign of the effects of having a queen whose consort was King of Spain. If Mary Stuart, queen of France and Scotland, were queen of England, France would be the leading State in the combination, and English policy would inevitably be made subservient to French policy. Whatever the religious leanings of the majority of the population might be, two-thirds of the Romanists would certainly not stir a finger to set a French queen on the English throne.

But it was imperatively necessary to arrive at a religious settlement which should give the country religious peace. Was Elizabeth to follow a Romanist or a Protestant policy? She could not if she would be frankly Romanist, because that would involve her own admission of her own illegitimacy; while it would deprive her Protestant subjects of their religious grounds for supporting her, and might even drive them to fall back upon asserting the claims of Catherine Grey, the sister of Lady Jane. Moreover, a Romanising policy could not stop short at a mere reversion to the position at the end of the reign of Henry VIII., which was what Elizabeth herself would certainly have chosen. Nor was that a policy which could have found support from the men on whom the queen knew that she must rely. A Protestant settlement was the only possible solution.

There still remained an undecided question of great importance. Whom

should the young Queen of England marry? All England took it for granted that she must marry somebody, if only in order to settle the succession. Elizabeth herself had probably made up her mind from the outset that she would not marry at all, though no statesmen either at home or abroad ever believed that this was her real intention. She did not mean them to believe it. She recognised in her own unwedded state an eternal diplomatic lure. Until she should be married, her hand was a prize which could be made the subject of negotiation; once she was married, an actual husband in the flesh would certainly be an incubus. And accordingly for five-and-twenty years of her reign she retained the possibilities of a marriage with herself as an invaluable diplomatic asset.

II

THE SETTLEMENT IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND

The first marriage proposal came from Philip of Spain himself. He would get a papal dispensation allowing his marriage with his deceased wife's half-sister. To his great astonishment, his offer was politely declined by the daughter of Anne Boleyn, who, if such a dispensation were valid, could not herself claim to have been born in wedlock. The disappointed suitor took another wife, a princess of France. A curious popular superstition that he sent the Spanish Armada thirty years afterwards to punish Elizabeth for refusing him must be put away among the fairy tales of history. The matter of pressing importance to Elizabeth was to free herself from foreign complications for the moment. There was an armistice in the French war, and the treaty of Câteau Cambrésis allowed England to retire with her honour saved by the French king's promise to restore Calais after eight years, supplemented by the formal recognition of Elizabeth as the lawful Queen of England; while she herself evaded the formal recognition of Mary as heir-presumptive.

The religious question was promptly dealt with. No changes were made till parliament met at the beginning of 1559. The Marian legislation was then reversed, and the new settlement took shape in the new Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity. By the former, the title of Supreme Head was dropped, but the Crown was declared to be "supreme in all causes as well ecclesiastical as civil." The refusal of the oath was not to be counted as treason, but was a bar to office. Religious opinions were to be a ground for proceedings only when they controverted decisions of the first four General Councils of the Church Universal, or were in plain contradiction to the Scriptures. The Act also authorised the appointment of a court for dealing with ecclesiastical offences, which was actually constituted twenty-four years later as the Court of High Commission. The new Act of Uniformity required the use of a new service-book

which differed very little from that of 1552, though in some respects it reverted to the less emphatically Protestant volume of 1549. Refusal to accept the two Acts caused the deprivation of all the bishops except one, and the ejection of a small number of the lower clergy from their benefices. The vacated sees were filled almost entirely from among the less extreme Protestants, Matthew Parker being made Archbishop of Canterbury.

Critics hostile to the doctrine of the continuity of the English Church and of the apostolic succession in its priesthood rest their case on doubts of the validity of the ordination of Bishop Barlow, who consecrated Archbishop Parker—doubts for which the evidence gives no sufficient warrant. The principle of the settlement was approximately that at which Somerset had aimed—the enforcement of a sufficient uniformity of practice and ceremonial along with the admission of very wide variations of doctrine but a definite rejection of transubstantiation. Methods of Church government and questions of ceremonial,

not questions of actual doctrine, were those which for the most part disturbed the peace of the comprehensive Church which was thus established.

Financial administration was also vigorously taken in hand. Immediate confidence was inspired by the known probity of the financial agents selected by Cecil, by the obvious self-reliance with which the government faced its difficulties, and by its hardly expected stability. It soon became manifest that there was to be no wastage, and that every penny of the public supplies would be strictly expended on national objects under stringent supervision. Every loan that was negotiated was repaid with



Queen Elizabeth.

[From the painting attributed to Marcus Gheeraedts in the National Portrait Gallery.]

an admirable punctuality; and with the restoration of public credit, the negotiation of loans became a comparatively easy matter. The financial problem was in great part solved by the skill with which the whole of the debased coinage in general circulation was called in and was replaced by a new coinage of which the real and the nominal values were the same.

During the same period Scotland was also settling her own affairs, which were reaching a crisis at the moment of Elizabeth's accession. In the eleven years since Somerset's invasion in 1547, the French party had held the ascendancy. Although the Earl of Arran, the heir-presumptive, who held also the French title of Duke of Chatelherault, was nominally regent, Mary of Lorraine was the real ruler of the country, and in 1554 she became actually regent, Chatelherault retiring. It was in fact her policy to turn Scotland into a province of France—by no means with Scottish approval. The appointment of Frenchmen to the most responsible offices of the state intensified the general uneasiness. An attempt to establish a property tax had to be promptly abandoned, and when the regent in 1557 proposed to invade England in the interests of France, she met with an obstinate refusal from the leading nobles. In the following year Queen Mary was married to the Dauphin, and the Scottish commissioners for the marriage treaty returned from France with an angry consciousness that if they had given way to the French demands, which they refused to do, Scotland would have ceased to be the ally and would have become in effect the subordinate of France.

Now hostility to France meant of necessity inclination towards England. In the past it might at almost any time have been claimed that patriotism and hostility to England would go hand in hand; but under the existing conditions patriotism came near to involving hostility to France. Moreover, the coming of the Reformation had introduced a new factor. The Guises in France were at the head of what, in that country at least, may be called without offence the Catholic party; Mary of Lorraine in Scotland had identified herself with the Clerical party. If Protestantism triumphed in England, Scottish Protestantism would inevitably turn to England for support, as it had done a dozen years before. Scotland would in any circumstances refuse, as she had always refused, anything that pointed to subjection to the richer country, but the idea of a union which involved no subordination was one which now might possibly be rendered acceptable to the Scottish people, even as it had seemed desirable to far-seeing statesmen in both countries.

During Mary Tudor's reign in England, the regent in Scotland had been obliged to walk warily in matters of religion, and the reformed doctrines had spread apace, several of the nobles ranging themselves upon that side; prominent among whom were the Lord James Stuart, the young queen's illegitimate half-brother, and the Earls of Argyle and Morton, to whom was shortly to be added the Earl of Arran, a title which was now borne by the son of the Duke of Chatelherault. The Protestant lords,

soon to be known as the Lords of the Congregation, were already in 1557 assuming an aggressive attitude, which became directly defiant in the next year when an old man named Walter Mills was burnt for heresy. And before the end of that year the professed Protestant Elizabeth was on the throne of England.

Before the end of May 1559 it was already certain that there would be an armed struggle in Scotland. In July Henry II. of France was killed in a tournament; his son Francis II. and Mary Stuart became king and queen. Both in France and Scotland the Guise interest was predominant; and the Lords of the Congregation opened communications with England, while French troops were landed in Scotland to support the regent.

It was at this stage that Elizabeth got fairly started on her matrimonial diplomacy. Philip of Spain now wished her to marry his cousin the Austrian Archduke Charles. The Scots proposed that she should marry the young Earl of Arran, whose prospective claim to the Scottish throne might be made an immediate one by the deposition of Mary Stuart. Elizabeth played with both offers, though she had no intention of accepting either. It was her favourite method to avoid committing herself to anybody.



Queen Elizabeth's State Carriage.

But in the next year, under persistent pressure from Cecil, she did commit herself to supporting the Lords of the Congregation; not, in theory, against the queen, but against the regent who was abusing the royal authority. Elizabeth was already able to send an efficient fleet to sea, and the arrival of an English squadron in the Forth cut off all prospect of French reinforcement for the regent. This was followed up by the despatch of an army to help the Lords of the Congregation. The regent was shut up in Leith, which was vigorously defended; but in June she died, and with her death the position of the French troops in Scotland became practically untenable. An arrangement was entered upon variously known as the Treaty of Edinburgh or of Leith. The French were to evacuate Scotland, having given a pledge that the demand of the Lords of the Congregation for religious toleration should be recognised, as well as Elizabeth's own right to the throne of England. Virtually the triumph of the Lords of the Congregation was secured with the death of the regent and the disappearance of the French troops. It was certain that after this any serious attempt to bring back the French would be impracticable. Mary might, and did, refuse to ratify the treaty, but the fact of the evacuation was decisive.

Before the end of the year, the death of Mary's husband changed the whole situation. She was no longer Queen of France. The queen-mother, Catherine de Medicis, meant to secure her own ascendancy over the new King Charles IX., and France had no longer the same interest as before in

the possibility of Mary's accession to the English throne. The presumption remained that such an event would bring England into close alliance with France, but nothing more. There was a possibility that Philip might attach Mary to himself, though unless he could succeed in doing so it would still be emphatically opposed to his interests to see Mary on the English throne. Elizabeth could for the present remain free from the fear of Spanish intervention on Mary's behalf, and would rather make it her aim to attach Mary to England. The Scots of both parties saw possibilities of advantage for themselves in the return of the young queen to her native country. In August 1561 Mary left the land in which she had been bred and reached the bleak shores of her own northern kingdom.

III

THE CONTINENT: MARY STUART IN SCOTLAND

For a few years to come, England itself was settling down and rapidly developing strength and wealth under Burleigh's administration. Mary was following out her own dramatic destiny in Scotland. But on the Continent events were taking place, the meaning of which must be grasped in order to make the subsequent history intelligible.

In the first place the Council of Trent was brought to a conclusion. It had never been in any sense a Council of Christendom, since it had excluded from its deliberations so much of Christendom as challenged the spiritual supremacy of the papacy. But it defined Catholic doctrine from the Roman point of view, drawing its own ring-fence round the Church and parting those whom it recognised as Catholics from the rest of the world. The party label was accepted in common speech, but without any admission of the implied contention that those whom the Church of Rome chose to exclude were not members of the Church Catholic; precisely as an English political party calls itself and is called by its opponents Liberal or Conservative without implying its exclusive possession of the qualities expressed by those terms. Further, within the Roman Church there was being perfected that militant organisation known as the Order of the Jesuits, which played an extremely active part in the coming politico-religious struggle.

Next; in France began a series of wars of religion which continued into the last decade of the century. Among the nobility and the common people there was something like a balance between the Catholics and the Huguenots; the Huguenots being headed by the Bourbon branch of the royal family, which stood next in succession after the four brothers of whom the reigning king Charles IX. was the second. At the head of the Catholics stood the powerful Guise family. But between the two stood a middle party whose main object was the political one of preventing either Huguenots or Guises from becoming over powerful. This was the party

of Catherine de Medicis, who herself cared nothing for religion, but inclined towards repression or toleration of the Huguenots according to the exigencies of political strife. These came to be known as the *Politiques*. This strife of parties prevented France from concentrating on a national policy.

In the third place, Spain became involved in a long struggle with the Netherlands, which formed the main portion of Philip's Burgundian inheritance. Here there were two factors at work. The several states which made up the Netherlands or Low Countries had in effect been self-governing states in the past; whereas it was Philip's aim to subject them to Spanish domination, to which none of them were inclined to submit. But further, the Northern Provinces were fervent adherents of the Reformation, whereas the Southern Provinces, roughly corresponding to the modern Belgium, remained on the Catholic side. Philip regarded the suppression of heresy as his own special function. The Northern Netherlands therefore had the double grievance that Philip's policy sought to deprive them both of political and of religious liberty; the Southern States had only the political grievance. In 1567 the Duke of Alba was sent to the Netherlands as governor to crush resistance in general and heresy in particular, and in 1568 the Netherlands broke out in open revolt. From that time the recognised hero of the struggle for liberty was William the Silent, of Orange and Nassau, and the subjugation of the Netherlands took precedence of all other objects in the mind of Philip of Spain.

The dramatic interest centres entirely in Scotland. There the young queen on her arrival found the Lords of the Congregation completely dominant, while the two most powerful men in the country were the preacher John Knox and her own half-brother Lord James Stuart, better known to posterity by his later title of Earl of Moray. In Scotland there was no question of a Catholic element extending toleration to Protestants; the question was as to the amount of toleration which the Calvinistic



Queen Mary Stuart.

[After the painting by François Clouet.]

Protestants of the country would extend to the Catholics. A Catholic herself, all that Mary could do was to place herself ostensibly in Moray's hands, whatever hopes she may have cherished of ultimately restoring the ascendancy of her own faith. But she was able and ambitious, and she had been bred in a political atmosphere. She was also beautiful, and endowed with an extraordinary fascination. With her as with Elizabeth, the great problem was to find a suitable husband, a matter which was of extreme interest to the French, the Spanish, and the English courts.

Elizabeth tried hard to persuade her cousin to marry her own favourite Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, a younger son of the traitor Duke of Northumberland. The Queen of England had driven her own ministers to the verge of despair by giving colour to the suspicion that she had thoughts of marrying Leicester herself; and the proposal that Mary should marry him was resented as insulting. Both Charles IX. of France and Don Carlos the heir-apparent of Spain flitted across the Scots Queen's matrimonial horizon, but neither was ever a probable suitor. Mary, however, selected for herself Henry Stewart, Lord Darnley—the eldest son of the Earl of Lennox—who as we have seen stood not far from the succession to the thrones both of England and of Scotland, in right of his descent on one side from a daughter of Henry VII. and on the other from a daughter of James II. Darnley himself passed for a Catholic, and the union would strengthen Mary's hold on the English Catholics. Unhappily for Mary, Darnley was utterly unfitted for the position she gave him. Intellectually and morally he was entirely despicable, as she was soon to find to her cost. Moreover the marriage alarmed and angered many of Mary's Protestant subjects, including Moray, who took up arms, but then thought it better to retire from Scotland. Mary was now managing her own affairs and ignoring her husband, who was easily inspired with a furious jealousy towards her Italian secretary, David Rizzio. The secretary was likewise detested by the Scots Lords because the queen placed her confidence in him and distrusted them. Several of them entered into a "band" with Darnley himself for the slaying of Rizzio, and the secretary was butchered almost before Mary's very eyes in the palace of Holyrood.

Mary was without a friend she could trust, tied to a husband whom she loathed most deservedly, surrounded by men who had proved themselves utterly unscrupulous. And yet there was one daring ruffian whom she did trust, or at least on whose loyalty to her she relied, James Hepburn, Earl of Bothwell; but for practical purposes she was a woman helpless in the hands of her enemies—a girl rather, for she was but three-and-twenty when her husband and his fellow-conspirators committed their unpardonable outrage. She would have been either more or less than human if her soul had not longed for vengeance, and, above all, vengeance on her husband. Yet since she could not strike, she suffered herself to make some show of reconciliation leading up to a new tragedy. There

were many of the Scots Lords who were ready to help her to that, for Darnley was unendurable. Before twelve months were out the vengeance fell. Mary and her husband were together. He was ill, and they were quartered, not at Holyrood, but in a house called Kirk o' Field close to Edinburgh, a house which had been selected by Bothwell and Maitland of Lethington, the cleverest politician in Scotland. Fortunately for Moray, who had been restored to favour, his wife fell ill and he was summoned to her side. One of the queen's servants was to be married, and late that night Mary left the doomed house to attend the bridal masque. Before she could return, the house was blown up. When search was made, the body of Darnley was found close by, dead, but bearing no signs of injury.



Queen Mary surrenders to the Confederate Lords at the battle of Carberry Hill, 1567.

[From "Vetusta Monimenta."]

Was Mary guilty? On the evidence, as we have it, a modern jury in a law court would be obliged to acquit her, because guilt is not definitely proved; but it would be difficult to find twelve men any one of whom after hearing the evidence, believed in his heart that she was morally innocent. The first quite plain fact is that the murder was carried out by Bothwell, the next that Maitland and Morton were both privy to it. It is scarcely possible to doubt that Mary left Kirk o' Field that night without any expectation of seeing her husband alive again. It is not easy to doubt that Moray at least suspected that the tragedy was imminent, and deliberately absented himself in order to avoid inconvenient entanglement. But this amounts to no more than saying that both Mary and Moray knew enough to enable them to save Darnley if either of them had chosen to do so.

The standard of political morality which refused to connive at assassination was exceedingly rare outside of England. Philip of Spain and a whole series of his ambassadors connived at plots for the murder of Queen Elizabeth, and for the murder of William of Orange. In France the massacre of St. Bartholomew was the deliberate letting loose of religious fanaticism in order to achieve a political end by assassination on an enormous scale. In England one Spanish ambassador noted with extreme disgust the difficulty of getting any one to lend himself to such expedients ; the Englishman's passion for doing everything by form of law was too

strong. Yet Henry VIII. had encouraged the murder of Cardinal Beaton, while in Scotland assassination was almost a commonplace ; and so far as Mary herself was guilty, she shared her guilt with the very men who sought to turn her ruin to their own advancement.

But the special points are : first, that there was a political as well as a personal motive for the crime, because Darnley had fully proved that so long as he lived either his follies or his vices would make havoc of every political design of Mary's ; and next, that the current morality of the period, even while it forbade persons in high positions openly to associate themselves with such crimes, did



James Stewart, Earl of Moray.
[Regent of Scotland.]

not by any means prohibit a very flimsily veiled connivance. The thing that was fatal to Mary Stuart was precisely the recklessness with which she permitted her actions to tear in pieces the flimsy veil which propriety demanded. If the unhappy queen had not chosen to marry the murderer himself almost on the morrow of his deed her actual complicity would probably have been, not acknowledged, but both assumed and condoned. As it was, she made herself an accessory after the fact, and gave the whole crime the appearance of being, not political, but the outcome of a guilty amour ; though it can never be proved beyond question that she had more than an inkling of the plot beforehand.

The drama moved forward swiftly. Three months after the murder Mary was Bothwell's wife. Another month, and at Carbery Hill she surrendered to the lords who had risen in arms, while Bothwell made his escape. She was carried to Lochleven Castle, and while there was compelled to sign a deed of abdication in favour of the infant she had borne

between the two murders; Moray being nominated as regent, with a council which included Morton, who has already been named as one of those privy to the murder of Darnley.

The arrangements of the new government were by no means to the mind of all the nobles, and Moray had some hard work before his authority was completely enforced. Even then the Hamiltons, angry at being set aside in favour of Moray, succeeded in contriving Mary's escape from Lochleven, and gathering a force to restore her to the throne. Just eleven months after Carbery Hill, Mary struck her last blow for her crown on Scottish soil at Langside. The battle was short and decisive. The queen's troops were completely routed; she herself fled southward, crossed the Solway, and threw herself on the generosity of her loving sister of England.

IV

CROSS CURRENTS

The England of 1568 was by no means the England of 1558. Ten years of a steady, honest, and business-like government had established the national finances on a sound basis, completely restored public confidence, and revived the activity of trade. The regulation of home trade and industry had been reorganised by the Statute of Apprentices. The process of enclosure had apparently been brought to a natural end, because the time had arrived when it was no longer obviously advantageous to the landowner to convert arable land into pasture; there was no more displacement of labour, and the labour which had already been displaced was beginning to find industrial instead of agricultural employment. The moral depression of the years preceding Elizabeth's accession had passed away, giving place to a spirit of energetic self-confidence which was finding expression in the adventurous activities of the seamen. Elizabeth was firmly seated on her throne, and the fact had become obvious to the world, as well as to the queen and to Cecil, that neither France nor Spain would or could openly assume the championship of Mary Stuart's title to the throne of England. Any attempt to do so by one of those two Powers would compel the intervention of the other, and both already had too much on their hands to enter upon outside adventures which did not promise immediate and certain benefit. England, in short, had passed from a condition of instability to one of assured stability. The immediate trouble which vexed the souls of her statesmen was the question of the succession if anything should happen to Elizabeth, a question which Elizabeth herself preferred to leave to chance. She had no intention of dying, and what might happen if she should die interested her less than the control of events during her own lifetime.

Such was the position when Mary Stuart crossed the Solway, and by

so doing presented Elizabeth with a very inconvenient problem. If she restored her cousin in Scotland by force she would alienate Scottish Protestantism. If she handed her over to the victorious Lords of the Congregation she would be condoning rebellion. If she allowed Mary passage to France, and the queen were reinstated in Scotland by French

aid, she would in effect be restoring the old French ascendancy in Scotland. She rejected each of these courses and resolved to keep Mary a prisoner in her own hands, in spite of the risk of her becoming a figurehead for any conspiracies directed against Elizabeth herself.

But the first thing to do was to minimise Mary's power for harm and at the same time to get some sort of colour for holding her prisoner. Elizabeth could plausibly assert that she was not justified in restoring Mary until the charges brought against her by her subjects had been investigated. Mary could not prevent an investigation, however vehemently she might deny that the English queen had any right of jurisdiction in the matter. So a commission was appointed at York, and later transferred to Westminster, before which the Scots Lords were invited to defend their own actions, which meant in plain fact to formulate their charges. They did so and put in their evidence, including the famous Casket Letters; documents which, if they had actually been written by Queen Mary, carried absolute proof of her guilt. The evidence having been produced, further proceedings were stopped. There was no cross-examination, no admission of evidence on the other side. Mary of course could not be condemned, but Elizabeth did



Sir Thomas Gresham, Banker and Merchant under Mary and Elizabeth.

[From a statue in Gresham College.]

not wish to condemn her; she merely wished to blacken her character thoroughly in the eyes of the world, and, having done so with complete success, to retain a large latitude of choice in such further action as expediency might suggest.

Mary was kept in ward, but the publication of the charges against her did not prevent her from at once becoming the centre of plotting among disloyal Romanists. The Duke of Norfolk, the premier peer of the kingdom, had been one of the commissioners for her trial; but the evidence did

not dissuade him from himself contemplating marriage with Mary. The earldom of Northumberland had been restored to the Percies, and in 1569 the Northern earls rose with the design of setting the Catholic Mary on the throne of England. The rising was crushed, and the earls of Northumberland and Westmorland were driven from the country; but the general effect was to bring wavering supporters of the old religion decisively into the ranks of the loyalists. The world as a matter of course believed that Mary had been involved in the conspiracy, and popular animosity towards her was intensified; though as before it did not suit Elizabeth to take any steps for proving either her guilt or her innocence.

Catholic loyalty to the Crown would probably have been completely confirmed, but for the Pope's blunder in issuing a bull deposing Elizabeth and laying upon all good Catholics the duty of seeking her removal from the throne, while instructing them to maintain an appearance of loyalty until the moment should arrive for striking. The host of loyal Catholics who set patriotism before their allegiance to the Pope were placed in a hopelessly false position. The most fervent declarations of loyalty were compatible with complete acceptance of the papal bull; which accordingly made every adherent of the old religion a suspect, and of necessity led to a greatly increased rigour in the application of the laws against papal practices; so that from this time onward adherence to Romanism became politically dangerous, while it entailed a considerable degree of petty persecution.

The sentiment of hostility to Rome and all her works was intensified, and there was a growing feeling in favour of England standing forth as the champion of Protestantism and the ally of Protestants, whether they were French Huguenots or Netherlanders struggling against Alva and the tyranny of Spain. English Protestantism fully recognised Spain as the enemy, all the more readily because English seamen were endeavouring to force their way into the New World, where Spain blocked the entry, and sailors who fell into the hands of the Spaniards were handed over as heretics to the tender mercies of the Inquisition. But Elizabeth, while she



Town houses in the 16th century.
[From Barclay's "Ship of Fools," 1570.]

knew that sooner or later England would have to fight Spain, was determined to put off the evil day as long as possible. The primary object of her diplomacy was to avert war at least until she felt strong enough to be sure of victory. She would not openly quarrel with Spain. But at the same time she was supremely anxious to preserve amicable relations with the government of France, whether Huguenots or Catholics were dominant.

At the end of 1571 an open rupture was with difficulty averted. A plot was discovered, for which the agent in England was one Ridolfi, which aimed at liberating Mary, marrying her to Norfolk, setting her on the throne, and killing Elizabeth. It was abundantly clear that the Spanish ambassador Don Guerau de Espes was in the plot. He was expelled from the country, and if parliament had had its way Mary would have been attainted and executed; but Elizabeth held fast to her own scheme of treatment for the captive. Philip himself was paralysed for action by the sudden outburst of a fresh revolt in the Netherlands, which Alva imagined himself to have brought into subjection. Elizabeth was dallying with projects for her own marriage, first with Henry of Anjou, the heir-presumptive of his brother Charles IX. in France, and then with his still younger brother, Francis of Alençon, who was only some twenty years younger than herself.


But again the situation was changed by an appalling tragedy. France was apparently on the verge of a religious settlement. Huguenot influence was predominant, and the Bourbon Henry of Navarre, the Huguenot figure-head, and heir to the crown after the king's brothers, was about to marry the king's sister. There was a vast gathering of Huguenots in Paris for the celebration of the wedding, which took place on August 18th. Six days later the streets of Paris were running red with the blood of the victims of the massacre of St. Bartholomew. The possibility of a French marriage for Elizabeth for the time being vanished completely; to the disappointment of Elizabeth's ministers, who had hoped by means of it to secure France as a Protestant force in European politics. Indeed, whether she were Catholic or Protestant, France's political interests were so vitally antagonistic to those of Philip that even after St. Bartholomew, Orange would have accepted a French protectorate as the price of French aid when he despaired of definite assistance from England.

In the repulsion aroused in England by the massacre, Philip found his opportunity for reviving an appearance of amity with Elizabeth, in order to deter her from active intervention on behalf of the Netherland Protestants. Alva, by his own wish, was recalled from the Netherlands, and a governor whose methods were less drastic took his place. The southern provinces were detached from the revolt by proposals for meeting their constitutional demands as distinct from the religious demands of the northern provinces. Popular sympathy in England remained with Orange, but Elizabeth's personal views were antagonistic to the encouragement of subjects who declined to have their religion dictated to them by their

legitimate sovereign. In plain terms, her sympathies as a ruler were with Philip, though she felt the political expediency of fostering the forces which held him in check. She could not afford to allow the Protestant provinces to be crushed completely, but she would give them no more than just enough help to preserve them from destruction, and that help was given grudgingly and secretly.

And so she and Philip, each privily seeking to damage the other as much as possible, both publicly insisted on their desire for a reconciliation and an adjustment of the grievances of which the two countries complained. At the same time neither had the slightest intention of conceding what the other most strongly insisted on, Elizabeth demanding for English sailors in Spanish ports immunity from the claims of the Inquisition to seize them as heretics, while Philip demanded the suppression and punishment of the seamen whom he regarded as pirates. Still the mutual protestations of goodwill seemed to be quite promising when, for the first time since the Ridolfi plot, a Spanish ambassador, Bernardino de Mendoza, appeared in England in 1578. The time, however, was at hand when the papacy and the Jesuits were to take up the business of attacking England.

In the meanwhile Scotland was enduring the government of regencies in the name of the child James VI. Moray ruled with vigour and ability, but eighteen months had hardly passed since Langside when he was assassinated. After that came chaos, which after a considerable period issued in the predominance of Morton, who became regent at the end of 1572. It was not till then that that party among the nobles who had attached themselves to the scheme of restoring Mary to the throne was definitely crushed. For six years Morton remained supreme, enforcing the law with a strong hand, and with justice except when injustice was better suited to his personal interest. But such rule was popular with no class of the community. He was a political Protestant who would by no means counte-



Queen Elizabeth hunting.

[From Turberville, "Noble Art of Venerie," 1575.]

nance the claims of the Calvinistic clergy to assume the position of the prophets of Israel. The government needed money, and its exactions fell heavily on the common people. The nobles wanted to go their own way, whereas Morton made them go his. In 1578 he realised that he had brought together such a formidable combination of enemies that he resigned the regency ; but the chaos which immediately followed soon enabled him to recover a brief ascendancy, which was again broken down through the appearance in Scotland of the king's cousin, Esmé Stewart or D'Aubigny, who was now the male representative of the Lennox Stewarts.

V

IRELAND

The rule of St. Leger in Ireland had pointed not very conclusively to the possibility that combined firmness and tact might introduce into the country some conception of law and order as ends which it might be generally profitable to pursue. St. Leger had been superseded by Bellingham, who had taught the Irish chiefs that lawlessness and disorder might entail very unpleasant consequences, under a stern English governor with an adequate force at his disposal. But he had also inspired the Irish with a fervent dislike to any kind of English government which did not allow them to go their own way. If they had had any capacity for combination, Bellingham's disappearance would probably have been the signal for a concerted uprising with which the governments of Edward VI. and Mary would have been quite unable to deal. But they preferred relapsing into general disorder, and English rule was again hardly felt outside the Pale except in the south, where, perhaps owing to jealousy of the Geraldines, the Butlers were consistently loyal to England.

Now, while Mary was still reigning in England, there arose in Ulster a leader who presently caused serious trouble to Elizabeth. This was Shane O'Neill, who was the legitimate heir of the Earl of Tyrone, although the peculiarities of Irish custom allowed the recognition in his place of a younger and illegitimate brother. Matters were simplified when the brother was killed, leaving a youthful heir. Shane, in accordance with another Irish custom, got himself elected as "the O'Neill," chief of the traditionally dominant clan of Ulster. In this capacity he rapidly made his power felt, and became practically master of the north of Ireland, where he exacted an obedience to his rule not less effective than that exercised by the English government within the Pale. There the English Deputy, the Earl of Sussex, was forced to rely upon his English soldiery, who were generally speaking the worst kind of riff-raff ; whose perpetual misconduct persistently destroyed the moral effects which ought to have followed upon the enforcement of authority. Shane's indepen-

dence caused the Deputy to attack him in arms, with the result that his expedition narrowly escaped being cut to pieces.

Elizabeth made up her mind that Shane was a fitter subject for conciliation than for coercion. He was summoned to England, whither he came under a safe conduct, and where he studied English ways with Lord Robert Dudley, the future Earl of Leicester, as his tutor. But during his absence, wild disorder raged in Ulster. Elizabeth was obliged to recognise that he was the one man who could rule Ulster, and to let him return with very large authority sanctioned by the queen. For the next three years O'Neill was consolidating his rule. Elizabeth's ministers, with benevolent intent, devised the scheme of dividing Ireland into four presidencies or provinces. One was to be the Pale, that is Leinster; O'Neill was to be president in Ulster, a Geraldine in Munster, and a Burke or an O'Brien in Connaught. This system in the two latter provinces only opened the way to violent tribal feuds; while O'Neill continued to prove himself the one strong man, though his methods were rather those of an oriental potentate than of a western ruler.

In 1566 Sir Henry Sidney came to Ireland as Deputy, and Shane found an antagonist who taxed his abilities to the utmost. Sidney promptly informed Elizabeth that, if English government was to prevail in Ireland, O'Neill must be suppressed, to which end he must have the necessary forces. With extreme difficulty the supplies were extorted from the reluctant queen. Sidney's diplomacy dissuaded Desmond from joining O'Neill; Sidney himself marched into Ulster; the O'Donnells of Tyrconnel, who had an old complaint against O'Neill, rose to take vengeance. O'Neill had to fly and take refuge among his very dubious friends, the Scottish colony of Antrim, and there he lost his life in a brawl.

So fell the first Irish chief who may be suspected of having formed the deliberate design of throwing off the English yoke; for such a description would hardly apply to the men who had supported the adventure of Edward Bruce two and a half centuries before. And Shane had set the ominous example of opening correspondence with foreign Powers on the basis of national Irish loyalty to the Roman religion. With O'Neill's fall Elizabeth's government began trying to enforce the Act of Uniformity outside the Pale; and from that time forward the religious grievance took its place beside the national grievance against English domination.

In the years that followed both these grievances were greatly embittered, and a third, thenceforth of vital importance, began to assume an acute form. Over the greater part of Ireland the relations between the occupiers and the owners of the soil were fixed in fact, not by English law, but by the Celtic tribal traditions of centuries. The customs according to English ideas were bad; but bad or good, the Irish people were passionately attached to them. The Englishman likes to believe that political institutions are a matter of common sense in which there is no room for sentiment. When sentiment gets the better of him, he persuades himself that it is not sentiment

at all but common sense. With the Celt, sentiment stands first, and a very long way first. The Elizabethan Englishman proposed to substitute common sense for sentiment in the government of Ireland. His common sense taught him that if Ireland were planted with English colonies, English laws were applied to the holding of land, and English law generally were enforced, sentiment would die a natural death, and Ireland would become a second England. Incidentally the process appeared to demand the treatment of the native Irish as unreasoning savages, brutal and treacherous, on whom it was useless to waste intelligent argument or human sympathy. They must be ruled by brute force. There was indeed a good deal of excuse for the point of view. Irish sentiment being unintelligible to the Englishman, the Englishman attributed its existence to lack of intelligence in the Irishman; and the Irishman, being treated as outside the pale of civilisation, acted accordingly. But in his eyes it was the Englishman who was the aggressor.

In an evil hour, then, the English hit upon the happy expedient of planting English colonies; in an evil hour, because every circumstance combined to ensure the maximum of hostility between the colonists and the natives. The land to be colonised was provided by the seizure of domains for which the holders could prove no title valid in English law, however secure it might be according to Irish customs. These lands were conferred upon adventurers, chiefly gentlemen from Devon, who were prepared to take care of themselves without expense to the English government—an arrangement which appealed to the economical soul of Elizabeth. The scheme was applied in the province of Munster very shortly after the death of Shane O'Neill. Another experiment of the same kind was tried in Ulster. In both cases the attempt to rule with an iron hand was met by savage outbreaks and massacres, answered by equally savage reprisals; and the English government still refused to provide the government of Ireland with the supply of well-paid troops under thorough discipline which the situation absolutely demanded. The alternatives were a despotic but carefully just rule maintained by a palpably irresistible force, or a consistently conciliatory attitude. There was a possibility that either policy might have had a really successful issue. But the Irish got neither, and every day hatred of England and of English rule struck its roots deeper and deeper.

VI

THE SEAMEN

In the first twenty years of Elizabeth's reign she and her ministers restored order where there had been chaos: a stable government, sound finance, a religious peace in which the great bulk of the nation acquiesced. France and Spain both learnt that England would go on its own way,

indifferent to any threats from any foreign Power, knowing that whatever they might threaten, they were impotent to take effective action against her. England was playing no heroic part; she rejected the rôle of the champion of Liberty, civil or religious. She would embark on no great adventure. The second half of the reign was to see her challenging and breaking the might of the greatest Power in Europe, and asserting for herself an unqualified supremacy by sea. It was to see her also step into the front rank among the peoples who have given to the world great poets and great thinkers. Already, however, in 1579, while as yet scarcely a hint had appeared of the literary splendours which were so soon to burst forth, the English seamen knew that when the hour of conflict should arrive, their own supremacy was assured.


In the narrow seas English sailors had always held their own since the days when Hubert de Burgh dispersed a French Armada off Dover. The two great Edwards and Henry V. had been alive to the uses of fighting fleets, which English statesmen occasionally endeavoured to foster, with no very marked success, by Navigation Acts. But, until the sixteenth century, the recognised maritime Powers were the dwellers on the Mediterranean, and the Portuguese. The reign of Henry VIII., however, saw signs of the coming maritime expansion. The creation of a royal navy was that monarch's pet hobby; it was the one useful object on which he expended a portion of the spoils of the monasteries. He was the first king who really owned a considerable navy of fighting ships, although in the ten years after his death its strength in numbers and in tonnage was reduced to about one half.

But, in fact, England was awakening to a consciousness of her maritime destiny. English sailors were making adventurous expeditions, intent on exploration or on commerce; even the reign of Edward VI. witnessed the departure of the expedition of Willoughby and Chancellor in search of a north-east passage to the Indies—an expedition which resulted in the "discovery of Muscovy," the opening of direct communications with Russia. But by the time of Elizabeth's accession they were already turning emulous eyes to the realms of fabulous wealth where the Spaniard had established his dominion. Apart from that shoulder of South America which the Pope had inadvertently bestowed upon Portugal, the whole of that continent, as well as North America up to Florida, was regarded by the King of Spain as his private estate, in which a strict trading monopoly was preserved. That trading monopoly was resented by the English, who claimed that it was in contravention of past treaties. Moreover, it was inconvenient to the Spaniards themselves, to whom English sailors brought goods which they were prohibited from buying, but were quite ready to buy on some show of compulsion.

John Hawkins, to his profit, broke through the official barriers with a cargo of negro slaves, purchased from native chiefs on the African coast. The negro was a much more efficient labourer than the so-called "Indian"

of America, and John Hawkins repeated the experiment. His first venture had displeased the King of Spain, and the official barriers were less easily penetrated the second time. But they yielded to a formal display of force. Hawkins sold his slaves and returned to England a wealthy man, but under official Spanish condemnation as a pirate.

He sailed a third time, and with him his young cousin Francis Drake. His previous experiences were repeated, but when he had already started




Knife which belonged to Drake.

for home his three ships were driven back by stress of weather to the Mexican port of San Juan D'Ulloa. He was received with entire friendliness, but, while he was still in port, a large Spanish squadron arrived on the scene. The attitude

of friendliness was maintained; but Hawkins' suspicions were aroused, and he was preparing for departure when the Spaniards made a sudden attack upon him. Hawkins and Drake, with two of the ships, escaped; but with the loss of a large part of the crews, many of whom fell into the hands of the Inquisition, to be treated not as pirates—for which there would have been technical excuse—but as heretics. England and Spain were at peace; but from this time forward both English and Spaniards acted on the hypothesis that beyond the line—not the Equator but the Pope's boundary line between Spaniards on the west and Portuguese on the east of it—there was a declared state of war.

Five years later, in 1572, Francis Drake set sail with a small company in three ships for the Spanish Main, the mainland of South America. The expedition was in the technical sense wholly piratical, that is to say, he intended to seize by force any Spanish treasure



Drake's ship, the *Golden Hind*, at Java.

[From the Chart of Drake's voyages.]

which fell in his way. Cecil, who about this time became known as Lord Burleigh, was perhaps the only prominent Englishman who viewed such proceedings with disfavour; he had in full measure that passion for legality which has usually been so marked a feature in the English character. But the rest of his countrymen, with the queen at their head, had no compunction whatever in encouraging such ventures, participating in the risks, or sharing the profits; although the proprieties might compel them personally to remain in the background. Drake seized a quantity of treasure in the Spanish emporium Nombre de Dios on the Isthmus of Darien. Then he laid up his ships, penetrated the Isthmus, saw the

Pacific, and swore that he would sail upon those seas. On his way back to the coast he fell in with two treasure-laden mule-trains, and returned, well recompensed, to England.


Thence he sailed again on the most famous of all his voyages in the last month of 1577. Meanwhile another adventurer, John Oxenham, more reckless though not more daring, had won the credit of being the first Englishman to sail on the Pacific Ocean, having, like Drake, crossed the Isthmus of Darien and then built himself a pinnace with which he surprised and looted two Spanish treasure-ships. Oxenham, however, was caught and killed.

Drake started on his great voyage with the intention of doing what only one man had done before him, entering the Pacific by the Strait of Magellan. So daring a scheme was undreamed of by the Spaniards, and twelve months after he first set sail, Drake with his famous ship the *Pelican*, renamed the *Golden Hind*, began his raids on Spanish ports and Spanish treasure-ships, on the west coast of South America. Enormous prizes fell into his hands; but he evaded the Spanish ships which were sent after him, and, sailing northward with the idea of possibly discovering a north-east passage, he touched at California. Thither he returned again to refit, when further exploration decided him against attempting the northern voyage. He declined the divine honours proffered to him by the Californian natives, and made his way home through the Southern Archipelago and round the Cape of Good Hope—the first captain who had in person conducted and completed the circumnavigation of the globe. The *Golden Hind* sailed into Plymouth Sound on September 26th, 1580.

Already another of the great captains, Martin Frobisher, had made three Arctic voyages, in the course of which he explored the waters now known as Frobisher's Sound. During the years ensuing his example was followed by John Davis, whose name stands second only to that of Drake in the list of English explorers.

These are the conspicuous instances of the mighty spirit of adventure which had taken possession of the English seamen. Their boundless audacity can be felt by realising that Drake's company on his Darien expedition numbered less than six score; that the *Pelican* herself was of only one hundred tons burden; and that Martin Frobisher's first ship was of no more than twenty-five tons. The English seamen, in fact, carried the art of navigation to a pitch hitherto unprecedented; and they discovered the all-important fact that with sufficient breezes the sailing ship in skilful hands was a more efficient instrument than the oar-driven galley. They found by practical experience that a well-handled English ship could sail round a Spanish galleon of thrice the size and pound it to pieces with comparatively little injury to itself. They learnt how to handle ships and how to build them, how to mount their guns so as to pour in broadsides, while the Spaniard still held the conventional belief that the business of a ship in battle was to ram or to grapple her opponent and leave the fighting

to the soldiers. Even before Drake's return, and very much more so after it, the English sailors knew themselves a match for the Spaniards. They had learned to hate Spain as the instrument of the Inquisition and also as the monopoliser of the wealth of the New World; to hate her and to crave for her destruction as the enemy of England; and they had learnt also how her destruction was to be wrought. Their hour was at hand.



Drake's voyage round the world, 1577-1580.

CHAPTER XIII

THE DAY OF TRIUMPH

I

THE JESUIT ATTACK

IN the year 1578, Philip's lieutenant in the Netherlands was his half-brother Don John of Austria, who enjoyed a brilliant reputation as a soldier and was meditating grandiose schemes of his own which probably included his marriage with Mary Stuart. Elizabeth, as we have seen, had no real sympathy with William of Orange, since she hated and feared the doctrine that subjects might legitimately offer armed resistance to their lawful sovereign. But she could not afford to see the Provinces crushed, because Philip would then be left free to employ all his energies against England. She did not want openly to take the part of the Provinces, but there was a possibility that France might do so out of antagonism to Philip, even although the King, Henry III., was suspected and feared by the Protestants as having been very deeply implicated in the massacre of St. Bartholomew. Now both Elizabeth and Burleigh in their hearts were more afraid of France than of Spain; not as matters actually stood, but if France should succeed in healing her internal discords and aggrandising herself at the expense of Spain.

Elizabeth therefore could not view with equanimity the prospect of Orange throwing himself completely upon French support and accepting a French protectorate. And yet she wanted to impose upon France the burden of supporting the Netherlands revolt. To this end in the year 1578 she revived the old business of negotiating for her own marriage with Francis of Alençon. Alençon was more or less in alliance with the French Huguenots; in the event of a French protectorate the office of Protector would be conferred upon him; and Elizabeth hoped to keep him virtually under her own control by dangling before him the prospect of a marriage with herself. For five years she managed to keep up the farce, always evading the actual marriage, although more than once she seemed to have committed herself so far as to make withdrawal impossible.

Late in the year 1578 Don John died, and was succeeded as governor of the Netherlands by Alexander of Parma, the ablest soldier and one of the ablest statesmen of the age. Politically Parma succeeded in narrowing the issue in the Netherlands by detaching the Southern Catholics from

the Northern Protestants ; but by so doing he gave the struggle the definite character of a war waged by the United Provinces of the North for the preservation of their religious liberty. The one thing certain was that those provinces would hold out to the last gasp. English volunteers fought for the Dutch in the Low Countries ; England secretly supplied Orange with funds just sufficient to preserve from complete financial collapse ; and Elizabeth kept Alençon in play. Such was the inglorious part which she chose to take in that glorious struggle.

But England herself now became the object of attack ; a papal attack which Philip of Spain fostered in the same sort of fashion as Elizabeth herself fostered Philip's enemies and encouraged the depredations of the English seamen. The agents of the attack were the Jesuits and the English Romanist zealots trained by Cardinal Allen in his seminary first at Douai and then at Rheims. These were men who for the most part believed with an entire conviction that their first patriotic duty towards England was to bring her back to the Roman fold at whatever political cost. The attack was threefold. It was directed to the resuscitation in Scotland of a Catholic party, which should appeal to national sentiment by pressing the claim of the Stuart succession to the throne of England. In Ireland it sought to raise insurrection ; and in England itself it developed a vigorous Romanist propaganda, associated with the doctrine that Romanists were bound to do everything in their power to subvert the government of Elizabeth but were individually free to follow any course which might divert suspicions of disloyalty.

In Scotland the agent of the scheme was Esmé Stuart, who captured the confidence of the young king by professing to have been converted to Protestantism by his superhuman dialectical skill. But though Esmé Stuart was made Duke of Lennox and compassed the downfall and execution of Morton, there was no effective Romanist reaction ; and Scotland was not attracted into hostility to the English government.

In Ireland the flame was kindled by the Jesuit emissary Sandars, who arrived in the island as Papal Nuncio, and by Fitzmaurice, an exiled rebel who was Desmond's cousin. The murder of two English officers started the conflagration. Half Munster rose, and Desmond was drawn into assuming the leadership. Malby, the English president of Connaught, dashed into Munster, swept through it with fire and sword, and having, as he hoped, terrorised the province sufficiently, fell back into Connaught. The moment he was gone Desmond again issued from his fortress of Ashketyn, and recovered the mastery of Munster. For some time the war took the shape of a series of savage raids and counter-raids, till Elizabeth was at last driven to provide sufficient supplies. But just as it seemed that the insurrection would be stamped out, the Catholics in the Pale itself rose, and a force of Italian and Spanish adventurers landed in the south-west at Smerwick. The Deputy himself, Lord Grey de Wilton, met with a disastrous defeat among the mountains of Wicklow. The revival of the insurrection,

however, was brief. There was no organisation among the insurgents. In the late autumn Grey marched to the south and laid siege to Smerwick, supported by a squadron of English ships which had been despatched to his assistance. Smerwick was forced to surrender at discretion and the garrison were put to the sword. Its fall was practically decisive. A desultory struggle was still maintained, the English hanging and slaying ruthlessly wherever they met with resistance, while the Irish slaughtered the English whenever an opportunity occurred. A couple of years passed before the smoulderings of revolt were completely stamped out, but the Irish leaders had learnt that they were not strong enough to fight the English unaided and that active aid from Philip would not be forthcoming. He was willing to use them as catspaws, but would not commit himself on their behalf.

In England the papal mission was in the charge of Parsons and Campian. Campian was a single-minded enthusiast, ready for martyrdom in the holy cause of the Redemption of England; a man without guile and with no suspicion of the sinister purposes of which his own simplicity and enthusiasm were being made the instruments. It was his business to inspire religious zeal; it was that of his colleague to adapt that work to political ends—in other words, to foster treason. The country was flooded with Jesuit emissaries of both types. But they found their match in the



Francis Walsingham.

Secretary Francis Walsingham, who for some twenty years counteracted every conspiracy and plot that was concocted by a consummate system of espionage. Invariably at the critical moment Walsingham's hand fell. His methods were unscrupulous. His own hands were clean. He was absolutely incorruptible, absolutely devoted to the cause of his country and of Protestantism. He was the one minister who never hesitated to speak his mind to Elizabeth, the one man of whom she herself was afraid. But if his own hands were clean, he had no hesitation in employing the basest instruments and leaving them to employ the basest means in his warfare with enemies who, in his belief, could be fought effectively only with their own weapons. Walsingham was mainly responsible for the employment in England of torture, not as a form of punishment, but in order to extract evidence from reluctant witnesses. In his excuse it can only be urged that torture was universally employed outside of England, and was universally condoned by public opinion. It was now freely employed against the Jesuits, who displayed the same admirable constancy which is habitually shown by the martyrs of religious enthusiasm, whatever their creed.

Campian himself was one of the victims whose sufferings and death really furthered, instead of injuring, the cause for which they died.

But the cause against which Walsingham was fighting was ruined by the attendant disclosures, in spite of the aid it received from the blood of its martyrs. More than ever in the eyes of the public at large, as well as of statesmen, Romanism was identified with treason, and the Jesuit mission drove the parliament of 1581 to impose new penal laws upon the Catholics. Those who had remained loyal to the old faith were heavily penalised for celebrating the Roman Mass and for non-attendance at Anglican services. It was made treason to become a convert, or to attempt to make converts, to Rome. The lives of Catholics were made a burden to them, and the burden was not removed for generations.

In 1583 the Alençon farce came to an end. That contemptible prince entered on his own account upon a plot for the betrayal of the Netherlanders which was discovered and frustrated. From that moment his political career was at an end, and he vanished from the political stage on which he had played so prominent and so despicable a part. In the following year he died.

II

COMING TO THE GRIP

French policy was complicated by the fact that King Henry III. and the court party, while they would have liked to crush the Huguenot heresy, detested still more the political ascendancy of the Guise faction, which for family reasons ardently favoured the cause of Mary Stuart. Moreover the Guises and their extreme supporters were ready, in their religious fanaticism, to go so far as to seek, though not yet openly, an understanding with Spain. The criminal folly of Alençon strengthened the Guises. Hence developed the Throgmorton Plot, which as a matter of course was detected and dealt with at the beginning of 1584. The Guises, sundry English Catholics, and the Spanish ambassador in England, Mendoza, were involved in a scheme for a Guise invasion, of course with the object of setting Mary on the throne. As usual there was no definite proof produced of personal complicity on the part of the imprisoned queen. There was no possible reason why she should be dragged into it. But quite enough was revealed to intensify the common feeling that Elizabeth's security demanded Mary's death, and to warrant also redoubled severity in applying the penal laws; while Mendoza was ordered to leave the country.

Alençon's death made the Huguenot Henry of Navarre heir-presumptive to the French throne, a prospect intolerable to the Guises, and to Henry III. only more tolerable than the Guise ascendancy. Hence France was practically barred from adopting any active foreign policy



Queen Elizabeth in Parliament, 1586.

[From a contemporary print].

whatever. On the other hand, the assassination of William of Orange, the great leader of the Dutch Protestants, threatened to destroy the Dutch resistance of which he had been both the soul and the brain, while it emphasised the unscrupulous methods of Philip of Spain. Manifestly the English people were ready to espouse the Dutch cause whole-heartedly; had they been allowed to do so the French court party would probably have made common cause with them in association with the Huguenots. The restraining factor was Elizabeth herself, with her passion for abstaining from any course which so committed her that she could not withdraw. The grim unanimity of the nation found expression in the formation of "The Association," which might be called a voluntary league of Englishmen sworn to put to death any one concerned in any plot against the queen, and any one—meaning of course Queen Mary—in whose favour such a plot should be formed. Elizabeth herself, however, insisted that for such a person exclusion from the succession should be the penalty. At the same time, while the queen, then as always, refused to recognise any specified person as her heir, arrangements were made for carrying on the government in case of her sudden demise.

Now, however, the Guises openly proclaimed a Holy League, whose object was the exclusion of Henry of Navarre from the French succession. Henry the king, despairing of English support, joined hands with the League. Philip of Spain, reckoning that an Anglo-French alliance was now impossible, while Alexander of Parma was steadily and persistently pressing forward the subjugation of the Netherlands, sought to frighten England by the sudden seizure of all English ships upon his coasts. Instead of frightening England, he kindled thereby a sudden flame of passionate defiance. Elizabeth was obliged to give way to the national feeling, and openly to league herself with the United Provinces. By the end of the year the Dutch had placed four of their ports in her hands, and an English army under Leicester's command had been landed in the Netherlands.

Leicester and his troops were to render no great service to the Dutch cause; but the declaration of war let Francis Drake loose against the Spaniards. On a private venture, though with government sanction, he sailed with a squadron first to the Spanish port of Vigo, captured some prizes, then betook himself to the West Indies, where he held first San Domingo and then Cartagena to ransom, and then returned home with an immense booty, having very efficiently demonstrated that English seamanship was fully competent to take the offensive against the might of Spain.

In the Netherlands, Leicester at the best was but an incompetent commander, and the English were really paralysed by the double dealing and contradictory instructions from the queen, which drove even Burleigh himself to threats of resignation. The one thing accomplished was a brilliant but perfectly useless feat of arms at the battle of Zutphen, where Philip Sidney fell, and dying, won immortal fame. Leicester himself was recalled before the end of the year (1586), because, in flat contradiction to

instructions, he accepted the formal governorship of the Netherlands, hoping thereby to restore in the Dutch the confidence which Elizabeth's suspected intrigues with Parma had destroyed.

Meanwhile events in England had been moving towards the consummation of the tragedy of Mary Stuart. Through the long years of her captivity, voluntarily or involuntarily, she had provided a focus for eternal



The Low Countries and Picardy in the 16th century.

plots and intrigues. Nearly all England believed that she had murdered Darnley to gratify her passion for Bothwell. Nearly all England believed that she was actively engaged in plotting for the assassination of Elizabeth and her own elevation to the throne. All England, with the exception of the extreme Catholics, viewed the possibility of her accession, whether as the result of conspiracy or in the natural course of events as the legitimate heir, with the gravest apprehension; and very nearly all England would at any time have learnt with relief that she was dead, or would have

welcomed her execution. But Elizabeth had stood in the way of the national feeling. In the first place, Mary, living, however dangerous, was a valuable diplomatic asset by means of which Scotland, if it turned restive, could always be coerced. In the second place, the sanctity of crowned heads was a cardinal article of the English queen's creed. The last thing she wished was to find herself compelled to sanction Mary's execution; and whatever conspiracies were detected, she resisted all pressure to proceed against Mary herself in respect of them. Ever since 1568, Mary had been kept in strict confinement in the charge of gaolers who could be trusted to show her no superfluous kindness; permitted the minimum of intercourse with the outside world, and perpetually conscious that her life would be forfeited so soon as the Queen of England might deem it to be in her own interest to strike.

Now the declaration of war between England and Spain changed the situation. Of necessity it made Spain the open instead of only the secret champion of Mary's cause. There was nothing to be feared from Scotland, where the attempt to create a Romanist reaction had failed absolutely. In France, nothing Elizabeth could do would increase the hostility of the Guises. The uses of Mary as a captive were over, while every argument for her removal had gathered rather than lost force. Elizabeth yielded to the pressure from Burleigh and Walsingham, which had behind it the whole weight of English public opinion, and Walsingham found himself free to adopt measures which should incriminate Mary in charges of compassing the queen's death.

Mary was removed to Chartley Manor, and was placed in charge of custodians officially less rigid than those who had hitherto been responsible for her. Walsingham was satisfied that, with increased facilities for outside communication, the captive queen and her supporters would commit some indiscretion which would place her in his power. His expectation was fully warranted. A plot of the usual kind was set on foot, in which the leading part, which included the assassination of Elizabeth, was assigned to a young enthusiast named Anthony Babington. The conspirators found it almost unexpectedly easy to open communications with Chartley Manor—one of the most active and apparently most zealous of their number being a traitor in Walsingham's pay. Correspondence passed in and out of Chartley Manor, but each letter passed *en route* through the hand of an agent of Walsingham, who took a copy of it before allowing it to proceed to its destination. But no one could condemn Mary for being privy to a plot for her own liberation, seeing that there was no kind of legal authority for her detention. It was some time before Walsingham's agent could produce a letter conclusively associating Mary with the plot as one for the assassination of Elizabeth. But with that letter in his hands Walsingham had all he wanted. The conspirators were arrested, tried, condemned; and a Commission was appointed for the trial of Mary herself.

Once again the decisive evidence against Mary was contained in a single letter. Without one particular letter of the Casket group, the positive evidence of her guilt in the Kirk o' Field affair broke down. Without one particular letter, the positive evidence of her guilt in connection with the Babington Conspiracy broke down; that is, there was no warrant for charging her with having actually given her sanction to assassination. In both cases the genuineness of the decisive document has been assailed. In neither case is it reasonably possible to maintain that the document was forged from beginning to end; in both it is possible to believe that the damning passages were forged interpolations. But in the one case the difficulties of forgery were enormous, in the other they were small. Mary's denials may have been worthless, but they were explicit and not incompatible with the rest of the evidence. Walsingham's answer to Mary's challenge was not explicit, "As I bear the place of a public person I have done nothing unworthy my place." There the matter stands and will stand till the Day of Judgment. No human being will ever know whether the technical evidence on which Mary was condemned to death was her genuine writing or a forgery. But of two things there can be no manner of doubt. Mary would have sanctioned and would have profited by Elizabeth's assassination without a qualm. Walsingham would have found some technical excuse for the destruction of the queen whose life, in common with three-fourths of the country, he regarded as an intolerable menace to the state. Whether he really discovered or invented it is a minor matter. Whether Mary was morally justified by Elizabeth's treatment in accepting any possible means for her own liberation is beside the question. No person in Mary's position in Mary's day would have refused on moral grounds to countenance Babington's plot; and no government in Europe would have hesitated to remove a person who was in Mary's position.


Mary was pronounced guilty, but her sentence was referred to parliament and the queen. Parliament forthwith demanded her execution. Still Elizabeth hesitated. Possibly she had qualms of conscience, certainly she shrank from the idea of slaying a crowned queen, and feared the tongues of men. She tried to shift the responsibility. She hinted to Mary's custodians that they should relieve her of it by taking the law into their own hands—to their extreme indignation. But at last she was induced to sign the warrant for Mary's death, which was brought before her by the Secretary Davison. The Council acted without a moment's delay, fearing that the warrant would be revoked. Royal to the last, never more royal than in the hour of her death, Mary Stuart ended her long captivity. Whatever the faults or follies of the House of Stuart, its sons and daughters, with rare exceptions, have at least known how to die.

III

THE ARMADA

By the death of Mary in February 1587 the situation was changed once more. The Romanists were without a candidate of their own faith who had any plausible title to the succession. The King of Scots was a Protestant; the family of the Earl of Hertford, who had married Catherine Grey, were Protestants. But Philip of Spain, like the Guises, had adopted the doctrine that heresy was itself a bar to royalty. Of the few English Romanist nobles who claimed a Plantagenet ancestry, none would become

DESCENDANTS OF HENRY VII.




a candidate for the crown. But Philip himself, through both father and mother, was descended from daughters of John of Gaunt. Moreover Mary, having very naturally quarrelled with her son, who was not distinguished for filial piety—after all he was Darnley's son as well as Mary's—had chosen on her own account to declare Philip her heir. On this decidedly flimsy basis Philip put forth his own claim not only to succeed Elizabeth, but to supplant the heretic queen on the throne of England; a claim which he transferred from himself to his daughter the Infanta Isabella. Nothing could have been more admirably calculated to ensure that wavering Romanists should choose patriotism in disregard of their allegiance to the papacy, since they were forced to make choice between the two. A popular error attributes to Elizabeth a magnanimous superiority to religious differences, and confidence in the loyalty of her Romanist subjects, because she chose the "Romanist" Lord Howard of Effingham to be admiral of the fleet in the great contest. Unfortunately, it is perfectly clear that Howard was not a Romanist at all. The English Catholics acted with a

loyalty most honourable to them, but without any encouragement from the government.

From the moment of Mary Stuart's death, however, it was manifest that a life and death struggle between England and Spain could not be deferred. Philip departed from his patient determination to grind the United Provinces into complete submission before extinguishing the power of England. His ports were filled with preparations for a mighty armada. The able Spanish admiral Santa Cruz was to be in command—so far as any servant of Philip II. could regard himself as in command, for Philip trusted no man. But Drake did

not wait for the Armada. As in 1586, so now, he sailed with a squadron to take the offensive, having slipped out of port in time to escape the counter-orders which he very accurately anticipated from the queen. He sailed to the great harbour of Cadiz, where he destroyed a vast quantity of shipping, completely spoiling the Armada's chance of sailing before the winter; and then, failing to entice the main Spanish fleet out of the Tagus, contented himself with capturing a great Spanish treasure-ship, and so returned home.



An English ship in the Armada fight.

[From a contemporary engraving of one of the tapestries in the old House of Lords.]


It was Philip's intention to despatch an invincible fleet which would sail up the Channel, take on board from the Netherlands Parma's veteran regiments, and proceed to the conquest of England. But Drake's operations of necessity postponed the sailing till the late autumn, and, when the late autumn came, Santa Cruz pronounced that winter storms would paralyse naval operations, even if they did not break up his fleet. With the new year Philip resolved to ignore his admiral's objections; but Santa Cruz's own death again necessitated postponement, and by this time the English fleet was in full fighting trim. During the whole year past Elizabeth had been pursuing her own exasperating policy of intriguing with Parma on the basis of proposals for the betrayal of the Dutch, filling her own ministers and sailors with acute apprehension and disgust. Yet it may be that she was only playing for time, since when the crucial point in the negotiations was reached, she declared that she could not think of surrendering the cautionary towns which she held until full effect had been given to

her own requirements ; whereas the surrender of the cautionary towns was from the Spanish point of view the necessary first step in the whole business. Every one appears to have believed that Elizabeth's negotiations were serious ; her ministers could only hope that they might be frustrated either by some fortunate accident or by Elizabeth's recovery of her moral equilibrium ; and as a matter of fact she extricated herself from the apparent *impasse* precisely as she had done half-a-dozen times before in similar cases. Philip, it may be remarked, went on patiently and laboriously as ever with his preparations, as though no negotiations had been in progress.

When the Armada was all over, English piety attributed its defeat to the special interposition of Providence on behalf of the Protestant faith. "*Dominus flavit et dissipati sunt,*" "the Lord blew and they were scattered." As a matter of fact, they were not scattered by tempests until they were thoroughly shattered and beaten by superior tactics, superior gunnery, superior seamanship, and superior naval construction. There was never a shadow of a doubt in the minds of the English seamen that, if they were allowed a fair chance, Philip's Armada would prove his ruin. If Drake had been given his way, the Armada would never have sailed at all, because it would have been sunk or burnt in detail in the Spanish ports or at least in Spanish waters. The alarms of the landmen detained the English fleet in the narrow seas, and so the Armada had to be fought in force when it did come ; and even then, what surprised the seamen was not their ultimate success in destroying it, but the unexpected capacity for resistance which it displayed.

The actual number of the English vessels which took some sort of part in the long series of engagements was somewhat greater than that of the Spaniards, but a large number of these were small boats which did not count in serious work. In tonnage, in men, and in guns, the Spaniards doubled the English. But the big ships were much harder to manœuvre, the English gunners could fire three shots to the Spaniards' one, and make every shot tell, while most of the Spaniards' were harmless. The men on board the English ships were nearly all sailors, who were working the ships themselves as fighting machines ; while half the men on the Spanish ships were soldiers who were of no use at all until the ships grappled, whereas the English never grappled until the enemy was already disabled. In plain terms, the end of the Armada was practically a foregone conclusion from the outset. The English made one grave miscalculation, which alone saved the Armada from total annihilation at their hands. They had not reckoned upon the enormous and wholly unprecedented expenditure of ammunition, of which the supplies ran short in both fleets, with the result that the English had to give up the pursuit when the Spaniards were already in helpless and headlong flight.

The nucleus of the English fleet was the small but exceedingly efficient royal navy ; the majority of the vessels were privately owned or furnished by the seaports. The whole was under the general command of Lord




THE ENGLISH FIRE-SHIPS SENT INTO THE SPANISH ARMADA AT ANCHOR OFF CALAIS

From an engraving of one of the old House of Lords tapestries executed to commemorate the victory.

Howard of Effingham, with Drake, Frobisher, and Hawkins as subordinates; while Drake was the real head. The major part of the fleet was collected at Plymouth, while a squadron commanded by Wynter watched the Dutch ports to prevent any possibility of a surprise movement from that quarter. On July 19th the Armada was sighted off the Lizard, the ships massed in the form of a crescent. The English fleet had time to work out of Plymouth Sound, cross the front of the approaching foe, and lie to windward of the enemy's course so as to be able to attack or hold off at will. The Spaniards sailed in line abreast with a wide-spread front; the English attacked sailing in line ahead, that is to say in single file, ship following ship, passing the Spaniards and pouring in broadsides as they passed; while the Spaniards endeavoured to disable them by ineffective firing at their rigging.

As the great fleet moved up Channel no attempt was at first made to bring on a general engagement, but stragglers were cut off and an occasional Spaniard was disabled. On the fourth day there was a sharper engagement off Portland, and another on the sixth day off the Isle of Wight. So far the Spaniards had kept their formation and actually lost very few ships, but the fight off Portsmouth prevented their apparent design of securing a station in the Channel, and they proceeded to Calais. As they lay there on the ninth night, the English, now reinforced by Wynter's squadron, floated fire-ships down upon them before a favouring breeze. The Spaniards were seized with panic, cut their cables and made for the open sea. In the morning they were scattered far and wide. Off Gravelines the English fell upon them and destroyed them in detail. A fierce squall forced the English ships to draw off, and by the time it was over the Spaniards had begun their headlong flight up the North Sea. On the third day after Gravelines the pursuit ceased, partly from lack of ammunition, partly



The defeat of the Armada.

[From a broadside issued at the thanksgiving for the victory.]

from the supposed necessity of guarding the Channel in force in case Parma should still attempt an invasion. Of the fleet which escaped from the English shattered and crippled, one half was lost on the Scottish or Irish coasts, or foundered at sea. Only a battered and ruined remnant struggled home. In the whole series of engagements the English had lost one ship and less than a hundred men.

IV

AFTER THE ARMADA

What would have happened if the Spaniards had crippled the English fleet without getting crippled themselves? They would have convoyed to

the English shores from the Netherlands an army of invasion consisting partly of Parma's veterans, partly of the large reinforcements which the Armada was carrying from Spain, under the command of the ablest soldier living. They would have found awaiting them the English levies gathered at Tilbury, commanded nominally by the incompetent Leicester, but probably in actual fact by the experienced captain, Sir John Norreys; an army enthusiastic but untrained, though containing a leaven of men who had seen hard fighting as volunteers in the Low Countries, in the French Huguenot wars, and in Ireland. Parma's task would not have been an easy one, but the possibility that there would have been a Spanish conquest of England cannot be denied. After the defeat of the



Queen Elizabeth in her Armada Thanksgiving robes.

[From a miniature executed in 1616.]

Armada, however, no invasion was possible, and had it been possible, the invading force would have been isolated in England, completely cut off from supplies or reinforcements. As matters stood, the dominion of the seas, hitherto claimed by Spain, had passed completely out of her hands, and the destruction of the Armada secured the deliverance of the United Provinces as well as that of England herself. From that time forward, Spaniards and Englishmen met on the seas with a perfect confidence that if the Spaniards were only three to one they had no chance of victory.

The fear of Spain had passed. England was no longer on the defensive. The party of aggression would have set themselves to the annihilation of the Spanish power, the complete destruction of Spanish fleets, the seizure of the Spanish dominion in America, the separation of Spain from Portugal,

whose crown Philip had appropriated eight years before, claiming through his mother Isabella, the sister of the two last kings, both of whom died childless. To that party belonged Drake among the seamen, Walsingham among statesmen, and Walter Raleigh, who was courtier, statesman, soldier, and seaman by turns. But Elizabeth and Burleigh were not of the party of aggression. Politically, they did not desire the destruction of Spain, fearing the aggrandisement of France thereby. Nor were they moved, like Raleigh, by great conceptions of England's expansion in America. They wanted a Spain powerless to hurt England directly, but able to serve as a counterpoise to France. Burleigh had strong Protestant sympathies, but they were subordinated to his ideas of political expediency. Elizabeth had no Protestant sympathies, and only championed Protestantism with reluctance and for exclusively political ends. The majority of the nation at large did not look beyond making the maximum of personal profit out of the weakness of Spain. Spain was to be smitten hip and thigh, and the Egyptians were to be thoroughly spoiled; but their spoiling, not their destruction, was the end in view, though there was no desire to preserve them from destruction.

Elizabeth perceived that she could give rein to this popular demand without detriment to her own policy. But Drake was the hero of the hour, and there must be an appearance of giving Drake his way. In the process the now inconvenient admiral should be discredited; and she would be able to carry out her own plan of continuing to humble Spain without reducing her to entire impotence. A better title than Philip's own to Portugal was possessed by his cousins of the house of Braganza. A more useful pretender, however, was found in the person of an illegitimate cousin known as Don Antonio. The aggressive school saw the chance of dealing a heavy blow to Spain by setting Don Antonio on the throne of Portugal. With this end in view Drake was sent forth on his ill-starred Lisbon expedition. We need not accuse Elizabeth of deliberately planning to ruin that venture; but she did in fact so interfere with and modify Drake's own scheme of operations that the expedition entirely failed of its object. It was indeed demonstrated that Spain was open to attack on her own soil. Corunna and Vigo were very severely handled, and a number of store ships were captured. But the attack on Lisbon failed, several ships were lost in a storm, and Drake returned home with a damaged reputation—though the blame did not really rest on his shoulders—which made it comparatively easy to displace his naval policy by that of his only less famous cousin, John Hawkins. That great seaman was content with merely applying on a big scale the old principles of his private feud with the Spaniards. English squadrons sallied forth to lie in wait on the trade routes for Spanish ships and fleets laden with treasure or merchandise, without devoting themselves to any persistent destruction of the arsenals and warships by the construction of which Philip hoped to redress the balance.

The policy was satisfactory enough to English adventurers, who had a free hand to raid Spanish commerce, and to it we owe that famous sea fight which stands beside the battle of Thermopylæ and the charge of Balaclava in its glorious futility. Futility, that is, as concerns tangible results; for the moral effect of such deeds is not to be measured. Sir Richard Grenville on the *Revenge*, Drake's ship when the Armada came, was with a small English squadron off the Azores, awaiting a Spanish treasure-fleet, when news came of the approach of fifty-three Spanish war-ships—an illustration, by the way, of the stolid determination with which Philip set about the reconstruction of the Spanish navy. Grenville deliberately allowed his own ship to be cut off by the great Spanish fleet, which he then fought single-handed for fifteen hours. The issue of such a fight could of course never have been in question. But it taught Englishmen, though they hardly needed the lesson, that to consider the odds against them when they fought the Spaniards was almost superfluous.


The fact however remained that, while English raiding crippled Spanish commerce and diverted quantities of treasure from Spain to England, Spain was stolidly reconstructing and reorganising her navy. Philip's chances would have been better if he had devoted himself with a single mind to this object, and to the completion of the conquest of the Netherlands. But Parma was perpetually crippled by want of supplies, besides being hampered by being called upon at critical moments to turn aside and intervene in France. There Henry III. had first tried to rid himself of the Guise domination by assassinating the Duke of Guise, and had then himself been assassinated, leaving the Holy League and Henry of Navarre to fight out their quarrel. Elizabeth lent Henry occasional assistance, just as in the past she had helped William of Orange. Philip allied himself with the Guises; and his daughter Isabella, niece of the last three French kings, was put forward as the true, because the orthodox, heir to the throne. Henry IV. was able to pose as a patriot, and to accuse the Guise faction of aiming at the subjection of France to Spanish control. But the scale was decisively turned in his favour when he formally reconciled himself to the Church of Rome while still asserting the principles of religious toleration.

The signs of Spanish recovery, however, were sufficiently ominous to induce Elizabeth to give the more aggressive war party a freer rein. Drake and Hawkins were despatched on an expedition to the West Indies, there to discover that the Spaniards had learnt many lessons since Drake's last visit to those regions. Not much was effected, and both the great seamen died before the expedition returned home. But in the following year, 1596, a severe blow was struck when a force under command of Lord Howard, the Queen's latest favourite the Earl of Essex, and Walter Raleigh, fell upon the port of Cadiz, sank or burnt a vast quantity of shipping, and extracted a substantial ransom from Cadiz itself. Even after this, later in the year, Philip was able to despatch a new Armada, though it was actually

shattered by winds and waves and was never subjected to the tender mercies of the English seamen.

In 1598 both Philip of Spain and Lord Burleigh died, almost at the moment when a general European peace was restored by the treaty of Vervins. Walsingham had preceded them by nine years. Elizabeth had been fortunate in her great antagonist and doubly fortunate in her ministers. For forty years Philip had dominated Europe. When he came to the throne, Spain and the Netherlands were his, much of Italy, the inheritance of the New World, the lordship of the seas. The one recognised maritime rival was Portugal, and in the course of his reign he absorbed Portugal and the Portuguese empire under his own sway. He made pretension to the Crown of England; for his daughter, the child of a French princess, he made pretension to the Crown of France. He was the avowed champion of the Church against heretics, though he was by no means ready to recognise the authority of the Pope over himself. For forty years Philip's shadow lay upon Europe; but during the last ten years of his life, though he never knew it himself, the substance of his dominion had passed from him. The most patient, the most industrious, the most obstinate, and the most ambitious of men, he trusted no man; and by his distrust he spoilt the work of every man who served him. He conceived of himself as a sort of Fate, moving slowly, steadily, irresistibly, grinding to powder his own foes and the foes of his faith; a Fate which would smite in its own good time. Unfortunately for Philip, he always deferred the moment for striking till it was too late. He could never grasp the possibility that his intended victim might strike first and do so with effect. Self-confidence is a supremely valuable quality when it is not misplaced; when it is misplaced it is apt to prove fatal.

In caution, in patience, and in industry, Philip was matched by Lord Burleigh, whose main defect as a statesman was a prosaic lack of idealism, which, as well as a still more penetrating intelligence, was supplied by his colleague Walsingham. The conjunction of those two great men was precisely what was needed to counteract and supplement the erratic ingenuity and selfwill of their mistress, to show her the path she ought



Elizabethan armour.
[From an effigy at Wrentham Church,
Suffolk.]

to tread—and always at the critical moment did tread, though not as a rule until her capriciousness had driven both of them to the verge of despair. They were the pilots who steered the ship of state, or rather the navigators who set the course which the actual pilot, the queen, followed after her own devious fashion, evading by the merest hair's breadth the rocks and shoals of which they warned her. The passage had already

been accomplished when Walsingham passed to his grave; one whose loyal service to England left him a poor man at the last. Burleigh was already not far short of seventy when the Armada came, and his personal activity was less in the last years of his life.

Younger men were coming to the front: Burleigh's second son Robert, the heir of his policy; the brilliant but little trusted Raleigh; Essex, showy but unbalanced, the queen's personal favourite, though her reliance was reposed rather on the younger Cecil. Less prominent, but intellectually above them all, even above Raleigh, was Francis Bacon, Burleigh's nephew by marriage, son of the Lord Keeper Nicholas Bacon who, through the first



Sir Walter Raleigh.

half of the reign, had been one of the pillars of Elizabeth's government. These were the men who played the leading parts in the last wintry years of the great queen's life, when her own contemporaries, the men who most had helped to make her great, had passed before and left her in dreary solitude.

V

SCOTLAND

While England was waging her great struggle with Spain, James VI. in Scotland was becoming an adept in the arts of what he was pleased to call "king-craft." When Morton resigned the regency in 1578 the boy was not yet twelve years old. Morton owed his power to the fact that he was very much the ablest and one of the least scrupulous among the Scottish nobility. He represented that school of statesmen which for some forty years past had definitely regarded union with England on satisfactory terms for Scotland as the goal to be aimed at. In common with Moray and Maitland of Lethington, he believed that that goal was to be achieved on the basis of the common Protestantism of the two nations, though Maitland's

tortuous mind had led him in his last days to seek the union through the restoration of Queen Mary. But Morton's Protestantism was of a political and Erastian character; that is to say, religion in his view was entirely subordinate to politics, whereas the Scottish preachers, from John Knox downwards, treated politics as subordinate to religion; they looked upon secular policy as a means to establishing their own conception of a theocracy, which meant in effect government by the clergy, who were to stand to the civil power as Samuel stood to Saul. The mantle of John Knox, who died in 1572, had fallen upon the shoulders of Andrew Melville, who was as rigidly uncompromising in his demands for clerical supremacy as a Gregory, an Innocent, or a Boniface. But Morton was stronger than the preachers, and he forced upon the reluctant Calvinists the semblance of an episcopal organisation of the Church. His bishops, however, existed merely that their official revenues might be transferred to the coffers of others, whereby they were given the mocking nick-name of "Tulchan" Bishops—the *tulchan* being a dummy calf which facilitated the process of extracting milk from reluctant kine; the Church in this case being Morton's milch cow.

Morton's power was broken by the appearance in Scotland of Esmé Stuart, who was made Duke of Lennox, and of another James Stewart, not a member of the royal family at all, who acquired an ascendancy over the mind of the boy king and was raised to the vacant earldom of Arran. Arran and Lennox, acting in conjunction, destroyed Morton; who was executed on the charge of complicity in Darnley's murder. On this there followed a duel between the Romanising Lennox and Arran on one side, and on the other the preachers, who relied upon what was then the most representative body in Scotland—not the parliament, but the General Assembly of the Church, a gathering of laymen as well as of clergy. The General Assembly in 1581 succeeded in definitely introducing a Presbyterian organisation, based upon that of the French Huguenots, into the Church of Scotland. This was only a beginning; for Lennox and Arran still retained their ascendancy over the king. But among the magnates, though in general they had no love for the preachers, there was a party which had still less love for Lennox. A "band" between them brought about what was called the Raid of Ruthven, the conspirators capturing the person of the young king. The capture checkmated Lennox, who



James Douglas, Earl of Morton, Regent of Scotland, 1572-1578.

was obliged to leave the country and died soon after ; but Arran still remained ; and in 1583 James escaped from his captors and Arran once more ruled the country, from which the nobles who had shared in the Ruthven raid were expelled.

A Scottish parliament at this time was not unlike an English parliament when the War of the Roses was going on ; that is, it was usually attended only by the supporters of the existing government, who carried out the behests of their leaders. So the Scottish parliament of 1584 repressed the preachers. It declared General Assemblies to be illegal except when they met under the royal authority, and it reconstituted an episcopate appointed by the Crown, through whom the Crown would be able to control the Church. Just after this, however, Elizabeth was forced to commit herself to the war with Spain and to a more aggressive championship of Protestantism. As matters stood she regarded the banished lords with more favour than Arran. Pressure from her brought about the restoration of the exiles and the fall of Arran from power.

The result was a government passable though not too efficient, sufficiently subservient to Elizabeth to content itself with feeble protests when the captive Queen of Scots was put to death. The most prominent events were still those which marked a victory either for the preachers or for the king in the contest for effective supremacy. The parliament of 1592 reversed the proceedings of that of 1584, and promulgated the Presbyterian constitution of the Scottish Church. The contest between Presbyterianism and Episcopacy was not on the face of it a question of theology but of Church government, although the one system attracted Calvinists, and the other Anglicans whose doctrines were less antagonistic to those of Rome. The Presbytery was Democratic in its structure and was a complete departure from the old organisation. Episcopacy preserved the old organisation in a slightly modified form, but when separated from allegiance to the papacy became inevitably allied with the monarchy. Hence both in England and in Scotland the Crown was antagonistic to Presbyterianism. Episcopacy, the effective control of the Church through bishops nominated by the Crown, requires no explanation for English readers ; but in England Presbyterianism, after the Stuart restoration in 1660, fell into such a subordinate position that the system which triumphed north of the Tweed is not commonly understood in the southern country, although there was a time when there also it came near to capturing the establishment.

The Presbyterian system is pyramidal. The constitution obtained in Scotland in 1592 made the base of the pyramid the Kirk Session, the governing body of each parish or congregation, consisting of the minister and presbyters or "elders" appointed by the congregation. Next came the Presbytery or assembly of the ministers and elders of a group of congregations. Then came the Synod, or assembly of a group of Presbyteries ; and finally, the General Assembly of the Church, the ultimate controlling authority. But in the General Assembly the Crown was also

to be represented either by the king in person or by a commissioner. The fundamental fact however remained, that the General Assembly was very thoroughly representative of popular feeling, while it considered itself warranted in dealing with all which could conceivably be regarded as entering the sphere of religion. Moreover within each congregation and each larger or smaller group of congregations the different bodies from the Kirk Sessions upwards possessed, in the name of ecclesiastical discipline, very extensive powers of interference with and control over the private life and conduct of every individual.

To the king himself such a system was intolerable. It made every minister the most powerful man in his own parish. It did not, like the Church as conceived by Hildebrand, claim from National Churches allegiance to a foreign potentate of higher authority than their own temporal rulers; but in effect it claimed that higher authority for the ministers of the National Church itself, collectively and individually. The position was expressed by Andrew Melville when he told King James that the King of Scotland was God's "silly" (that is, weak) "vassal," to be obeyed only as an official of his Divine Sovereign of Whose will the ministers were the interpreters.

But the lay magnates of the country were as little disposed as the king to be held in bondage under the preachers. The General Assembly, representative though it was, had not the secular authority of parliament, in which the Church was not represented. An arrangement was now made by which fifty-one representatives of the Church, nominated partly by the Crown and partly by the Church, should sit and vote in parliament; and the Estates also pronounced that if the king should nominate bishops, they should sit of right in parliament as in the past. The next step was the transfer to the king of the exclusive right of nominating the Church representatives, although he could only select them from lists submitted to him. And finally, in virtue of the powers granted by the Estates, James in 1600 actually appointed three bishops, of Ross, Aberdeen, and Caithness. The wedge was fairly inserted for the complete restoration of the Episcopate.

VI

WINTER

The last years of Elizabeth's reign are occupied largely by the antagonisms and intrigues of rival politicians and parties and possible candidates for the throne. Most prominent is the tragedy of the Earl of Essex, and the story of Essex is inextricably bound up with that of Ireland. The scene yields no great actors; for even the men who had in them real elements of greatness, Raleigh and Bacon, played parts which were far from being great. In Europe two men stand out far above their contemporaries,

Henry IV. of France and Maurice of Nassau, the son of William of Orange, a worthy successor of his father in the leadership of the United Provinces. But these two enter little into specifically English history.

Elizabeth until her last hour would never definitely acknowledge any particular person as her successor. So far as legitimacy was concerned, there was no possibility of questioning the title of James VI. of Scotland; but political reasons were likely to weigh more than mere legitimacy. The



Robert Cecil.

[From the engraving by Elstrak.]

Greys were represented by Lord Beauchamp, son of Catherine Grey and the Earl of Hertford, and by his son William Seymour. Margaret Tudor was represented not only by James VI. but by her great-granddaughter, Arabella Stuart of the house of Lennox. The line of the Poles, descending from George Duke of Clarence, was represented by the Earl of Huntingdon. And the ultra-Romanists at least fixed their hopes on Isabella of Spain, the sister of the reigning King Philip III. Nor was Isabella now an entirely impossible candidate, because Philip II.

had conferred upon her the sovereignty of the Netherlands, parting it from the Spanish monarchy. Isabella of Burgundy, with an Austrian archduke for a husband, might mean, not the subjection of England to Spanish control, but the union of England with an independent Burgundy, in which quite conceivably the United Provinces might be included. Isabella's claim rested on the fact that she was the only pronounced Catholic with Plantagenet blood in her veins who was a candidate at all.

There were many of the English, especially among the nobility, with leanings to the old religion, and in common with many of the professed Romanists they might be expected to accept with equal readiness a Roman Catholic ruler pledged to tolerate Anglicanism or a Protestant ruler pledged to tolerate Romanism. Hence there was a very wide field for plotting and counter-plotting, especially in view of the possibility of a marriage between

Arabella Stuart and either Lord Beauchamp or his son. Of the English plotters, by far the most subtle was Robert Cecil, who intrigued with all parties, but with the ultimate intention of securing the throne for James VI. and recognition for himself as the man to whom the Scots king owed the success of his candidature. Incidentally it was of primary importance to Cecil to ruin his leading rival, the Earl of Essex, who was identified with the anti-Spanish war-party and the more aggressive Protestants, and was bound to champion the cause of James VI., although the Romanists cherished vain hopes that either James or Arabella Stuart might be won over to their own cause. We must be content with this indication of the nature of the plotting and counter-plotting that went on, without attempting the long task of unravelling the intricate details.

The ruin of Essex was accomplished through Ireland. Power of resistance in that unhappy country had been broken by the Smerwick campaign and the subsequent merciless treatment of the Irish. The north had not taken part, however, in Desmond's rebellion; the O'Neills in Ulster and the O'Donnells of Tyrconnel, in the north-west, had remained loyal; Hugh O'Neill, the young Earl of Tyrone, had enjoyed an English training and was a professed supporter of English rule. In the south Ormond was at least convinced that English tyranny was preferable to the wild anarchy which seemed the only alternative. But Tyrone was not content; and he brought to bear upon the problem a subtlety of brain and a power of organisation unprecedented among the Irish leaders.

The Armada came and passed without stirring up any movement in Ireland; but not long afterwards the north-west was again in a state of ferment. The government, always kept with insufficient funds, except at the moment of some supreme crisis, could only deal with the insurgents after the usual ineffective fashion. Tyrone posed as the pacificator, exerting his influence to quiet the disturbances; his attitude and all his overt actions were irreproachably loyal; yet the English officials were convinced that he was merely masking disloyal intrigues. In fact, five years after the Armada, he was in communication with Philip of Spain, and Ireland was at least in part the objective of that second Armada of Philip's which collapsed so ignominiously in 1596. Yet, whatever Tyrone had been doing, nothing could be brought home to him; and after this demonstration of the futility of trusting to Spain, he succeeded in making his peace with the English government, while he continued to weave his intrigues and to organise his own effective ascendancy. In 1598 the English government resolved to deal with him with a strong hand, but only to meet with a disastrous defeat on the Blackwater near Armagh. Still Tyrone did not follow up his victory, though if he had done so half Ireland would probably have risen. He still chose to maintain his professions of loyalty, and to declare that the misguided government was attacking an innocent man.

This was the situation which brought about the downfall of Essex. He clamoured at the council-board against the inefficiency of the Irish

administration ; his tirades were answered by the offer of the deputyship for himself. He declared himself ready to undertake the task of bringing Ireland to order upon conditions—conditions which would place under his control a force dangerously large for a man of overweening ambition. The conditions were granted, and he departed to Ireland. But Essex in Ireland could not exercise his personal fascination upon the queen. His absence left the field clear to his antagonists, and his own proceedings in Ireland did not improve his position. He exceeded even the exceptionally full powers which had been conferred on him, acting in direct defiance of instructions, and wrote violent letters of complaint at the treatment which he was receiving. He paraded through Ireland instead of marching in force against Tyrone ; and when at last peremptory orders did compel him to march, he negotiated and made terms instead of striking, and, to the consternation of his supporters in England, retired without a blow. What actually passed is unknown ; but, on the whole, the presumption is that he made a private bargain with Tyrone, which was to secure the succession of James VI. in England and the ascendancy of the two earls in England and Ireland respectively.

The outraged queen expressed her resentment against her favourite in unmeasured terms ; whereupon in a moment of madness he threw up his post, hurried to England, rode post-haste to Greenwich, and flung himself in most unseemly guise into the presence of his royal mistress, trusting to recover his ascendancy with her. But the outrage was too gross. The queen banished him from her presence, and the same day he was arrested and placed in prison.

For nearly a year Essex was kept in ward, while Tyrone in Ireland opened fresh communications with Philip III., and the game of intrigue went merrily forward in England, always to the advantage of Cecil. Essex on his release found himself powerless, and made frantic efforts to recover ground as a popular champion and a patriot, to the entire satisfaction of his rival. When he had been given sufficient rope, Cecil struck. Essex was summoned to appear before the Council. The earl made a desperate attempt to appeal to the London mob, which failed completely. He was arrested, tried for treason before his peers, and executed. Passionately as Elizabeth was attached to him, pardon was impossible ; but, with his death, all happiness went out of the old queen's life.

Montjoy, an able commander, was sent to take the place of Essex in Ireland ; but even the exceptionally large forces placed at his disposal did not suffice him to make an immediate end of Tyrone. Philip III. of Spain made a last effort, and the insurgents in the south were reinforced by troops from Spain. Here, however, Montjoy succeeded in crushing the enemy before Tyrone could come to their assistance. Of the insurgent chiefs, some were captured and others fled the country. Tyrone displayed his own diplomatic abilities by making satisfactory terms for himself, and the rebellion was at an end.

With the fall of Essex, Cecil's most dangerous rival had vanished. Raleigh, with all his abilities, was better skilled in making enemies than friends, in politics at least. Elizabeth never trusted him, and he lacked both the craft and the self-control which distinguished the son of Lord Burleigh. That astute politician knew exactly what every one was doing or trying to do, and half the plotters looked to him for a lead while he manipulated the game to suit his own ends. When Elizabeth was stricken down with mortal illness, all his plans were in perfect order for securing the succession of James the moment the throne should be vacant. Troops and fleets were under the command of his partisans; virtually none but adherents of his own had access to the dying queen. Only at the very last, when speech had actually left her, the spectators averred that she signed her acquiescence, when asked if she recognised James as her heir. No one was ready to come forward



The funeral hearse of Queen Elizabeth.

[Taken from a contemporary drawing of the funeral ceremonies by William Camden, Clarenceux King-at-Arms.]

on the spot as champion of any of the rival candidates; and no hand or voice was raised in opposition when James VI. of Scotland was proclaimed James I. of England. Cecil had won, and there was no question at all that he would be all-powerful with the new monarch.

Mournful was the deathbed of the great queen, the most triumphant of all English rulers; mournful, because her own delight in life had departed from her, and of all those who still flattered her and bowed to her imperious will there was none who loved her, none whom she loved. In the heart of the nation she has been enshrined as "Good Queen Bess," the princess who flung defiance at the might of Spain and raised England to the highest pinnacle of power, the queen in whose reign English seamen won for England her proud position as mistress of the seas, and English poets matched the triumphs of the Athenian stage. What England owes to the Elizabethan age, Englishmen feel that they owe to Elizabeth herself. All other personalities are dominated by hers. And yet it is one of the most

amazing of paradoxes that such a woman as Elizabeth should stand out emphatically as one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of all English monarchs. Trickery was the breath of her nostrils; an insatiable vanity, for which no flattery was too grotesque, was, superficially, her most prominent characteristic. She deliberately assumed her right to display, in an exaggerated degree, every foible which the misogynist attributes to her sex. She was as ready to make a scapegoat of the innocent as her father before her; her treatment of Davison the Secretary, who obtained her signature to Mary Stuart's death warrant, was not less base than Henry's treatment of Wolsey and Cromwell. And yet her greatness remains. Beneath the trickery and meanness and vanity lay a deep-rooted love of her country; a mighty resolve to make that country great. Perhaps she never loved any man save Essex, the darling of her old age; but she loved her people. And behind the mask of feminine caprice there worked a brain, cold, calculating, unemotional, which gauged chances to a hair's breadth, knew exactly how far it was safe to go on any particular course, never failed to provide a means of escape from every apparent *impasse*. "Dux femina facti" was the legend on the medals to commemorate the Armada. "Under a woman's captaincy," England won for ever her place among the nations.

CHAPTER XIV

UNDER THE TUDORS

I

THE STATE

BROADLY speaking, the Tudor period falls into two parts, the pre-Elizabethan and the Elizabethan. The first is a time of transition, partly constructive but mainly destructive. The second is a time of reconstruction. On the ruin of the baronage, completed by the earlier Tudors, the monarchy took a new shape perfected under Elizabeth. On the ruin of the old ecclesiastical system accomplished under her predecessors, Elizabeth constructed a new ecclesiastical system. Out of the rural and commercial revolution which had been in progress for seventy years, the Elizabethans built up a new industrial social order. Out of the maritime activity of the first period arose the maritime supremacy which was established and the oceanic commerce which was inaugurated in the second; and from the revival of intellectual activity which practically began in the reign of Henry VII. burst the blaze of literary splendour which glorified the closing years of the period. The narrative has enabled us only in part to watch these movements, which will now demand our closer attention.

Through the medieval period the power of the Crown was limited in various degrees by three forces: the fear of excommunication by the Church, the danger of armed coercion by the baronage, and, as the expenses of government grew, the power of the Commons to withhold supplies. Arbitrary action by the Crown—action, that is, which did not clearly rest upon precedent—was invariably challenged by the application of one or other of these forces, unless the approval of the three estates had first been secured; and these three estates or parliament obtained an effective control over legislation and a degree of control over administration.

Of the three forces, the fear of ecclesiastical censure was habitually of least account; but it could not be altogether ignored, as King John in particular found to his cost. It remained, however, for Henry VIII. to bid successful defiance to the thunders of the Church and to destroy its capacity for hampering the action of the Crown.

The War of the Roses broke up the second limiting force. When Henry VII. took possession of the Crown the remnant of the old baronage, together with the new baronage, were no longer able to make head against the

monarchy. The complete subversion of the baronial power was decisively demonstrated when the peers unanimously condemned the Duke of Buckingham, the greatest noble in the realm, at the implied behest of King Henry VIII., in spite of the absence of any evidence that he was cherishing treasonable designs. The demonstration was repeated at intervals throughout the reign; the nobility at all times showed an entire

subservience to the Crown, as they also did in the reign of Queen Mary. Apart from Northumberland's abortive conspiracy, which was formulated with the sanction of the reigning king, and from the rising in the north in 1569, every revolt during the sixteenth century was a rising not of the barons but of the commons. In that year the revolt of the northern earls was the last futile attempt at coercing government by a baronial insurrection. The depression of the nobility was effected partly by the enforcement of the laws against maintenance and livery through courts which




Armour presented to Henry VIII. by the Emperor Maximilian.
[In the Tower of London.]

were not amenable to coercion, partly by systematic fines and confiscations, partly by the merciless application of the laws against treason, reinforced by the Treasons Act of Thomas Cromwell.

There remained the third force, the power of the Commons to cut off the supplies. The time had gone by when a king could attempt to act except under colour of law. The Crown could not emancipate itself from such control as the Commons possessed, so long as it was dependent on the goodwill of the Commons for the supplies necessary for carrying out its policy. The ingenuity of Henry VII. almost attained the desired end by the accumulation of a hoard which made appeals to the Commons for financial assistance superfluous. But the extravagance of his son

dissipated the hoard; and in the course of the French war he and his minister Wolsey were quite emphatically taught that a policy opposed by the popular will was impracticable if it involved heavy expenditure. There was no battle for the principle that the Commons had a right to direct policy; there was merely a demonstration that in practice an expensive policy required the acquiescence of parliament. Cromwell tried to effect an emancipation by sweeping the vast wealth of the Church into the Treasury; but the intention was frustrated again by the reckless dissipation of the wealth acquired by the spoliation. In Henry's last

years, the Crown, to avoid appeals for intolerable taxation, was driven to the miserable expedient of debasing the currency and repudiating debts. By the time of Elizabeth's accession the Crown was as dependent as it had ever been on the goodwill of the Commons. There was no new mine of wealth to replace the hoards of Henry VII. or the spoils of the monasteries, nor had the Crown succeeded in asserting any fresh claim to impose taxation on its own authority, except for some slight alterations in the customs



The *Harry Grace à Dieu*, built by Henry VIII. in 1513.

[From a drawing in the Pepysian Library, Cambridge.]

duties which were made in Mary's reign without exciting protest.

Subserviency, it may be said, would have served the purposes of the monarchy as well as goodwill; and we are told that the Tudor parliaments were subservient. That is a view hardly warranted by the facts. Within certain limits the Commons could be relied upon to carry out the wishes of the Crown. The nobility were beyond question subservient, and great nobles controlled the return of a good many members of the Commons' House. Mary too erected into boroughs sundry towns where local sentiment supported her views, just as afterwards Elizabeth created boroughs in the south-west country where her own nominees were secure. Much energy was occasionally expended on the packing of parliament, but not always with success. Constituencies occasionally refused point-blank to accept the nominees sent down by the agents of the Crown. Mary's

parliament in the spring of 1554 stopped very far short of endorsing the programme laid before it. When Henry VIII. intended to proceed against Thomas More by bill of attainder, he was wise in time and withdrew More's name from the bill in the face of unmistakable indications that otherwise if it were pressed forward it would be thrown out. The Reformation parliament itself rejected the Bill of Wards in spite of blustering threats on Henry's part. The House of Commons refused to discuss a money bill at all until Cardinal Wolsey withdrew from the precincts. The right to the utmost freedom of debate was cherished and exercised. When their pockets were touched at least, Tudor parliaments quite refused to be browbeaten. Even when money was not in question, Tudor governments did not impose legislation to which they compelled assent; they could only do their best or worst by packing or otherwise to secure a house which was likely to support the measures they intended



An Elizabethan family.

[From a brass of 1584.]

to introduce. And they could not secure such parliaments unless there was a very substantial body of popular feeling in their favour.

The Tudors, then, did not tyrannise over their parliaments, but on the other hand the parliaments did not assert new claims to control. They asserted successfully the right to discuss with entire freedom questions of policy, questions of administration, questions of religion, personal questions such as royal marriages, the right to petition the Crown, to exhibit grievances, to recommend measures, to refuse measures submitted to them, to control supply absolutely. But they did not claim the right to dictate policy. They claimed only the veto in the last resort through the refusal of supply; but this was an extreme measure, to be called into play only when there was a point-blank collision between the will of the Crown and the wish of parliament. Such a collision the Tudors were always wise enough to avoid; being happily endowed with a singular skill in retiring gracefully from an untenable position, and with an unflinching capacity for recognising the moment when a position had become untenable. Elizabeth frequently resented the freedom claimed by her parliaments, and rated them furiously

for discussing matters which were no concern of theirs ; but they went on with their discussions ; and if, as seldom happened until the very end of her life, she found herself arousing a real resentment, she was a consummate mistress of the art of beating a retreat. As a rule, however, the Commons were content to express their opinion and leave her to go her own way, which she was always careful in the long run to keep sufficiently in harmony with their wishes.

So long as harmony prevailed this was a sound working system. The brief triumph of legalised absolutism, when an Act of parliament practically bestowed on Henry VIII. unlimited powers, would at once have become intolerable if the Crown had employed those powers so as to arouse popular resentment. The Royal Proclamations Act was cancelled in the next reign. The system under Elizabeth was essentially one of partnership, in which the queen was the senior partner and manager, and parliament was the junior partner and critic. But a partnership must mean a divided authority, a possible clashing of authorities. So long as both partners are of one mind, or so long as one cheerfully accepts the subordinate position, all may go well. English institutions have existed and flourished very largely because rival authorities prefer compromise over points of difference to battles for supremacy. When differences become too acute for compromise and one side or the other must give way, the situation may be saved by the timely surrender of one or the other ; but, if it is not so saved, no alternative remains but a fight. And this is precisely what happened in the time of the Stuarts. The differences between Crown and parliament became too acute for compromise, neither would give way, and the stakes of the fight ceased to be the particular questions at issue and became the larger question of the permanent supremacy of the one or the other of the partners. Even in Elizabeth's last years there were indications of very acute friction, though a direct contest was averted partly by Elizabeth's diplomatic withdrawal and partly by the inclination of parliament to defer a serious struggle till after the old queen's death. The Crown and the people had been loyal to each other so long, and through a crisis so tremendous, that neither could willingly contemplate an open rupture.

II

THE CHURCH

The Reformation in England was primarily the handiwork of Henry VIII. ; its completion was the logical outcome of Henry VIII.'s policy, though it was by no means what that king himself contemplated. What Henry himself carried out was a revolution, not doctrinal nor moral but political. When he came to the throne, Western Christendom formed one single spiritual organisation. The Church was co-extensive not with the State

but with Christendom ; since Eastern Christianity, the " orthodox " of the Greek, not the Roman Church, was in the Western view outside the pale, not pagan but heretical. Within the Western area all Christians belonged to that one organisation, and the only non-Christians tolerated were the Jews. Within the Church, so far as doctrine and practice were defined, no diversities were permitted ; nor did the State sanction the existence of Christian sects external to the Church. It followed that all individuals owed a double allegiance, to the Universal Church and to the particular State. The essential feature of Henry's Reformation was the repudiation by the State of the existence of any such double allegiance. The citizen owed allegiance to the State alone, or to the Church only subject to the



A cut from the Great Bible of 1539.

State's sanction. It did not follow of necessity that the State would sanction one Church only. It might sanction one or many or none at all. The authority of the State might be repudiated, but it could and would enforce its *de facto* supremacy. It was not a matter of necessity, but it was practically a matter of course, that the State should sanction in these circumstances one Church coterminous with itself. In effect it treated the Church in England as the Church of England, the ecclesiastical expression of the State, though it did not quarrel with the liberty of churchmen to regard themselves still as members of the Universal Church, provided that they remained in practice obedient to the State control ; and explicitly from Henry's point of view the State in this connection meant the Crown. In the theory of the State, there was no real change ; the State merely asserted the authority which it had always possessed. Such changes as were made were not organic, but were simply administrative modifications. And this view that the Church retained its identity was made possible of acceptance by the Church itself, by the retention of the Ordination which gave continuity to the priesthood. Thus spiritually in the eyes of the Church, and legally in the eyes of the State, the continuity of the Church was preserved.

But diversity was contemplated no more than in the past. No one was to be permitted to separate himself from the Church ; there were to be no external sects. Yet in the general intellectual ferment of Europe, immense uncertainties had arisen as to what doctrines and practices were positively enjoined, what were permitted, what were sanctioned as mere matter of convenience, what were immutable by the sanction of Divine law. Definition was necessary or there would be chaos within the Church. Rome

established her own definitions by the Council of Trent. England established hers by formularies prepared mainly by clerical commissions and sanctioned by the Crown and parliament. Of these formularies, the first was the Ten Articles of Henry VIII. and the last the Thirty-nine Articles incorporated in the Prayer Book during the reign of Elizabeth. Between these two stages there were violent fluctuations. But throughout the root principle remained the same; the definitions laid down with the sanction of the State must be accepted by all; departure from them subjected the recalcitrant to penalties which ranged from burning down to fines or disability to discharge public functions. Definitions might be rigid or loose, penalties might be mild or severe, but within the scope of the definitions uniformity was to be enforced. Toleration in the sense that men were



The two Shepherds.

[From a drawing by Hans Sachs, about 1525.]

at liberty to follow the dictates of their own conscience was hardly dreamed of. But the characteristic of the formularies of Elizabeth, to whom it fell to make a finally acceptable settlement, was a wide latitude which admitted within the pale on the one hand followers of John Knox, and on the other men whom many Calvinists regarded as no better than Papists.

The State demanded from the laity only outward conformity, a decent observance of practices enjoined, abstention from practices forbidden. Privately a man might hold what opinions he liked, so long as those opinions did not materialise into actions or language subversive of the authorised institutions and doctrines. For some time even disobedience, unless thrust upon the notice of the authorities, was to a great extent winked at. Neither Romanist nor Protestant sectarians were much interfered with, unless they chose to be aggressive, until first the papal bull of deposition

and then the Jesuit propaganda of Parsons and Campian brought Romanism under suspicion of treason, stiffened the enforcement of conformity, and brought all kinds of overt nonconformity under the ban.

Now Elizabeth herself was not a woman of strong religious feeling like her sister Mary. Her religion was in the main dictated by politics. Probably if she had been circumstanced like Henry IV. of France, she, like him, would have considered that the Crown was "worth a Mass," although, not being similarly circumstanced, she expressed much righteous indignation when he acted upon that view. But her intellectual sympathies were on the side of the conservative element in the Church, the element which desired the least possible departure from the old practices and doctrines. A substantial proportion of the nobility, especially of what remained of the old nobility, was on the same side, and also perhaps of the old gentry. The north, too, was conservative, as it had been in her father's time, though in this respect the south-west had undergone a transformation. Hence enthusiastic Romanists perpetually suffered from a conviction that the country would welcome the restoration of Romanism.

On the other hand, however, the parliaments were very emphatically Protestant, more Protestant than Elizabeth's government; and every one of Elizabeth's ministers, though in somewhat varying degrees, leaned in the same direction. It is hardly to be imagined that this would have been the case if popular sentiment had been with the reactionaries. At all times parliament was ready, even eager, to go further than the queen in favouring the puritan element in the Church, repressing Romanism, attacking Mary Stuart, and adopting an aggressively Protestant attitude towards the European Powers. The English people have never, like the Scots, taken a keen delight in metaphysical and logical arguments or troubled themselves greatly with dogmatic subtleties. But a great many of them connected Romanism with the fires of Smithfield, the brutalities of Alva in the Netherlands, and the tortures of the Spanish Inquisition, or still more luridly after 1572 with the Paris massacre. Romanists might indeed retort upon Protestants a few years later by pointing to Jesuit martyrs and to the sufferings of the Irish; but the English had then already learnt to look upon the Jesuits as traitors and upon the Irish as wild beasts, so that the retort fell flat. Nowhere outside of the northern counties was there ever the slightest sign that the mass of the people was Romanist in its sympathies.

In fact, the question of the future was not whether England would revert to Rome, but whether Calvinism would dominate the Church in England as it very emphatically did in Scotland. In both countries, the secular government was antagonistic to Calvinism, and to the conceptions of Church government and of the relations of Church and State associated with the Calvinistic creed. On the other hand, intense hostility to Rome and to the active champions of Rome tended of itself to generate

Calvinism, simply because Calvinism was the form of Protestantism which was most palpably irreconcilable to Romanism.

After the Bull of Deposition and the massacre of St. Bartholomew, active hostility to Rome increased and Calvinism in England became more aggressive. In part it merely took the shape of what was called Nonconformity, the demand for the abolition of ceremonial observances which were looked upon as papistical, or at least for permission to dispense with them. But then there arose the demand for a change in the form of Church government on Presbyterian lines. This called for active repression, for the Crown held the doctrine, summarised in a favourite phrase of James VI., after he became King of England, "No bishop, no king." Even within the Church organisation, certain of the advanced clergy constructed a Presbyterian organisation. Presbyterianism was to the full as rigid in its demand for uniformity as was the State itself, and sought to impose its own particular views on the whole body. It had no sympathy with the audacious individualism of the group who at this time began to be known as Brownists, and subsequently became exceedingly formidable under the name of Independents; a group which claimed freedom of conscience for each separate congregation, the right of each congregation to worship unmolested after its own fashion. In the sixteenth century, at least, such an idea appeared to be hopelessly anarchical, subversive alike of State and Church.

Now Elizabeth's first Archbishop of Canterbury was the typical moderate Matthew Parker; and Parker was succeeded by Grindal, whose sympathies were entirely with that party which in modern phraseology would be termed Evangelical. Thus at the time when he was succeeded in 1583 by Archbishop Whitgift, the Evangelicals were exceedingly active in the Church, while the tide of severe repression against the Romanists had just set in, in consequence of the great Jesuit mission. It appeared that credit for impartial justice would be the more readily obtained if Protestant indiscipline were sternly dealt with at the same time with Romanism. Whitgift was not so much a High Churchman as a rigorous disciplinarian, and his primacy was signalled by the establishment of the Court of High Commission for dealing with ecclesiastical causes, which had been sanctioned by the Act of Uniformity a score of years earlier, though it had never been actually constituted. The Court's methods were inquisitorial and arbitrary, and were clearly disapproved by Lord Burleigh. It enforced uniformity very much more rigidly than had been done in the past, with the effect of intensifying the hostility of the advanced school to the episcopal system as an instrument of tyranny. Thence there issued a violent and unseemly onslaught on that system by the publication of a series of tracts signed Martin Mar-Prelate, in the year following the Armada.

The violence of the pamphleteers created a certain reaction, and this, coupled with the actual and fancied existence of all manner of Romanist plots, led in turn to increasingly severe legislation in 1593, directed against

the Romanists on one side and the Nonconformists on the other. It should, however, be remarked in passing, that the Nonconformists did not seek to separate themselves from the Church, but remained professedly within it, while protesting against certain doctrines and practices; even as Cranmer had remained Archbishop of Canterbury while avowing to the king, at serious risk to himself, his personal adherence to views condemned by the Six Articles. These measures now resulted in the expulsion or emigration, chiefly to Holland, of the determined Brownists. The bulk of the Nonconformists, however, preferred obedience under protest to exile, and the Church parties became more and more differentiated as High Churchmen and Puritans, the names which afterwards came to be generally adopted to distinguish them. At the same time what may be called Liberal churchmanship was finding admirable expression in what is perhaps the first monumental work of English prose, the *Ecclesiastical Polity* of Richard Hooker, which exemplifies the attitude of all the greater minds of the day in England.

III

ECONOMIC PROGRESS

The Tudors inaugurated the great period of English commercial expansion. Henry VII. made the development of the national wealth an explicit object of policy, the State operating by means of commercial treaties, although he did not hesitate to employ commercial wars as a means to securing quite other political ends. The root principle of the politico-economic theory known as Mercantilism was already being formulated, namely, that wealth is to be sought as a means to national power. It was not assumed that wealth is convertible into power as a matter of course; on the contrary, it was frequently assumed that wealth might be accumulated at the expense of power; it did not follow that the course which was economically the best was politically the best.


On this theory, then, trades and employments should be encouraged which tended to develop national strength; trade which enriched another nation was to be discouraged; the prosperity of a neighbour probably, of a rival certainly, was looked upon as injurious. The importance to the State of possessing a large amount of gold and silver gave rise to the doctrine that a trade which exchanged treasure for goods was bad for the country, but that one which exchanged goods for treasure was beneficial. It became, therefore, the duty of the State to control commerce, to encourage or discourage it actively, with a view to maintaining the "balance of trade"—that is, of securing an inflow of treasure greater than the outflow—the artificial development of industries regarded as beneficial, as, for instance, the manufacture of gunpowder and ordnance, and in particular the in-

crease of shipping, which the England of the sixteenth century was learning to look upon as of quite vital importance.

The principal means to the encouragement of shipping was found in the Navigation Acts, favouring goods exported or imported in English bottoms ; and to these must be added the post-Reformation ordinances insisting on the Lenten fast—issued by Protestant governments even while they repudiated fasting on religious grounds as a papistical superstition—because employment was given thereby to the deep-sea fishermen and sailors, and so shipbuilding and the mariner's art were fostered. But the State left it to private enterprise to turn maritime energy to commercial account. After the first start, sailors and explorers owed nothing to the State, although Elizabeth personally speculated in some of their ventures on terms exceedingly profitable to herself.

Perhaps, however, we should qualify the statement that private enterprise was unaided. The government con-

tinued on an extended scale to employ the old method of granting monopolies in order to extend trade. Of these monopolies there were two types, those which were granted to mercantile companies, and those which were granted to individuals. In the past the great examples of monopolist Companies had been the Merchants of the Staple and the Merchant Adventurers, who had exclusive rights of trading in certain classes of goods in Western Europe. Such monopolies were in fact a condition of the progress of trade, or at least appeared to be so. Other states practically excluded the foreign private trader, as did the English themselves. The trader was admitted only if he was an enrolled member of a Company which was responsible for his good behaviour and could be penalised if its members set rules and regulations at naught. To



At the market, 1603.

[From a broadside.]

a Company which was under control privileges might be conceded. A Company to which authority had been granted could control its members, but unless the grant conveyed also a monopoly, it would have no control over traders who were not members. It could not protect itself against the misconduct of such persons, while they, on the other hand, would have the utmost difficulty, acting as private individuals, in enforcing for themselves such rights as the law might concede to them. Provided that the monopolist Company was open to all would-be traders on reasonable terms, it was ordinarily to the advantage of the private individual to trade under its ægis; while the Company itself was liable to suffer damage from illegitimate practices, if non-members were permitted to trade within its area. Commercial treaties were effective under the Company system, but would have been a dead letter without it.



Weaving in the 16th century.
[From Erasmus, "In Praise of Folly."]

That was a state of things which passed away in Western Europe as the ordinary machinery of the law became sufficient to protect the community against the unprincipled "free trader," the trader who was not a member of a Company, and to secure the individual in his rights even when there was no organised Company at his back to help him. But the maritime expansion of the sixteenth century opened up new markets or new fields of enterprise, where the economic arguments which had warranted

the old monopolies were more effective than ever. The great bar to enterprise was insecurity, and a chartered Company could give a comparative security to its members. But the chances of profit were too precarious, unless the Company itself could protect itself from the reckless competition of the free-trading adventurer; in other words, unless it had a legal monopoly. So in Elizabeth's reign there began a multiplication of chartered Companies for trading in the more remote and less civilised portions of the globe. Thus the Eastern or Prussian Company was established for trading with the Baltic, the Muscovy Company for the Russian trade, the Levant Company, and, finally, on the last day of the year 1600, the East India Company.

Analogous to these were the patents granted for colonisation to Sir Humphrey Gilbert and Sir Walter Raleigh in America. These were the men who first conceived the mighty vision of a new England beyond the ocean, where Englishmen should find a new home. The Spaniard had secured the treasure-regions of the south, and Englishmen were eager enough to break through the Spanish monopoly, to join on their own account in the hunt for Eldorado; but Gilbert and Raleigh dreamed of

something far different, something which was realised in those colonies which have developed into the United States of America. To neither of them was it given to realise the dream. Gilbert tried vainly to plant a colony in the vague northern region known as Norumbega, but his ship foundered at sea when he was returning to England. After him his half-brother Raleigh spent wealth and brains and energy in the attempt to plant his colony of Virginia, whither he sent expeditions year after year, only to find each time that the last group of settlers had been wiped out. Only in the next reign, when Raleigh was eating his heart out in the Tower, was the colony of Virginia really created ; the child of a commercial chartered Company.

Somewhat different was the basis on which trading monopolies were granted to private individuals. In theory, at least, the monopoly was granted in such cases with the direct object of creating industries which could only be nursed into life, industries in which the financial risks were too serious unless they were protected from competition, or which required the granting of special powers such as those which, in the nineteenth century, it was necessary to confer upon railway companies. In practice, the system became liable to serious abuse, and occasionally, at least, the Crown conferred monopolies for the enrichment of private individuals where there was no adequate excuse for prohibiting competition. At the end of Elizabeth's reign the grievance had become sufficiently serious to threaten a rupture between the Crown and parliament ; a rupture which was averted by the tactful skill with which Elizabeth promised to withdraw and prohibit obnoxious monopolies, although the promise was not in fact observed.

The State sought to encourage new industries, as it sought to encourage commercial enterprise, by granting monopolies to the pioneers, but also by the introduction of foreign craftsmen. In particular, privileges were granted to refugees from Alva's persecution in the Low Countries, where textile arts in especial were practised which had not yet been taken up in England, in spite of the great development of the cloth manufacture. It is probable that refugees from Antwerp introduced the cotton industry, although its great development was deferred for a couple of centuries.

We have already described the depression of the rural population, which reached its climax in the middle years of the century. The process of enclosure appears to have come to an end quite early in Elizabeth's reign with the disappearance of the immense disparity between the profits of wool-growing and of tillage. The constant displacement of labour ceased, and the problem was reduced to that of finding employment for those already displaced, of whom a large proportion were willing enough to work if they could get work to do upon reasonable terms. The system of apprenticeship controlled by the guilds had in the past shut this displaced labour out of employment in the trading and manufacturing industries ; but the expansion of trade, and the multiplication of minor industries which were not subject

to gild regulations, now began to provide employment for this surplus working population.

The Statute of Apprentices, an Act passed quite early in the reign of Elizabeth, did much towards the settling of industrial conditions. In spite of the fact that there was manifestly a good deal of wealth in the country, though Henry VIII.'s depredations and the financial chaos of the two next reigns were extremely unsettling, the chartered towns throughout the Tudor period, until the accession of Elizabeth, were losing their old prosperity, which was already to some extent falling off in the fifteenth century. They were responsible for their own misfortunes, which were largely the outcome



Eastcheap market about 1598.

[From a drawing in the British Museum.]

of the self-protective policy of the guilds, which tried to make a close preserve of their trades. They forbade the practice of a trade by any one who had not qualified by a stated term of apprenticeship, the numbers of apprentices were limited, and apprenticeship itself was open only to the children of the comparatively prosperous. Theoretically, these rules were enforced in order to maintain a high standard of efficiency, though it is safe to suppose that the desire to restrict competition was really a more active motive with the guild councils. But the actual effect was to drive would-be competitors out of the chartered towns into the unchartered market-towns, where there was no authority to enforce guild regulations. The high standards were, perhaps, not maintained, but production was cheaper, and the market towns attracted the custom which before had been concentrated in the chartered towns. By the Statute of Apprentices uniformity was introduced. It ceased to be the business of the local authority to make the regulations, which were laid down by law; the local authority becoming the machinery through which the law was enforced. Seven years' apprenticeship was required before any one could set up in trade on his own account in the then recognised trades, and the whole country was covered by the regulations, instead of only the chartered towns, while the conditions of admission to apprenticeship were made less rigorous in the latter. In what were regarded as superior trades, a property qualification for the parents of apprentices was preserved, so that their social status was maintained. These trades presented no opening for the unemployed rural population, but in minor trades the property qualification

of the self-protective policy of the guilds, which tried to make a close preserve of their trades. They forbade the practice of a trade by any one who had not qualified by a stated term of apprenticeship, the numbers of apprentices were limited, and apprenticeship itself was open only to the children of

was reduced or abolished. Moreover, the statute only applied to the existing trades which were scheduled in the Act, so that the new trades which sprang up during the reign were outside its operation. From this period dates the development of spinning and weaving in particular, as occupations engaging the rural population, in addition to agricultural labour. No apprenticeship was required, and the industry could be made supplementary to field work, besides giving employment to women and children.

The enclosures had been responsible for bringing into prominence a problem which had not been aggressively noticeable in the Middle Ages; the double problem, it may be called, of helpless poverty and wilful vagrancy. Both were further intensified by the dissolution of the monasteries, which, on the one hand, was followed by an increase of enclosure, while, on the other hand, it abolished the one institution which admitted a sort of professional responsibility for the care of the indigent. Whatever the sins of the monks may have been, the monasteries, in fact, did a good deal towards clothing the naked and feeding the hungry, though their methods probably encouraged those who preferred idle beggary to laborious poverty. But when the monasteries were dissolved, no one admitted responsibility for maintaining the indigent, and the number of sturdy vagabonds was multiplied.

Then some town corporations experimented on their own account, and Elizabeth's exceedingly practical ministers extended the experiments. The object was to differentiate between the wilfully idle and the poor who were either incapable of work or were idle only because they could find no work to do. The failure of appeals for voluntary contributions led to the levying of compulsory contributions for the maintenance of the impotent poor, and the results of forty years of experimentation were formulated in the Elizabethan Poor Law of 1601, which continued in force with little modification for nearly two centuries. The law established a poor-rate in every parish, and workhouses; where relief was given to those who were unable to work, and work was given to those who applied for relief because they were unable to find employment, while those who declined to work and preferred to beg were severely penalised. As a general rule, there was now a sufficiency of employment for those who were willing to work;



16th century mendicants.

[From Barclay's "Ship of Fools."]

the parish provided relief for those who were actually incapable ; the wilful vagrant was marked off from the man who was willing to work ; and throughout a very long period the problems of pauperism and unemployment again dropped into the background.

IV

LITERATURE

Until the age of Chaucer, at the close of the fourteenth century, England had produced nothing which could enable her to rank among the literary peoples. Before the accession of Henry VII. Wiclif's Bible, Langland's *Piers Plowman*, the works of Chaucer himself, and the *Morte d'Arthur* of Mallory, were the only works in the English tongue which could in any sense be held to rank as classics. In the reigns of Edward IV. and of Henry VII. the intellectual movement was at last beginning to take hold of the English. Education and liberal studies received a strong stimulus, but still an English literature was unborn. Sir Thomas More's native humour combined with his Platonism to produce the *Utopia* before Martin Luther had flung down his challenge to the papacy ; but the *Utopia* was written in Latin, not in English. Literary energy was almost entirely absorbed in pamphleteering and theological controversy, and of poetry there was none in England until the latter years of Henry VIII. ; unless we dignify by the name of poetry the satires of John Skelton, whose doggerel rhymes have at least immortalised his name. Scotland, on the other hand, produced William Dunbar, who may in some sort be regarded as the remote progenitor of Robert Burns ; and in Bishop Gavin Douglas and Sir David Lindsay, the northern poets maintained their claim to have carried on the Chaucerian tradition much more successfully than their southern neighbours. The capacities of English prose found their best expression in the great translations of the Bible by William Tyndale and others, of which our own "authorised version" is a modification, in the music of the new English Church Services, and in the racy rhetoric of Hugh Latimer's Sermons. Still, before Henry VIII. was dead, Surrey and Wyatt, harbingers of the coming dawn, were weaving dainty fancies into dainty verse, learnt mainly from Italian models, piping a delicate prelude to the glorious outburst of Elizabethan song.

Yet fully twenty years of Elizabeth's own reign were past before any sign appeared that the poets were to share with the sailors the glories of her reign. Only in translation had it been shown that English prose could be made an instrument of artistic expression, though Foxe in the work commonly called the *Book of Martyrs*, and John Knox in his *History of the Reformation in Scotland*, had proved its capacity for vigorous narrative. The

year which signalises the birth of a new era is 1579, the year in which appeared the *Shepherd's Calendar* of Edmund Spenser, and that very amazing work the *Euphues* of John Lyly.

The one great original work of the early Tudor period was More's *Utopia*. Himself no mean scholar, and the intimate friend of all the best scholars of his time, the son of a judge, and bred up in part in the household of Cardinal Morton, More as a young man was strongly drawn towards entering the religious life. But something withheld him. He became an active man of affairs, and a somewhat unwilling favourite of Henry VIII.

He was Speaker in the House of Commons which declined to be brow-beaten by Cardinal Wolsey, whom he succeeded as Chancellor. He resigned the Chancellorship on a point of conscience, because he would not admit that a secular authority could be supreme in matters spiritual; and he cheerfully chose to

be beheaded as a traitor when he was offered his choice between acknowledging the royal supremacy over the Church and losing his head. Such was the man who, in his imaginary Commonwealth, depicted by contrast the social and political conditions of his time as he saw them, with a satire none the less penetrating for its kindness. His ideal Commonwealth is an anticipation of modern socialistic dreams; dreams, that is, of a Christian socialism, resting not upon economic but upon moral foundations, and reaching back to the communistic doctrines of Plato's Republic.

Euphuism has been held up to our ridicule, but *Euphuies* is very far from being altogether ridiculous. It is full of an extravagant pedantry, an exaggerated foppery of phraseology, a fantastic playing upon words, which at first invite burlesque emulation but very soon become inexpressibly tedious. But *Euphuies* meant something serious. Admirable moral aims, indeed, are not a passport to Helicon; the significance of the work lies in the fact that it was a deliberate attempt to create a style, a conscious effort to give prose composition a decorative value, to apply to prose the idea of artistic selection in the use of words. The actual result was fantastic enough, and fantastical conversation modelled upon it became the fashion in polite society; the wits played with *Euphuism*, and if Shakespeare burlesqued it, its influence is also nevertheless apparent in many passages

Februarie.



A cut from the rare first edition of Spenser's "*Shepherd's Calendar*."

which have no savour of parody. English style we may say for the first time became self-conscious in John Lyly's work, which is thereby rendered significant; it became absurd chiefly because it had not learnt to conceal its self-consciousness and to produce the impression of spontaneity.

At the same time Spenser, in the *Shepherd's Calendar*, achieved, in what we call minor poetry, a standard which decisively proved the effectiveness of the English tongue in that field. It was not till ten years later, when the Armada had come and gone, that the first book of the *Faërie Queene* definitely enriched the literature of the world. Had the age of Elizabeth produced no other poet than Spenser it would still have been glorious in the annals of poetry.

But it was in another field that the mightiest triumph was to come. The poetic glory of ancient Athens had lain in her drama, and the drama had retained its place in the front rank as a form of literary expression until Christianity dominated the Roman Empire. The Church prohibited it, but could not prohibit the instinct for dramatic representation. Therefore it turned that instinct to its own uses, sanctioning only the Miracle plays, Mysteries, and Moralities, which were intended allegorically to impress on the vulgar mind the superiority of virtue over vice. But in this medieval substituted for drama, the essential matter was the pantomime, the dialogue was merely an accompaniment. In the early sixteenth century, when the ecclesiastical conventions were losing their authority, the Moralities were supplemented on the one hand by masques and pageants, which gratified the popular taste for gorgeous display, and on the other hand by a development of buffoonery, which the Church, in its consideration for the weakness of the flesh, had allowed as an accompaniment of its Sermons in Pantomime.

But at the same time, the revived study of the ancient literatures and of the new literature to which it had given birth in Italy began to awaken an imitative tendency. The first English play was a comedy constructed by the schoolmaster Nicholas Udall for his boys to perform, adapted from a classic model, in the reign of Queen Mary; the first blank-verse tragedy, *Gorboduc*, was acted some three years after Elizabeth's accession. Companies of strolling players began to perambulate the country, though of the nature and quality of the plays they performed we have practically no knowledge. The performances generally took place in a nobleman's hall or the yard of an inn, and some twenty years after Elizabeth's accession they had already become so popular as to seduce the errant youth of the metropolis from the due observance of their religious duties. The performers were expelled from the city, and, perhaps for this reason, began to localise themselves in permanent centres, and to construct playhouses. Peele, Greene, and others, for the most part undisciplined young men who had enjoyed a university education, began to write for the players dramas of a higher literary standard; and in 1587 young Christopher Marlowe's terrific melodrama, *Tamburlaine*, was presented on the boards.

Tamburlaine does not itself rank as a great tragedy. Marlowe was but three-and-twenty, the same age as William Shakespeare. The only known canons of the tragic art were those laid down nearly two thousand years before by Aristotle. The English tragedians had still to arrive at canons of their own. But *Tamburlaine* was the work of one who, though he died before he was thirty, killed it is said in a tavern brawl, lived long enough to prove that his tragic genius was unsurpassed, though not long enough to consummate his artistic method. In the year of Marlowe's death Shakespeare himself was certainly writing for the stage, and from that date, 1593, onwards, through the last ten years of Elizabeth's reign and through many years of that of her successor, there was no year which did not witness the production of a masterpiece, either of comedy or of tragedy.

We speak of the Elizabethan literature; but we do not generally realise that not one line of the great literature associated with her reign was published until after the Armada. Until then Spenser and Marlowe had done only apprentice work. It would seem as if, down to that tremendous crisis, men's hearts and brains were absorbed in action. The fame

of nearly all the great men of action of the reign had reached or was reaching its zenith in 1588; but if none of the English poets whom we call Elizabethans had survived that year, Spenser alone would be remembered to-day, and he only as an attractive minor poet. Even so in Athens of old, after the tremendous crisis of the Persian War, the triumphs of Marathon and Salamis were matched by the triumphs of Æschylus and Sophocles; they were the triumphs of the generation which was only maturing at the moment of the great crisis of national liberty. Of the great group of dramatists among whom Shakespeare stands supreme, some were altogether unknown until after Elizabeth's death; excepting Marlowe, none was heard of before 1593, and all lived far into the reign of James. Yet they are rightly termed Elizabethans, since they were all the offspring of the great outburst of national vitality in Elizabeth's reign.



Shakespeare.
[The Droeshout portrait.]

Amongst Elizabethans must also be ranked Richard Hooker, whose *Ecclesiastical Polity* was mentioned in connection with the religious movements. An Elizabethan too was Francis Bacon, in genius second only to Shakespeare, to whom he was slightly senior. But the product of Bacon's powers belongs almost entirely to the following reign; before then he had only given the world a taste of his quality by the publication of his essays; and although he himself was a product of the Elizabethan spirit, he was in many respects rather the forerunner of the scientific age which was dawning than the glory of the poetic age in which he was bred.

BOOK IV

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

CHAPTER XV

RIGHT DIVINE

I

THE SPRING OF TROUBLES

THE accession of James VI. of Scotland to the throne of England as the legitimate heir of Henry VII. and his wife united at last the Crowns of the two kingdoms, which for centuries had looked upon each other as foes even when their relations were formally friendly. Technically under the will of Henry VIII., which had never been formally set aside, Lord Beauchamp, the son of Catherine Grey and of the Earl of Hertford, was the heir, because Henry had postponed claims through his elder sister Margaret to claims through his younger sister Mary. James I., like Henry VIII. and Edward VI., could definitely claim to represent by seniority of descent the house of Plantagenet. That was a claim which neither Henry VII. nor Richard III., nor any member of the house of Lancaster had been able to assert. Nor could the title be challenged on the ground that descent through females was invalid, because there was no one living who could profess descent in unbroken male line from the royal house.

The English people could no doubt assert that they had never recognised an indefeasible title to the throne on the part of a monarch, and had always claimed the right to divert the line of succession; but it remained open to James to assert that all such diversions had been *de jure* invalid. He had become king *de facto* by consent of the nation; no one else could claim to be king *de jure* on any principles whatever; but he could also claim to be king *de jure*, irrespective of national consent, by the immutable law of succession by Divine right, as the lineal descendant of William the Conqueror and the lineal representative of the house of Cerdic. Hitherto the royal authority had been content to rest itself upon human law and precedent; it remained for the Stuarts to find for it a sanction in

a Divine law higher than human law and precedent, the recognition of which would set the king himself above all human law and precedent. The assumption was harmless, so long as the king in practice consented to be bound by law and precedent; the trouble arose when kings refused to be so bound. The theory of Divine Right was for the first time asserted by James, but he did not carry his insistence upon it to the extreme point in practice. Hence the great collision between Crown and parliament was

deferred to the reign of his successor. Nevertheless, it was James who set the ball rolling. The claim that the Crown was bound by precedent not of right, but only of grace, entailed not only the stubborn assertion by parliament of the contrary principle but also its interpretation of precedents in a sense which would have been emphatically repudiated by the Tudors; with the result that royal prerogatives hitherto unquestioned were challenged and abolished, and finally the succession was diverted into a new line which could not pretend to rule by any higher title than the national consent.

The British people is not given to concerning itself greatly with abstract theories until they are applied to practical questions in a tangible manner. On the basis of the new theory the Crown sought to assert rights of arbitrary taxation, arbitrary control of religion, and arbitrary imposition of penalties. By exceeding its prerogative, or powers established by precedent, it caused those prerogatives to be challenged. Hence it became clear that they must either be extended so as

to make the Crown decisively predominant over parliament, or curtailed so as to make parliament decisively predominant over the Crown. The battle cost Charles I. his head; but the republic which replaced the monarchy took the form of a Military Dictatorship as arbitrary as any monarchy. The monarchy was restored with the royal prerogatives curtailed; but the renewed attempt to establish absolutism brought about the expulsion of the Stuarts and the retention of a monarchy under conditions which precluded the possibility of a revival of the claims of the Crown.

The history of the Stuarts down to what the Whigs called the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688 is not concerned exclusively with this great constitutional struggle; but that struggle entirely occupies the foreground. The first great phase of it extends over the whole period from 1603 to 1640, and accordingly it will be here treated continuously in a single chapter



A musketeer of 1603.
[From Skelton's "Armour."]

instead of being arbitrarily divided at the moment of the accession of Charles I. As a preliminary we shall review the conditions out of which the contest arose, and by which it was affected.

We shall find that the antagonism between Crown and parliament arose primarily out of two questions, taxation and religion. The religious question was the outcome of the growth of what is called Puritanism in England, and the question of taxation was made acute by the foreign policy of the Crown. We shall therefore in the first place outline the European conditions which indirectly helped to force on the constitutional struggle.

When Elizabeth died the ruler of Spain was Philip III., the son of Elizabeth's great antagonist. In France Henry IV. had established a substantial degree of religious toleration by the Edict of Nantes, which conceded freedom of worship to the Huguenots, although the Government was officially Catholic. In Germany for half a century the principle had been broadly recognised that in each principality the prince recognised that form of religion which was acceptable to himself. None of the emperors had professed Protestantism, but they had not pressed forward the papal cause against the reformed religion. On the other hand, the reformed states were divided between Calvinists and Lutherans, who were hardly less hostile to each other than to the papacy. In the Netherlands the contest with Spain had reached the stage at which it was all but certain that the Northern Protestant United Provinces would secure their independence, while the Southern Catholic Provinces would remain attached to the Spanish dominion. Spain was still looked upon as the aggressive champion of Catholicism, and neither she nor the world had yet realised her fundamental weakness or awakened to the fact that the Austrian, not the Spanish, Hapsburgs constituted the real menace to Protestantism. The keen political instinct of Henry IV. did indeed recognise the growing danger to Europe of a coalition between the two branches of the house of Hapsburg; but his schemes for an opposition League were destroyed by his assassination in 1610, the year following the formal suspension of hostilities between Spain and Holland. The recognition of Ferdinand of Styria as heir to the Emperor marked the approach of an aggressive Catholic policy. The kingdom of Bohemia, which for some time past had been attached to the house of Austria, claimed that its monarchy was elective and chose for its king the Protestant Elector Palatine Frederick, instead of Ferdinand. Ferdinand asserted his own claim, and so in 1618 began the Thirty Years' War, a struggle mainly between the Protestant and Catholic states of the Empire, in which the Scandinavian Powers also became involved, Spain, too, intervening on behalf of the Hapsburgs. In France the accession of a child, Louis XIII., had put the government into the hands of a regency, and that country became entirely absorbed in party factions and intrigues among the nobles, until the young king assumed the reins of government, and called to his aid the great minister Cardinal Richelieu, whose ascendancy dates from 1621. It became Richelieu's business to carry on the suspended

work of Henry IV. by establishing the supremacy of the Crown over the nobles in France, and directing an anti-Hapsburg foreign policy. As matters stood, the most troublesome of the nobles were also Huguenots; and thus the civil broils in France assumed superficially the appearance of a religious struggle, although in essence it was political. The relations of England with Spain, France, and the Palatinate, between 1618 and 1630, were the main cause of the financial difficulties which, along with the religious difficulty, brought Crown and parliament in England into direct hostility. After that date the domestic discords practically prevented England from taking any part in Continental affairs until after the Commonwealth was established.

II

PURITANS, ROMANISTS, AND THE IMPOSITIONS

The accession in England of the King of Scotland was marked by the discovery of two conspiracies known respectively as the Main and Bye plots. The object of the Bye plot was to capture the person of the new king and compel him to make concessions to the Romanists. The object of the Main plot was apparently to substitute Arabella Stuart for her cousin. Neither could ever have had the remotest chance of success, and the real interest of the Main plot lies in the fact that Cecil succeeded in procuring Walter Raleigh's condemnation as a participator in it. That crafty politician had not openly been on hostile terms with Raleigh, but feared his rivalry, and therefore compassed his removal from the political world. Raleigh was reprieved at the last moment, and was shut up for a dozen years in the Tower; where he passed his time writing a *History of the World*, making chemical experiments, and dreaming of Eldorado. Cecil was comfortably secured as the king's right-hand man.

James was the more readily accepted in England, because each of the religious sections hoped for alliance with him. As King of Scotland he had indubitably intrigued with the Catholics abroad, and the Romanists hoped that when he was secure upon the throne the penal laws would at least be relaxed, even if the king remained professedly a Protestant. On the other hand, James had been brought up by teachers of the school of John Knox; and English Nonconformists dreamed that he would sympathise with their grievances. They had not realised his conviction that "Presbyterianism consorteth with monarchy as well as God with the Devil."

Both Nonconformists and Romanists were promptly disillusioned. During his progress from the North James was presented with what was called the Millenary Petition, signed by a thousand of the clergy, praying for a relaxation of the ecclesiastical rules as to vestments and ceremonies,

in favour of the Nonconformist views. The petition was answered by the calling of the Hampton Court Conference. In effect the king presided over an assembly of bishops to whom four of the Nonconformist clergy were permitted to present their case. In all but minor points the Conference, and the king personally, flatly rejected the Nonconformist petition. New canons were promulgated which enforced the regulations upon the clergy more strictly than before, and some hundreds were driven to resign their livings; although the great majority were able to reconcile their consciences to the practices enjoined, such as the use of the Sign of the Cross in Baptism and of the ring in the Marriage Service. The vehemence of the language of the king, who had not forgotten how Andrew Melville had addressed him as "God's silly vassal," was a warning to the Puritans that they had nothing to hope for from the new régime even more emphatic than the formal results of the Conference. Nevertheless, when Parliament met, it was obvious that the sympathies of the representative chamber were with the Puritans.

On the other hand, James had many reasons for wishing to conciliate the Romanists. He was not only sensibly anxious to terminate the perpetually hostile relations with Spain, but was possessed with a fear of that Power very much greater than the circumstances at all warranted. Moreover, the penal legislation of Elizabeth's later years was of an extremely oppressive character, excusable only on the plea that Romanism was an insidious political danger. Unfortunately, colour was perpetually given to the popular suspicion of the Romanists by reports of plots, sometimes fictitious but sometimes real, for which not the body of Roman Catholics but a few zealots were responsible. The Main and Bye plots upset the



James I.

[From a contemporary engraving.]

king's pacific intentions ; and before he had been a year on the throne all Romanist priests were banished from the kingdom. The relaxation of the fines imposed on the laity for absenting themselves from the English church service led to a great increase in this practice, which was known as Recusancy ; whereby so much uneasiness was caused that after another twelve months the laws were again enforced with their old rigour. Again the zealots plunged into a crazy scheme for blowing up the king and the Houses of Parliament and raising the country. At the moment when the execution of the plot was at hand, one of the conspirators gave a hint to a kinsman of his who was a peer ; and he also conveyed to his fellow-conspirators a warning to escape while there was yet time. The hint was



The Gunpowder Plot: the Conspirators.

[From a contemporary print now in the National Portrait Gallery.]

taken, but the warning was not acted upon. The authorities caught Guy Fawkes in the cellars under the Houses of Parliament surrounded by barrels of gunpowder. The rest of the plotters were also captured and killed. Nothing could have happened more fatal to the cause of the Romanists. Popular terror and hatred were roused to the utmost pitch by the unparalleled nature of the crime which had been contemplated ; and for a century to come, even for two centuries, a rumour of a "popish plot" was all that was required to create a popular frenzy. And every government which displayed a disposition to relax the attitude of suspicious severity towards Romanist practices itself became the object of acute popular suspicion if not of angry hostility.

King Henry of France is credited with having summarised the character of King James of England by describing him as "the wisest fool in Christendom." He was well versed in political theory, and was particularly

well informed as to European affairs, besides being endowed with a very subtle intellect. Unfortunately, he was in love with his own subtlety, and his passion for craftiness habitually prevented him from thinking or acting straightforwardly ; while he was wholly deficient in that supreme quality of the Tudors, the capacity for gauging other men's brains and characters, and for reading the temper of the people over whom he ruled. The aims that James set before himself were often wise, but in his methods he neglected to take count of popular feeling. With an unbounded belief in his own intellectual capacity, he was extremely opinionated and at the same time very easily led ; while those by whom he was led were, at least after Robert Cecil's death, the very worst type of advisers—not statesmen but personal favourites. Hence everything he attempted to do was spoilt in the execution.

If Romanists and Puritans were both grievously disappointed in King James, he himself had just reason for disappointment in the reception of his own ideas for the union of his two kingdoms. In both England and Scotland there had in the past been statesmen who realised that the incorporation of the two in a single State would be an achievement from which both would benefit. The Union of the Crowns was merely a step to that achievement, making it impossible for the two nations to pursue hostile foreign policies. The foreign policy of the State could only be the foreign policy of its king. Scotland and England could not fight each other, except on the hypothesis that one or other was in a state of rebellion against the king. This in itself was a great gain, but was very far from uniting the two States into one political community with common interests. That was the consummation desired by the king, but the nations were not yet ready for it. The Scots were afraid of being subordinated to the English, and the English were in no hurry to admit the Scots to full English citizenship. The countries remained separate and under separate governments. Scotsmen indeed planted themselves in England and prospered greatly, to the disgust of Englishmen ; but practically the only step towards a closer union was the dictum of the judges, that persons born after the Union were naturalised subjects on the soil of that country in which they had not been born ; that a Scot who transferred himself to England had all the rights of an English citizen, and an Englishman transferring himself to Scotland had the same rights as if he had been born a Scot. In practice Englishmen did not migrate to Scotland, whereas Scots did migrate to England in considerable numbers, but the Union hardly tended to increase mutual goodwill. The visitors from the North came to exploit England for their own benefit, and their success in so doing was not popular.

In Ireland it may be claimed that matters went better than under the Tudors. Although Tyrone had come to terms with the English government, his character and ambitions made it impossible to depend on his loyalty. With a man of his type there were two alternatives ; either he must be treated as Henry VII. had treated the old Earl of Kildare, and be practically

constituted viceroy of Ireland, or he must be completely suppressed. The Government was saved from the dilemma by the great Earl's flight from the country, which left no chief powerful enough to threaten rebellion, especially as Tyrconnell also fled. Both were held guilty of treason, and there were extensive forfeitures of territories in the North. This was the origin of that great plantation of Scots in Ulster which did so much to give the greater part of that province its distinctive character, intensified by the Cromwellian settlement half a century later.

From the very outset of his reign James showed his inability to grasp the ideas of government which had become ingrained in the English people—ideas which were thoroughly understood by the Tudors and which none of them would ever have been tactless enough to ignore. The axioms of English constitutionalism had never so much as presented themselves to the mind of the Scottish king, because they had no counterpart in the country where he had been bred. In England the supremacy of law was fundamental, whereas in Scotland arbitrary jurisdictions were the rule. Even on his first passage through the northern counties James had horrified his new subjects by proposing to hang a pickpocket, taken in the act, out of hand, without trial. In somewhat similar fashion he came into collision with his first parliament. A constituency returned as one of its members one Goodwin, who had been outlawed. The election would have been annulled by parliament; but parliament protested against the infringement of its privileges when the king took upon himself to declare the election void—all election disputes lay in their right to settle. When the king aired his theory of Divine Right and pronounced that they had no rights at all except by the king's grace, they replied that if he thought that was the case in England, he had been "misinformed." This privilege of the Commons was not in fact again brought in question; but the incident illustrated the character of the approaching contest between the Crown and parliament. The two parties had respectively assumed two different theories of the relation between Crown and parliament which could by no means be reconciled, although so long as compromises were possible between the will of the king and the will of the parliament a violent collision might be deferred.

Now a situation had been reached in which the normal expenditure of the Crown largely exceeded the normal revenue. The Crown had to face the painful truth that it could not afford to set parliament at defiance unless it could obtain additional revenue without appealing to the Commons for supplies. James resorted to a precedent which had actually been set in the reign of Queen Mary. A new "book of rates" was issued, adding to the duties at the ports so as to increase the revenue. A merchant named Bate refused to pay the new rates on the ground that they were illegal, but the judges pronounced that the "Impositions" as they were called were within the royal prerogative. The Commons passed a resolution traversing the decision of the judges, but a resolution of the House of Commons is merely

an expression of opinion having no legal force ; an Act of parliament, not a resolution of one House, is required to invalidate the judgment of the courts ; and until such an Act were passed, or the courts reversed their own judgment, the decision in Bate's case established the legal right of the Crown to vary the customs duties without sanction of parliament. Thus a serious constitutional danger was revealed. The judges held office by grace of the Crown ; they were appointed and might be removed at the will of the Crown ; and so long as this should be the case there was obviously a strong presumption, without imputing wilful dishonesty to the judges, that their decisions would be biassed in favour of the Crown. As concerned the particular question, the extent to which the king might add to the Impositions was limited only by the endurance of the House and of popular feeling ; he had the law on his side, but if he strained the law the consequences might be disastrous.

Cecil, who was now Earl of Salisbury, sought to devise a remedy by a settlement which was called the Great Contract. A number of the king's technically valid claims, which were perpetual sources of irritation and friction, were to be commuted for a fixed annual revenue, these claims including the Impositions and a variety of feudal dues. The scheme seemed likely to go through, but unfortunately, while it was under consideration, both sides stiffened in their demands, and the Great Contract was dropped, since neither would give way.

The result was that for many years James made shift to carry on the government without additional supplies from parliament. During these years the Houses were only once summoned, to meet in what was called the "Addled Parliament," because it was dissolved again without accomplishing anything whatever. James had to content himself with employing every colourable legal device for raising money, including a large extension of the practice of granting monopolies or exclusive rights of production and sale of particular articles. One ingenious scheme deserves special notice. In connection with the colonisation of Ulster, and with a scheme for planting Scottish colonists in the district of North America, to which the name of Nova Scotia or New Scotland was given, the king created a new order of "baronets," bearers of a hereditary dignity which did not entitle them to rank with the peers of the realm, while it carried precedence over knights. But the new dignity was conferred not as a reward for services, but in exchange for hard cash.

III

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF JAMES I.

The king's foreign policy was dominated by a fear of Spain, which was not shared by the English people. The strife which had continued through the last years of Elizabeth was terminated sensibly enough by a peace

almost immediately after James's accession. But James was possessed by an extravagant obsequiousness to Spain, which led to one of the most shameful incidents of the reign. To gratify Spain he deliberately sacrificed Sir Walter Raleigh. Raleigh was liberated from the Tower with a permission to seek and take possession of a hidden land of gold mines, of whose existence he had heard on the famous expedition to the Orinoco which he had undertaken in Elizabeth's reign. But he had strict orders to avoid a collision with the Spaniards. Every one concerned was perfectly well aware that a collision with the Spaniards would be absolutely

inevitable. Raleigh's expedition was a failure, and the inevitable collision took place. On his return he was arrested, and, to gratify the Spaniards, was executed on the strength of his ancient condemnation for complicity in the Main plot. At the time of Elizabeth's death Raleigh had perhaps been the best hated man in the kingdom; but the circumstances of his trial had caused a revulsion of sentiment in his favour; he remained the incarnation of the old popular feeling of undying hostility to Spain; and, by sacrificing him to Spain, James turned him into a popular hero.

James in fact wished to keep on good terms with both Catholics and Protestants on the Continent. He could not realise how completely the Spanish Government regarded itself as the agent of Heaven for the sup-

pression of heresy, nor the intensity of religious antagonisms, and he wanted himself to be regarded as a Solomon whom every one would willingly invite to arbitrate upon their differences. So he married his daughter, the Princess Elizabeth, to Frederick the elector palatine, the head of the Calvinistic princes of Germany. He would have tried to marry his own heir-apparent, Prince Henry, to a Spanish princess, but Henry had made to himself a hero of Raleigh, who was then in the Tower, and would have nothing to say to a marriage with any Romanist, least of all a Spaniard. The prince's premature death in 1612 made the king's second son, Charles, heir to the throne, and presently James revived the idea of a Spanish match, which was one of his motives for the destruction of Raleigh. He left out of consideration that, on the one hand, Spain cared nothing for the match, except as a means to restoring Romanist pre-dominance in England, and, on the other, that the English people detested



Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales, died 1612.

[From Drayton's "Polyolbion."]

the idea even more fervently than in the days of Queen Mary. These, he held, were high matters of State on which the people had no right to an opinion. As for Spain, he deluded himself with the belief that she would be quite satisfied with liberty of conscience for Spaniards in England, and some relaxation of the pressure of the penal laws upon English Catholics.

Now matters became alarmingly complicated when James's son-in-law, the elector palatine, accepted the crown of Bohemia, which was claimed by Ferdinand, the emperor-elect. The action of the Bohemian nobles and of Frederick was exceedingly questionable, since the Bohemians had actually pledged themselves to accept Ferdinand, and had broken that pledge, though not without some excuse, in offering their allegiance to Frederick. But there was the plain fact that the son-in-law of the King of England was plunged into a war with the head of the Austrian Hapsburgs, that the Spanish Hapsburgs were

in alliance with their cousins, and that there was every prospect that Frederick, instead of winning the Bohemian crown, would be deprived of the Palatinate. There was also a further probability that this would be only a step to an onslaught on the Protestant princes of Germany, who had not the wisdom to suppress their own quarrels and present a united front to the impending danger. James hated war, and flattered himself that he could detach Spain from the alliance by pressing forward a Spanish marriage. A vigorous interposition might have effected something, but nothing whatever was to be hoped from a diplomacy which did not rely upon armed intervention as its ultimate argument. Frederick's forces met with a severe defeat at the White Mountain, in Bohemia, and Spanish troops from the Netherlands marched into the Palatinate.



European Powers in 1610.

If James was to save his son-in-law from complete ruin, it was quite clear that he must arm; and he could not possibly arm without assembling a parliament and obtaining supplies. So in 1621 parliament was summoned; its last predecessor had been the Addled Parliament of 1614. As matters stood there were two possible war-policies; one was to take an energetic part in the war in Germany, the other was to attack Spain. The country was quite willing to attack Spain. It knew little and cared not much more about Germany; it took no interest in the king's German connections. But if there was going to be a stand-up fight between Rome and Protestantism, the traditional course for England was to fasten itself upon Rome's traditional champion, Spain; and war with Spain brought compensation to adventurers, apart from the comfortable sense that it was a smiting of the Amalekites by the chosen people.

Parliament, however, had not yet reached the stage of claiming to dictate the particular course to be followed. The programme set before it was negotiation, and war if negotiation failed. It professed enthusiastic acceptance of the programme, especially the second part of it, but voted by no means as much money as the king wanted, being very far from confident that the subsidies would be expended to its satisfaction. Having voted the money, it turned to accumulated grievances—it had been practically silenced for ten years, and since the death of Salisbury in 1612 the conduct of the administration had not commended itself to public favour.

Fortune had set beside the king a counsellor who understood the Tudor principles of statesmanship. But King James was far too sure of his own supreme wisdom to allow himself to be guided by the wisdom of Francis Bacon, while he allowed himself to be tricked and cajoled by favourites, to whom statesmanship meant nothing but personal intriguing for wealth and power. Youthful good looks provided a ready passport to the royal favour. Cecil had known how to keep such *protégés* from becoming too influential; the man who had destroyed Essex and ruined Raleigh knew how to secure his own ascendancy. But after Cecil's death, he who desired the king's favour required first the favour of the king's favourites. The first of these was Robert Kerr, created Earl of Somerset, who was fortunately ruined by the discovery that his wife, with his own connivance, had procured the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, who had stood in the way of her divorce from the Earl of Essex, which had been a necessary preliminary to her marriage with Kerr. Somerset's successor, with all his faults, remains a figure with a certain splendid fascination if only by reason of his magnificent arrogance. George Villiers, famous as the Duke of Buckingham, won the affection first of the king and then of his son Charles by his personal beauty and charm. Fearless, confident, and entirely self-centred, he never dreamed of doubting his own supreme capacity as a statesman and as a soldier; though politics in his eyes meant the punishment of people who had offended him, and he realised no difference between the art of the strategist and that of the duellist.

But the country had not yet realised that Buckingham was the king's evil genius. It did realise that corruption was rampant. It fastened upon monopolies as the great means of corruption, and the Commons attacked them so fiercely that Buckingham made a virtue of resigning those which he held himself, and inducing the king to bow to the storm and abolish them. But the attack went further. If corruption was to be effectively dealt with, the highest game should be aimed at. Francis Bacon, Lord St. Alban, was the Lord Chancellor, the head of the judicial administration, and the Commons were angrily confident that the whole judicial administration was corrupt. According to the exceedingly pernicious practice of the time, every judge was in the habit of accepting gifts from the suitors on both sides. The obvious inference was that their decisions were likely to be influenced by the relative value of the gifts. In the same way, it may be remarked, all through the Tudor period, English statesmen and persons of influence, from Wolsey down, were in the habit of receiving gifts and honours from European potentates; and although the thing was done openly, and implied nothing in the nature of a bargain, there was an obvious danger that the system would be utilised for purposes of corruption. Bacon then was made the scapegoat of the system by the House of Commons. The Lord Chancellor was impeached and condemned, although there was no evidence that he had ever allowed his decisions to be affected by the presents which he received. There is no ground whatever for supposing that he was a corrupt judge; but he lent himself to a system which tended to corruption and maladministration of justice, although he recognised himself that a high standard of duty would have required him to set his face against it. He admitted the justice of his own punishment, while claiming that he had himself been the most just of judges since his father's time. His fall has brought unmerited obloquy upon his name, but it greatly served the cause of justice generally. Its effect may be measured by the fact that since his day no judge has ever laid himself open to the charge of receiving bribes.



Sir Francis Bacon, Viscount St. Alban.
[From the engraving by William Marshall.]

Bacon's impeachment revived a practice which had fallen into complete abeyance ever since the beginning of the War of the Roses. From the impeachment of Lord Latimer, in 1376, to the impeachment of Suffolk, in 1450, the Commons had employed this method of attacking ministers, because the Commons were pressing their own right to control administration. The revival of impeachment meant that the Commons were once

more imbued with a determination to enforce that right ; and the practice was actively continued until the right itself had become thoroughly established in the eighteenth century.

When parliament was prorogued in the summer, it was still hoped that the negotiations would be sufficiently fortified by the proceedings in the House to make actual war unnecessary. But matters went so badly for Frederick that the prospect of persuading his enemies to come to terms vanished ; and at the end of the year parliament was again summoned in a hurry to vote supplies. But James was still devoted to his scheme of detaching Spain and inducing her to join England in bringing pressure to bear on the Emperor and his supporters. The Commons detested the idea of the Spanish marriage, had no belief in the possibility of detaching Spain, and were extremely averse from flinging themselves into the war on German soil instead of devoting the country's energies to a maritime attack on the traditional enemy. In their view it was England's business to stand forth uncompromisingly as the leader of the Protestant Powers in resistance to the Catholic attack. The Commons told the king their mind, and James wrathfully told them in return to attend to the business for which they had been summoned, instead of expressing opinions upon matters which were too high for them. They replied that they were entitled to discuss whatsoever matters they thought fit. James with his own hands tore the record of their resolution out of the journals of the House, and dissolved the parliament.

Again James had to fall back on such shifts for raising money as had been declared legal by the Crown lawyers. He reverted to a demand for benevolences, concerning which they had pronounced that the request might legally be made although it could not be legally enforced. But he could not in this fashion furnish forth an army which could save his son-in-law. He devised instead the farcical scheme of despatching the Prince of Wales incognito, accompanied by Buckingham, with false beards and other simple devices for concealing their identity, to Spain, that the Prince might woo the Infanta in person. Thus would the King of Spain and the Infanta be so charmed that they would willingly concede every request of the gallant wooer. Success did not attend this ingenious introduction of comic opera into high politics. The prince and the duke got themselves to Spain and were politely welcomed. The Infanta was terrified at the idea of marrying a heretic ; Charles was totally unfitted for playing the part of a romantic adorer, and Buckingham's arrogance enraged the entire Spanish court. The conditions of the marriage proposed from England were ridiculous from the Spanish point of view, and the Spanish conditions were intolerable from the English point of view. Prince and duke returned from Spain full of fury and burning for war. For the only time in his life Buckingham became popular.

Now, although James had gone hopelessly astray in imagining that Spain could be detached from the Catholic combination, he understood the situa-

tion better than his subjects. Either the Hapsburg Catholic combination must be split up or a powerful anti-Hapsburg league must be formed, strong enough to beat it. The English parliament did not realise the necessity ; it thought only of applying the old Elizabethan method of sending supports to the United Provinces, which were now fighting the Spaniards again, and of renewing the maritime war upon Spain. James then turned to the policy of a French alliance and a French marriage, since the Spanish alliance and the Spanish marriage had been put out of court. But the French marriage also involved that toleration for Romanists in England which was an abomination in the sight of English Puritanism. Parliament, summoned again, though ready for a Spanish war, viewed the proposals for a French marriage with extreme suspicion ; and was not at all inclined to vote the huge supplies necessary for a great German campaign, and for providing the subsidies which were needed to induce the Lutheran princes of Germany to take the part of the Calvinist elector palatine. The supplies voted were insufficient ; and when parliament had been prorogued, the proposed marriage was negotiated between Charles and the French King's sister Henrietta Maria. But to carry through the negotiations, Buckingham made concessions on the Catholic question which rendered it impossible for him to face parliament again with demands for more money. Parliament was not again summoned, and, although there was no money, Buckingham promised it right and left and plunged into war without the means to carry it on. There was just enough in the treasury to pay for raising and despatching to Holland a force of a few thousand men ; but when they got there they were left to starve. In a few weeks three-fourths of them were dead or dying from starvation, cold, or pestilence. Just at this point the old king died. For some time past, however, he had been entirely in Buckingham's hands, and Buckingham was no less omnipotent with the ill-fated Prince of Wales, who now ascended the throne as Charles I.

IV

BUCKINGHAM

The situation was an awkward one for the new king. He was on the point of marrying his French bride, and his subjects had still to learn how pledges made to them had been traversed by the promises made to the French king. He was in desperate need of money to carry on the war in which Buckingham had involved the country, and the last incident of the war had been an ugly disaster brought about by the grossest mismanagement. An appeal to parliament could not be long deferred, and parliament was absolutely certain, when called, to make itself unpleasant about the duke. The duke might despise it, but it held the purse-strings.

The king did not summon parliament till his marriage was an accom-

plished fact. He would have to break some promises, whether those made to England or those made to France ; but Henrietta Maria was irrevocably his wife, though it was an ill day for England that had made her queen to succeed Buckingham as the king's evil genius. Parliament met, angry and suspicious. It had separated a twelvemonth before, expecting to be summoned in the winter to provide for a campaign in the direction of which it would have a considerable voice. It had not been summoned, and Buckingham wrought irremediable mischief, with no one to criticise or



George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham (1592-1628).

[After the painting by Mierevelt.]

denounce. Criticism and denunciation were forthcoming now. The war was there, and the war must go on, but not under Buckingham's direction ; it would be preposterous to vote huge sums of money and see them recklessly squandered with no results. Until the Commons saw their way and knew what was to be done, until Buckingham ceased to dominate the stage, they would only vote just enough money for safety. They would grant two subsidies, that is to say, £140,000. When Buckingham was removed, they would consider further supplies, but not till then. The king was indignant. What right had the Commons to dictate to him the ministers in whom he was to trust? He trusted Buckingham, and would not dismiss him. Instead he dissolved parliament ; at worst he had the two subsidies to go on

with, besides tonnage and poundage which had been granted for a year.

With the money in hand, Buckingham organised an expedition, not to Holland, but against Spain. At Cadiz, Drake had "singd the king of Spain's beard" ; at Cadiz, Raleigh and Essex had again dealt Spain a crushing blow ; Cadiz was to be the scene of another glorious triumph. But Buckingham had no Raleighs or Drakes to do his work. While he went off to Holland to negotiate with German princes, his expedition went to Cadiz with crews collected by pressgangs, and captains who knew nothing of their business. Having gone to Cadiz, they came home again ignominiously, having escaped worse disaster chiefly because they had not attempted to do any fighting. It seemed more evident than ever that nothing could be done until parliament could be cajoled out of supplies. A second parliament was summoned ; Charles hoped to make it amenable



CHARLES I

From the original painting by Van Dyck at Windsor.

by making sheriffs of the most prominent leaders of the opposition to Buckingham, and thereby disqualifying them for election. Their absence only gave a greater prominence and a wider influence for a more pure-souled patriot than any of them, Sir John Eliot. The new parliament refused to discuss supplies until grievances had been redressed. Charles had no talent for cajolery or conciliation; he replied by threats. The Commons retorted by resolving to impeach Buckingham. The peers were no friends to the duke, and Charles was driven to quash the proceedings by dissolving parliament.

But how was Charles to raise money? Buckingham was now athirst for military glory, and war is an expensive pastime; not the less expensive when the policy of its managers varies from month to month. However, the resources, as it seemed, had not been exhausted. The king had a right to levy tonnage and poundage; at least it had been granted for life to every other king for two hundred years past, although Charles's own first parliament had granted it only for a year and the second parliament had been dissolved without granting anything at all. Benevolences were illegal; at least in their legal non-compulsory form they were non-productive. Still, compulsory loans might be demanded, and the demand would be difficult to resist. So it proved; but when the demand came before the Chief Justice he pronounced it illegal; whereupon he was removed from office.

Meanwhile Buckingham had been demonstrating afresh his lack of the elements of statesmanship. England had no conceivable justification for going to war at all with anybody, except in defence of the king's brother-in-law, which was excusable for family reasons, or in the championship of Protestantism against aggressive Romanism, the deliverance of Europe from a threatened Hapsburg domination. There was one Power, France, which could not indeed be naturally drawn into a Protestant league as such, but whose interests were entirely opposed to Hapsburg aggression. There was every possible reason for preserving at the very least friendly relations with France. But Buckingham chose to quarrel with France, where Richelieu's government was embarrassed by the semi-religious civil war brought on by the antagonism between the Crown and the Huguenot nobility. The seaport of La Rochelle had always been a Huguenot stronghold of the first importance. It was now undergoing a siege. Buckingham, neglectful alike of Spain and the Palatinate, resolved to intervene in France with a personally conducted expedition, which was to relieve La Rochelle by capturing the Isle of Rhé. The duke was no better fitted to command than to organise a great military expedition. The Isle of Rhé venture was merely a variation on the two previous ventures which had collapsed so ignominiously. Half the expeditionary force died, and the rest came home again defeated and savage.

But the whole business was something more than another military failure to be added to Buckingham's account. It had been made possible only by the forced loans for pronouncing which illegal Chief Justice Crewe had

been removed from his office. Men of position who refused to pay had been arbitrarily imprisoned by the Council ; poor men who refused to pay had been forced to serve in the expedition. Grumblers had been penalised by having troops billeted upon them, and, wherever troops were concerned, martial law was allowed to supersede civil law. Among the men who had been thrown into prison, five knights had demanded a writ of Habeas Corpus, requiring that they should be brought up for trial ; but the writ had been refused, the judges declaring that the king had power to refuse a trial.



A Cavalier of 1620.
[From Skelton's "Armour."]

The circumstances were not favourable for the summoning of a parliament, yet the king dared no longer to struggle on without the substantial supplies which it was impossible to obtain without a parliamentary grant. Charles summoned his third parliament, and it met in angry mood. The solid ranks of the opposition were led by the dark figure of Thomas Wentworth, by Sir John Eliot, the fiery and single-minded champion of liberty, and by John Pym, clear-headed, unimpassioned, but immovable as Wentworth himself. For the moment the attack was not directed against Buckingham. Personal questions were to be subordinated to a direct and decisive assertion of fundamental principles.

According to the now accepted practice, the presentation of grievances preceded the discussion of supply. The Commons formulated their demand in the Petition of Right. There was to be no martial law in time of peace. Soldiers were not to be miscellaneously billeted, and wherever they were quartered they must pay their way. No man was to be compelled to make or yield any "gift, loan, benevolence, tax, or suchlike charge" without common consent by Act of parliament. No freeman was to be imprisoned except on cause shown, or was to be detained in prison without trial. If these principles were established by Statute, it seemed to the leaders of the Commons that the endangered liberties of the nation would be safeguarded. With that security they were prepared to vote as much as five subsidies, or £350,000.

The questions of billeting and martial law presented no serious difficulties to the mind of the king. There were loopholes in the clause concerning taxation, which it was rather his business to avoid pointing out, so that it would be wise to accept that clause without too much demur ; but he was exceedingly reluctant to give way on the point of arbitrary imprisonment. The *Lettre de Cachet* was being used by Richelieu

in France as a very powerful instrument for the repression of the nobility, and the concentration of power in the hands of the Crown. In England the judges had just affirmed that it was within the royal prerogative to order the imprisonment of the king's subjects without stating any charge against them. If a charge were stated they could demand to be tried on that charge; if no charge were stated they could claim neither trial nor release. The principle at stake was absolutely vital. The Lords supported the Commons, and the king found himself obliged to give way. The Petition of Right took its place in the Statute Book, the subsidies were voted, bonfires blazed, and joybells pealed. England imagined that the victory of the Commons was won.

England was mistaken. The battle was but just joined. Charles had given way for the moment in order to get his subsidies; means would be found for making the Petition of Right a dead letter or something very near it. At the moment, however, the Commons proceeded to the serious business of attacking Buckingham, which had only been postponed because the assertion of principles demanded the leading place. A Remonstrance was drawn up which was in fact a detailed indictment of the duke and a demand for his removal. But Charles was amenable only so long as his treasury was empty. He met the Remonstrance by proroguing parliament, and ostentatiously displaying his confidence in the duke. A new expedition was already in preparation for the relief of La Rochelle, and Buckingham was sent down to Portsmouth to take command of the fleet. The Petition of Right received the royal assent on June 7th, the subsidies were voted on the 12th, and on the 26th parliament was prorogued.

In the interval between these two latter dates the fact that peace had not been achieved became manifest. Parliament proceeded with the deferred attack upon Buckingham by drawing up its Remonstrance, and it also proceeded with a bill to grant the king tonnage and poundage for one year. Now in this lay the crux of the financial question. Was it or was it not within the king's right to levy that impost? Parliament assumed that it was not. The king assumed that it was. Hitherto he had acted on that assumption throughout his reign. The claim of the Commons was an exceedingly doubtful one. In the first place, for two hundred years the grant had been made as a matter of form at the beginning of every reign for the whole period of the reign. Even if it were assumed that the Commons had never technically surrendered their right to withhold that grant, the attempt to exercise a technical right which had been in abeyance for two hundred years was doubtfully constitutional. Further, the Law Courts were the appointed authority for interpreting the law; in *Bate's* case the judges' decision for the Crown covered tonnage and poundage. The Commons had indeed passed a traversing resolution, but the resolution of one chamber could not override the authority of the Courts. Thirdly, when the Commons in 1625 had departed from precedent and made the

grant for one year only, the Lords had rejected the bill because of the unconstitutional limitation. Obviously then the king had an exceedingly strong case for his view. Further, if tonnage and poundage fell within the prerogative before the Petition of Right, no difference was made by the Statute; because according to the king's argument, and according to the claim of the Commons in presenting the petition, it deprived the king of no existing prerogatives, but was an Act declaratory of the existing law.



An Infantryman of 1625.
[From Skelton's "Armour."]

No mention had been made in the petition itself of indirect taxes, but only of specified forms of taxation against which the Commons had an adequate case as being opposed to constitutional practice. The only possible retort for the Commons was that the phrase "or other such charge" was intended to cover indirect taxation; that the king was perfectly well aware that this was the meaning of the Commons; and that in assenting to the petition he was accepting the doctrine of the Commons that the legal decision in Bate's case had been wrong and that the practice of two hundred years had not deprived the House of a right which it had always held in reserve. To the plain man the plain fact would appear to be that both the Crown and the Commons shirked the issue in the Petition of Right, and left the taxation clauses intentionally indefinite, because each party intended to insist on its own interpretation of the indefinite phrase as part and parcel of the terms on which the subsidies had been granted.

Each hoped indirectly to score the victory on the vital point which both thoroughly recognised. The king would be completely under the financial control of the Commons if he had annually to obtain their authority for levying indirect taxes; which was precisely what the Commons were bent on securing and the king was bent on avoiding.

Such, then, was the position of affairs when the House of Commons sent up its Tonnage and Poundage Bill accompanied by a declaration that the levying of the impost without parliamentary authority had been illegal. The king met the Commons with a flat refusal to accept the bill, or to surrender his constitutional right to levy tonnage and poundage without parliament's consent. He was able to do so, because the subsidies were already secured. The weight of opinion undoubtedly favours the view that Charles was technically in the right,

and that on this question the Commons were the innovators, not the Crown.

Nor was this the only blow suffered by parliament in the month of June 1628. Both in the first and in this, the third, parliament of the reign, the foremost champion of the Commons and the foremost enemy of Buckingham had been Thomas Wentworth. A week after the Petition of Right became law, Wentworth's colleagues, comrades, and followers learnt with dismay and alarm that he had been created a baron, which could only mean that he had left the leadership of the Commons to enter the service of the Crown. The moment when he resolved on the momentous change, and his motives for making it, are so obscure that they present an almost insoluble riddle. The leading champion of popular liberties, the most implacable foe of the Buckingham régime, the man most feared by the court, was suddenly transformed into the most relentless champion of the royal power since Thomas Cromwell, and the most contemptuous of parliamentary rights. And the change took place, not after Buckingham's fall, but at the moment when he was in the zenith of his power. No explanation at all is even plausible, unless we assume that Wentworth had convinced himself that Buckingham's fall was imminent; for it was equally impossible that he should have hoped to supplant Buckingham in the king's favour by his own influence, or that he should have been prepared to act either as the subordinate or the colleague of the duke; nor is it less impossible that a man of his character could have been bribed by a title to change sides. He must have reckoned that the combination of arrogance and incompetence in the duke were making his fall daily more inevitable. He must have been confident that he himself would secure the position of the supreme minister. We may, then, adopt the view of his old comrades and colleagues, that if he had any principles he sank them to gratify personal ambition, seeing himself a mightier man as the king's minister, without a rival among the minions of the Court, than as sharing the leadership of the people with Eliot and Pym. We may, as an alternative, believe that Wentworth was a patriot who, coming to man's estate in the year of the Addled Parliament, became firmly convinced that the increasing claims of the Crown must be curbed; that he held to that conviction, and strove his hardest for the legitimate authority of parliament until the full claims for liberty were formulated in the Petition of Right. Just at this stage he realised that a balance of parliamentary and royal powers was unattainable; that the hot-headed Eliot and the cold-hearted Pym would end by creating a parliamentary tyranny; that the one chance for the country was for a strong man to come to the support of the Crown, to render it absolute, and to provide the brain and hand which, when the Crown was once made absolute, should render despotism beneficent. There is, in fact, nothing incredible about the development, in a statesman of the first rank, of a change from a democratic to an absolutist attitude, of a gradual passage from one political pole to the other. The amazing thing about

Wentworth is that the change of attitude was made in a week, and the change was to all appearance a total reversal. But finally, it is conceivable that Wentworth took the same view of the Petition of Right itself as the king, that he never intended a further limitation of the prerogative, and that the attitude of his colleagues on the Tonnage and Poundage Bill not only failed to command his adherence, but drove him into the opposite camp. Whatever explanation we may adopt of Wentworth's conduct, the fact remained that he aroused in his old colleagues an overwhelming intensity of hatred as the supreme traitor and apostate. "You have left us," said Pym to him—so runs the story—some four months later; "we will never leave you while your head is on your shoulders."

Not perhaps in the fashion that Wentworth had anticipated the blow fell which hurled Buckingham out of his path. A certain John Felton had served as a lieutenant in the Cadiz Expedition. When Buckingham's force went to the Isle of Rhé, he had asked for a captaincy, which the duke scornfully refused him. Thence he had returned to England brooding over his personal wrongs, sick at heart, and savage, like all his comrades, over the sufferings and the disgrace in which the whole force had been involved. Touched with religious mania, he became possessed with the idea that he was the appointed destroyer of the detested enemy of the people. At Portsmouth he succeeded in making his way into Buckingham's apartments and, as the duke stepped out of his room, stabbed him to the heart. The assassin was seized and haled away to his doom; he had done his work of deliverance, and it was nothing to him that his own life was forfeit; nay, it was his privilege to have smitten down the tyrant and the oppressor, and for that his own life was a light enough price to pay. All over England the news of his deed was hailed with an outburst of savage jubilation which was never forgotten or forgiven by the king who had loved his splendid favourite as he never loved another man.

V

PURITANISM

On the question of arbitrary imprisonment it appeared that the Commons had won their battle. On the question of taxation, it was made abundantly clear at the moment of the prorogation that they had not won. But there was a third question with regard to which there had not as yet been a violent collision between the Crown and the Commons, but which nevertheless had been for some time past fermenting in men's minds, and was now about to be placed in the forefront of dispute. This was the religious question. And here, as in the question of taxation, we have to realise that the quarrel arose because the Crown strained, in defiance of popular sentiment, powers which the Tudors had exercised almost without

question, because both Henry VIII. and Elizabeth had been careful not to go beyond the limits of popular acquiescence. And in this respect James I. had on the whole followed the example of his predecessors.

In England the country, in the reign of Henry VIII., had accepted the general principles that uniformity of religion was to be enforced, that the formulæ of uniformity must have the sanction of the State, and that the supreme ecclesiastical authority of the State was the Crown. The Crown preserved the old episcopal organisation of church government as a matter of course. The uniformity which was insisted on permitted of a wide latitude of doctrine and of an appreciable variety in ceremonial. With this the mass of the people had been content. The limit of latitude in the direction of Roman doctrine was set primarily by the antagonism to the assertion of any claim to authority within the realm by any external potentate, whether spiritual or secular. When the popular mind learnt to associate particular doctrines or practices with allegiance to the pope, it became hotly antagonistic to those doctrines and practices. In the other direction, the popular mind was generally disposed to resent an attitude which challenged lawful authority. Popular sentiment sympathised with demands for increased latitude, but not with their aggressive expression, and so long as Nonconformity was unaggressive, popular sentiment was opposed to its aggressive repression.



Charles I.

[From a miniature drawing by Matthew Snelling, 1647.]

Now popular opinion had approved or acquiesced in the rigorous repressive action of the State in the reign of Elizabeth at the time of the Martin Mar-Prelate pamphlets, when Nonconformity adopted a violently aggressive attitude and thereby lost the popular sympathy which was being drawn to it in reaction against the arbitrary methods of Whitgift and the Court of High Commission. The Hampton Court Conference on the other hand, with its immediate results, made the set of popular feeling favourable to the Nonconformists. Gunpowder Plot, the Catholic marriage projects, and the attempts to relax the penal laws against Romanists, all tended to foster and intensify the alarmed hatred of Romanism and the unpopularity of the specific doctrines and practices which were looked upon as akin to those of Rome. But what King James cared about most was insistence on the authority of an episcopate intimately associated with the monarchy; and during the greater part of his reign bishops as a body were rather Calvinistic in their theology, and were not irritatingly strict in their insistence on unpopular details of ceremonial.

Thus circumstances combined to develop Puritanism. Now the essential characteristic of Puritanism is the vivid consciousness of an immediate personal relation between the individual and his Maker, which recognises no mediator between God and man except the Son of God, who is both God and man. No Church, no hierarchy of saints, can be interposed between the soul and God. There is no ordained channel for the Divine Grace, which must be sought directly by prayer and the study of God's Word, God revealed in the Scriptures. Of that Word there is no infallible interpreter; the only interpreter is the individual himself, guided by the Spirit of God. The individual, therefore, must in all things be guided by the inward monitor. Puritanism is, in short, the principle of individualism carried to its highest pitch in matters of religion.


But Puritanism in the seventeenth century, when it searched the Scriptures, turned to the Old Testament rather than the New. It believed very emphatically in prophets, and its prophet *par excellence* was Calvin. Its primary dogma was that of Predestination, a grim creed which tends to make its adherents absolutely fearless of what man can do to them, but, while it fills them with the fear of God, does not greatly tend to inspire them with a love of His creatures. So Puritanism dwells upon the Power of an offended God and the Righteousness of His Judgments rather than upon His Love and His Mercy. And an Old Testament Puritanism contained a grave element of political danger to monarchy; since neither the institution of monarchy among the Hebrews nor its persistence, nor the attitude of the Prophets to the Kings, suggest a high conception of royalty.

Logically it would appear that Puritanism ought to be tolerant. If there is no authority except Scripture, and no interpreter of Scripture except the individual, there can be no arbiter between individuals, no one who can impose his own judgment upon his neighbour, and every man must be left to follow his own conscience. Accordingly it was among the Puritans that the doctrine of toleration was first maintained as distinct from the doctrine of comprehension. Unqualified toleration leaves opinion absolutely free. A qualified toleration may repress the expression of opinions, not on the ground that they are false, but because their dissemination is injurious to public order; on the ground, that is, not of religious truth but of political expediency. Comprehension, on the other hand, draws a distinction between things fundamental and things indifferent, and is under no obligation to tolerate variations of opinion with regard to fundamentals. Comprehension, not toleration, is the normal attitude of a State Church. But the Puritan may interpret his position in two ways. If he admits his own fallibility, he is logically bound to leave to his neighbour the same right of private judgment which he claims for himself. Yet the Puritan may claim infallibility for himself, having assurance of the direct guidance of the Spirit. It follows, then, that any one who thinks differently from himself is not under the guidance of the Spirit, and therefore has no

claim to toleration. Hence Puritanism could also display a supreme intolerance, rendered additionally offensive by its egotism. Again, Puritanism is not essentially connected with any particular form of ecclesiastical organisation. It is perfectly compatible with an Episcopalian, a Presbyterian, or a Congregational system. It can accept creeds infinitely various.

We may then sum up the Puritanism of the seventeenth century by saying that it was predestinarian in its creed, that it drew its public morals from the Old Testament, that its personal morals were of an extreme austerity, and that it identified the Papacy with the Scarlet Woman of the Apocalypse. It was disposed to be anti-prelatical, partly because it regarded the old system as being too nearly akin to that of Rome, partly because the Episcopate was presented as a means of subjecting the things of the Spirit

Civitatis Westmonasteriensis pars



Westminster in the time of Charles I.

[From a print by Hollar.]

to the arm of the flesh ; whereas the Puritan advocates of Presbyterianism regarded that system as a means of subjecting the arm of the flesh to spiritual control. But Puritanism was not to be identified with Presbyterianism, nor did it become definitely antagonistic in England to the episcopal system until the Episcopate itself took on a new colour in the reign of Charles I.

The head and front of the movement in the Church which aroused the bitter hostility of Puritanism was William Laud, who was raised to his first bishopric, that of St. Davids, by James I. under pressure from Buckingham and the Prince of Wales. The old king yielded to the young men, but not without a warning grumble that trouble would come of it, not in his day but in theirs. Just so also he warned them against their folly in encouraging the impeachment of Middlesex, the Treasurer, who was opposed to the war with Spain on which the duke and the prince as well as the Commons had set their hearts. They would find they had more than enough of impeachments without going out of their way to encourage them.

The old king's warning came true. In his time Puritanism in general acquiesced sombrely while appointments were given to prelates with Puritan sympathies. A few of that sect who called themselves Independents demanded a liberty of worship which they could only obtain by migrating to Holland or Denmark, and when a band of them, joined by some associates from England, sailed in the *Mayflower* and set up in North America that community which became the nucleus of the New England States, they were readily granted a charter, as having provided an outlet for a class of persons who were rather troublesome to the authorities ; but a more active



Archbishop Laud.

[After the portrait by Vandyck.]

interference with the liberty of worship was required at home before a demand for greater freedom gave a strong impulse to emigration. The pressure came when Charles ascended the throne and the higher ecclesiastical appointments were habitually appropriated to the disciples of, that school of which Laud was the leader.

The laxity of discipline prevalent under King James disappeared. The lower clergy took their tone from the fathers of the Church. Breaches of the law were no longer overlooked or condoned. Unfamiliar doctrines were heard from the pulpits. Sermons became expositions of the divine authority of kings. The accustomed dogma of predestination began to be displaced in the pulpits by those less rigid views which are called


Arminian from their great exponent the Dutch Doctor "Arminius." The new school, while repudiating the Roman authority, emphasised the claim of the Church in England to be a branch of the Catholic Church, while denying that title to those Churches which had not maintained the continuity of episcopal ordination. They emphasised tradition, the authority of the early fathers, and the rulings of the four first General Councils. To the Puritans all these things were the inventions of priestcraft, innovations, insidious methods by which English Protestantism was to be seduced into the snares of Rome. Each one of Charles's parliaments lifted up its voice against the new teachers, and still while old Archbishop Abbott remained the Primate the Crown seemed likely to be restrained from using the Church as its own instrument. But in 1628 control over the licensing of publications was transferred from the archbishop to a commission which was practically managed by Laud, who was made Bishop of London. An attack in the Commons upon Mainwaring and Montague, two of the clergy who had just identified themselves with the most extreme doctrines of Absolutism as a part of the Divine

Order, was followed by the promotion of both. The king had made the Church his ally in the constitutional struggle, while parliament and Puritanism were ranged together in antagonism to the Crown and to the authority of the bishops represented by Laud.

VI

RULE WITHOUT PARLIAMENT

The prorogued parliament assembled again early in 1629. Buckingham was dead, but Wentworth was already a minister of the Crown, having been appointed to the Presidency of the Council of the North. Montague, censured by the Commons, had been preferred to the Bishopric of Chichester. Laud's activities as the new Bishop of London were in full play. The king had been levying tonnage and poundage as in the past; the goods of sundry merchants had been seized on their refusal to pay the duty, and among them was a member of parliament, John Rolles. In the existing state of tension it was easy enough for the Commons to believe that they had been tricked and betrayed by the king. The king had a still better right to declare that his own conduct had been unimpeachable, and that the attitude of the Commons was wholly unconstitutional.



A lady in her chair.

[From a MS. (1603-1638) in the Sloane Collection, British Museum.]

The elasticity of an unwritten constitution enables the machinery to work with an admirable ease so long as mutual understanding, good temper, and the spirit of accommodation prevail. But now questions had come to the front with regard to which the respective powers of the Crown and the parliament were debatable, each side being determined to push its own claim to the utmost. Instead of mutual understanding there was mutual distrust, and both sides were irritated and out of temper. As a matter of fact, the king was more disposed to accommodation than the exasperated Commons, who adopted a directly provocative course; and both Commons and king went on to set the conventions of the constitution at naught.

The Commons opened by declaring themselves to be in effect the judges of what was or was not orthodox in religion, and attacked the "innovations" of the clergy who had reverted to customs which were

looked upon as papistical. They summoned the innovators to give an account of themselves before the House, and in the meantime turned their attention to tonnage and poundage. The king had made the offer, reasonable enough in itself, that if the Commons would act according to precedent and vote him the duties for the term of the reign, he would waive the question of right. This was, in fact, the vital question, and it was the issue on which Pym wished to fight; for, unless the Commons could recover that control over tonnage and poundage which had been in abeyance for two hundred years, the king would be able to command a sufficient revenue to carry on the government after a fashion without appealing to parliament for aid. But Pym was overruled by Eliot, and the Commons elected to fight on the question of privilege involved by the seizure of the goods of a member of parliament. The officers who had seized the goods were summoned to the bar of the House; the king forbade them to obey the summons, since they had only acted in obedience to his orders. He ordered the House to adjourn till March 2nd. In the interval he endeavoured to negotiate with leading members. The negotiations failed. When the House met, Eliot moved three resolutions: against innovations in religion and the introduction of unorthodox opinion; against all persons who should be concerned in the levying of tonnage and poundage without direct parliamentary sanction; against all persons who should pay tonnage and poundage if it should be so demanded. All such persons were declared to be enemies of the king. Before the resolution could be moved the Speaker, Finch, announced that he had orders to adjourn the House again. But two of the members held him forcibly in the chair. The House broke out into wild disorder; one of the members locked the door and put the key in his pocket. When comparative calm had been restored, the Speaker refused to put the resolutions to the House. The king's troops were approaching to compel the assembly to disperse. While the Speaker was held in the chair, Holles, a member, read the resolutions. They were carried by acclamation. Then the doors were unlocked and the members poured out. Their dispersion was followed by the announcement that the parliament was dissolved.

Eleven years passed before another parliament met. The king took his stand upon his legal rights. The Petition of Right did not bar him from exercising to the full the statutory powers of the arbitrary Courts which could override the Common Law—the Courts of Star Chamber, of High Commission, and of the Councils of the North and of Wales. These Courts were in effect ready to do the Royal bidding. For the punishment of Eliot and his most prominent supporters it was unnecessary to appeal even to those Courts. They were charged in the King's Bench with riot and sedition. They pleaded privilege of parliament, declaring that the House alone had jurisdiction with regard to matters which took place in parliament. The objection was overruled on the ground that riot and sedition could not be a part of parliamentary proceedings. Eliot refused to admit the juris-

diction, and was thrown into prison, where he was shamefully treated, and died after three years.

The resolutions of the House of Commons could not touch the actual legality of the levying of tonnage and poundage, and the Courts maintained that the Petition of Right covered only those forms of direct taxation which were specifically enumerated therein. The king then could carry on his government after a fashion, by straining to the utmost every right which the Courts would maintain, but only with a strictly economical expenditure. To carry on Buckingham's French war was impossible, and terms of peace were soon arrived at, since the war itself was a quite unjustifiable intervention on the part of England in French affairs. Richelieu was victorious over the Huguenots, but he used his victory with unexpected moderation, maintaining the principle of toleration. English Protestantism was therefore not irritated by the peace. Intervention in Germany was also not possible, but this mattered the less, because in 1630 Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, the greatest soldier of the day, threw his sword into the Protestant scale. Thenceforth England and Scotland were affected by the Thirty Years' War only because a large number of adventurers, principally Scots, learnt the art of war as mercenaries in the armies of the Swedish king.

For the first few years of his government without parliament Charles was indebted to the ingenious financial management of his Treasurer, Weston, who discovered fresh legal devices for procuring funds, and successfully prevented the king from plunging into impossible expenditure. Weston was the useful man of business who found the supplies for carrying on the king's government; the government itself was carried on mainly by Wentworth and Laud.

The Council of the North had been established in the time of Henry VIII. to replace the old system of government of the Border Counties—in other words, of England north of the Humber. Its institution had been the outcome of the Pilgrimage of Grace. It had been endowed with large arbitrary powers, and the sway of its president was now almost despotic. Wentworth was a despot who ruled without fear or favour, but crushed all opposition with an iron hand. As between subjects, he enforced law untouched by considerations of the wealth, power, or influence of the persons concerned. As between the Crown and the subject, he enforced



The Old "Star Chamber."

[Pulled down after the burning of old Houses of Parliament.]

the will of the government without any respect to law at all. Between subjects, stern impartial justice was to be dealt out; between Crown and the subject, justice was not in question; all that the subject received was by grace of the Crown. In the north of England, however, Wentworth's rule was brief; in 1633 he was transferred to Ireland.

In Ireland Wentworth played the despot very much to the benefit of the country in which he ruled. Comparative peace had indeed descended on the land since the stormy days of Elizabeth; but it was an ill ordered peace. In Wentworth's view, what the country needed was a ruler with an iron will and an efficient army to enforce that will. Resistance was to be paralysed, and justice was to be dealt out on the lines already described. Disorder and violence, except violence in the king's service or by the king's servants, was to be sharply repressed and punished. Magnates were to find no favour merely because they were magnates. The great lesson to be inculcated was that of obedience to the supreme authority. Wentworth could not dispense with the Irish Parliament, but he could make it subservient. He got from it the money which enabled him to muster and train a disciplined army. Competent men were appointed to administrative offices; under the Deputy's fostering care industry and commerce began to flourish as they had never flourished before; in particular the Irish linen manufacture began to achieve that pre-eminence which it has maintained ever since.



A Pikeman, 1635.
[From Skelton's "Armour."]

But the fatal flaw in Wentworth's system lay in his principle that neither law nor promises were binding on the Crown. What Wentworth thought good to do, that he did, though it might involve the breaking of solemn pledges. The general result was that Wentworth made himself absolute master in Ireland, and had in his own hands probably the most efficient military force in the three kingdoms. The Ireland over which he ruled was rapidly achieving a material prosperity for which there was no precedent; but it was an Ireland which felt itself to be enslaved, and the greater part of Ireland preferred its accustomed anarchy to a prosperous slavery.

While the one strong man on the king's side was ruling in Ireland on the principles which he called by the name of "Thorough," an obstinate man was controlling the king's ecclesiastical counsels in England, also on the principles of Thorough. Laud, who became archbishop at about the time when Wentworth went to Ireland, was bent on establishing the

supremacy of his own ecclesiastical views, views which were detestable in the eyes of the whole body of Puritans. While he was Bishop of London he had been content to enforce a strict conformity throughout his own diocese, while his power was otherwise felt chiefly through the supreme influence which he exercised in the control of ecclesiastical preferments which were confined to the men of his own school. As archbishop he exercised to the full the authority of the Primate of England. The clergy were required to encourage the treatment of Sunday as a Feast Day, which to the Puritan was scandalous. The Communion Table of the Puritan churches again acquired the character of an Altar. Every detail of the ritual which Laud himself loved was forced upon the Puritan clergy, and those who were recalcitrant were fined or deprived. Quite erroneously, belief gathered ground that Laud was preparing the way for a reunion with Rome. True, he had rejected the cardinal's hat which had twice been offered to him, but the popular mind seized upon the fact, not that it had been rejected but that it had been offered. The conventional English Puritanism was based upon what may be called the No Popery sentiment more than upon any reasoned theological convictions, and nothing was more certain to arouse popular hostility than an alarm of Popery. The conventional Puritanism had not yet assumed the garb of ascetic austerity; there had been no demonstrations when John Prynne was first penalised for making a violent attack upon the stage and all its works; but now when he and two other Puritans were set in the pillory for writing violent pamphlets against the Church Government, the victims of the Court of High Commission received a popular ovation. Laud's innovations or revivals had set the Puritan tide flowing.

Weston's financial devices were impolitic, mainly because they were palpable tricks which happened to touch in an irritating manner classes of the community whose goodwill the king would have done well to cultivate. Thus he had enraged the whole group of moderate landowners by discovering that all who had a £40 holding had been legally bound to take up knighthood at the king's coronation, and were technically liable to a heavy fine (which was now enforced) if they had neglected to do so. But Weston's methods were strictly within the letter of the law; no one could claim that they were illegal. Now, although there was peace with France there were some alarms lest the peace should not last, and the Government became anxious to strengthen the fleet for coast defence. All precedent warranted the issuing of an order to the ports to provide ships, or a cash equivalent for ships, for this purpose, when war was in progress or was imminent. Ship-money, therefore, was levied on the ports in accordance with precedent. But Weston died in 1635, and the counsellors about the king's person were mere courtiers. The king wanted more money and more ships, and an order was issued contrary to all precedent requiring inland towns to pay ship-money. There was no answer to the argument that naval defence ought to be paid for by inland towns just as much as

by seaports ; but there was also no answer to the other argument, that no law or precedent could be found for imposing this particular tax. The demand was immediately challenged ; the king obtained from the judges a decision in his favour, the weight of which was materially diminished by the fact that in the course of the reign three judges had been suspended or dismissed for giving decisions adverse to the king. The pronouncement, however, was published all over the country, but the authority for collecting the levy was directly challenged by John Hampden, who carried the case before the Court of Exchequer. Of the twelve judges, five supported

Hampden, but of the five, three did so on purely technical grounds. Seven maintained the claim of the Crown, on the express ground that the Crown had the right to demand whatever money was required for the defence of the realm, and that it lay with the Crown to judge what money was required for that purpose. It was palpable that if that judgment held good there was no limit to the amount of money that Charles



Cheapside and the Cross in 1638.

[From a contemporary account of the entry of Marie of Medici, mother of Henrietta Maria, Queen of Charles I., into London.]

could raise on the pretext that it was required for the defence of the realm. Yet the nation could only rage in silence ; it had no mouthpiece, for it had no parliament.

But we must turn now to those complications in the northern kingdom of Scotland which at last drove Charles once more to summon an English parliament.

VII

SCOTLAND

In England the system of government was fixed partly by statutes explicitly defining the respective powers of the Crown and of the Estates or parliament, and partly upon conventions. There was no question in the mind of any man that the explicit provisions of the statutes *must*

not be over-ridden ; there was no question that an established convention *ought* not to be over-ridden. A constitutional problem was presented only when the real bearings of the convention were a matter of doubt, when the Crown exercised in defiance of the popular will powers which had hitherto been exercised in conformity with the popular will. The system, that is, worked satisfactorily so long as Crown and parliament were in agreement ; when they were in disagreement disputes arose as to the actual extent of the powers which the conventions conveyed to one party or the other. But in England there existed in parliament a definite body which was the legal mouthpiece of public sentiment ; a body moreover which could compel the Crown to give at least a degree of consideration to popular sentiment through its power of withholding additional supplies, of which the Crown habitually stood in need over and above its normal revenue.


Now in Scotland there was no such balance of constitutional powers ; parliamentary institutions were undeveloped. There was a parliament, but in practice it had become a body merely for registering the decrees of the Government. The Government itself was conducted through the committees which had been known as the Lords of the Articles, whose composition was very largely controlled by the faction among the nobles which was for the time being in the ascendant. The dissensions and rivalries of the magnates had then enabled the "kingcraft" of King James VI. to convert the governing body into a privy council of the Crown's own nominees. The parliament was practically powerless, because the small public expenditure made the Crown virtually independent of the control exercised in England by a body which could refuse supplies until grievances were considered. The body most nearly representative of popular feeling was the General Assembly of the Kirk, which possessed neither legislative nor financial powers. The weak point in the absolutism of the Crown lay in the difficulty of enforcing its will upon defiant or reluctant magnates who could not easily be crushed by force, or upon a population with whom magnates were disposed to make common cause. So long as the magnates were in tolerable accord with each other and with the Crown, the Crown could take its own course

In England the State control over religion was not in question ; the question we have seen coming to the fore was whether that control should be exercised by the Crown or by parliament ; and the Episcopal system went far to ensure that it should be exercised by the Crown. In Scotland, however, the Reformation had taken a different course. It had been forced upon the Crown by the people instead of being imposed on a not unwilling people by the Crown, as had been the case in England. The system adopted was rooted in Calvinism, and demanded "spiritual independence." It produced a Presbyterian system and a Presbyterian ministry who claimed an authority in things spiritual free from State control, and sought to extend spiritual dominion into the political sphere ; whereas in England

Calvinism was merely a graft, hitherto admitted only so far as it was content to recognise the controlling authority of the State, in practice at least if not in theory. These claims the kingcraft of James VI. had enabled him to combat effectually. Before he became King of England as well as of Scotland he had succeeded in establishing the Royal authority within the General Assembly itself and in regrafting Episcopacy upon the Presbyterian system. He had succeeded, because the magnates were with him in opposition to the claims of the Presbyterian ministry, and because in his campaign against the preachers he had been careful not to

run counter to the interests of the magnates.

This policy James maintained throughout his reign. It was his persistent aim to recast the Scottish Ecclesiastical polity on Prelatical lines, and to assimilate the Church in Scotland to the Church in England. He was wise enough not to go so fast as to arouse violent popular hostility, while taking advantage of the sub-



Plan and view of Edinburgh in the early 17th century.

[From a contemporary print.]

sidence of popular passion in connection with the subject. But he went to the utmost limits of safety, if he did not actually transgress them; and in Scotland as in England those bounds were passed by his son.

According to the last phase before the Union of the Crowns, it was exceedingly doubtful whether a General Assembly could legally be convened without the authority of the Crown. In 1604 and 1605 James refused to call one, and in the latter year a number of ministers met at Aberdeen, claiming to be the legal General Assembly. Several of those who had attended were punished, but the amount of sympathy they received made James hesitate to adopt extreme measures. He tried unsuccessfully to convert some of the leaders to his own views by bringing them up to London to consort with the English bishops, but he gained little by this beyond keeping Andrew Melville permanently out of the country. Then the king summoned an informal convention of ministers and laymen, to whom he propounded a scheme for providing each presbytery with a permanent "moderator" or president. From this he advanced to making the moderators of the Provincial Synods also permanent, each bishop being moderator

of his own presbytery and his own synod, and an *ex officio* representative in the General Assembly. The permanent moderators in general provided an obvious step towards the development of episcopal government ; while Church lands appropriated by the Crown were restored to the Church in order to make provision for an enlarged episcopate. Popular irritation was soothed by the professed application of the funds to the enforcement of the penal laws against Romanism. But the practical outcome was that when a regular Assembly was held in 1610 it was dominated by the Crown, admitted that no Assembly could be held without the Royal authority, and assented to the extension of the episcopate and of an episcopal authority of a more comprehensive and penetrating character than had been granted when bishops were first introduced. An important detail was added when three of the bishops were regularly ordained by bishops in England, thus reviving the apostolic succession which, in the Anglican view, constituted the difference between an unrecognised sect and a branch of the Catholic Church. These proceedings were ratified with some further modifications by a parliament in 1612. As yet, however, no changes were made in the accustomed ritual and liturgy of the Church, which still in general retained its Presbyterian organisation.

The next move was made in a General Assembly in 1616. Proposals were made, after some order had been taken for the further repression of Popery, to introduce a revised liturgy, confession of faith, and catechism. It must be remembered that at this time the Presbyterians had not developed their later objection to a stereotyped form of service. The proposals were carried, and James then resolved to introduce further alterations after the Anglican model. He had avoided the mistake, in Scotland as in England, of appointing bishops of the High Anglican School. Hence it was with extreme reluctance, and against their own judgment, that they endorsed the innovations embodied in the Five Articles of Perth, which were adopted by the General Assembly held in that city in 1618. These Articles required the observation of certain Church Festivals, and admitted the private administration of the Sacrament under special circumstances. But the Article which seriously alarmed the Calvinistic conscience was that which required kneeling at Communion, since this was regarded as implying the act of Adoration. The practice had been retained in England through the firm resistance offered by Cranmer and Ridley to the pressure of Knox and Hooper when the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. was authorised. Alarm and resentment were now aroused ; and it was not without difficulty that the ratification of parliament was obtained three years later, while popular sentiment encouraged the clergy to ignore the new regulations.

James, then, had carried matters at least as far as it was safe to venture. But when Charles I. ascended the throne he was guided in Scotland as in England by considerations which left popular feeling out of account. It was enough for him to believe that he was acting within his rights ; whether

in so doing and enforcing his own will he was serving the people's interests, it was for him and not for them to judge. His own religious convictions were deep and sincere, and he had no qualms about compelling his people, whether in England or in Scotland, to conform to them. Moreover, he had the singularly unfortunate habit of forgetting that, if he wished to enforce unpopular measures, it was at least advisable to seek means of conciliation instead of accumulating causes of irritation; that if he was bent on alienating one section of the community, it would be politic to secure support in other quarters.

The religious innovations under James VI. had been possible because the old king had kept on good terms with the magnates. The one thing wanting to combine the whole country in a solid opposition to the Royal policy was a quarrel between the magnates and the Crown. A means of irritating the magnates lay ready to the king's hand; having discovered his opportunity, he did not neglect to seize it. Since the party of the Reformation had triumphed in Scotland, quantities of Church lands had been granted away; every great landowner and many of the small ones had profited thereby. Charles was no sooner on the throne than he issued an Act of Revocation, resuming for the Crown all grants of land made since the death of James V. in 1542. The Revocations were not intended to be pure confiscations; the holders were to receive compensation assessed by a commission. But as a matter of course the assessment was more than sufficiently adverse to the holders to create in them a rankling sense of injustice. It was part of Charles's scheme to appropriate a portion of the revenues accruing to make provision for the clergy. What are called in England "tithes" and in Scotland "teinds" had in the course of the Reformation passed into the hands of miscellaneous laymen who had no other connection with the lands. When the arrangements for the Revocation were completed, a process which occupied some five years, the landowners were enabled to recover the teinds at a low price, a portion only being appropriated to the ministerial stipends. The clergy benefited and the Crown benefited; but the "Titulars of Teind," as the holders had been called, got only about two years' purchase by way of compensation, and the landowners got only ten years' purchase. Thus both these bodies were driven into an attitude of angry hostility to the Crown, while, in the eyes of the clergy, the financial benefits they received were by no means an equivalent for the increased control of the Crown over the Church. And now when the clergy kicked against the pricks, the sympathies of every nobleman and every laird or landowner were on their side instead of on the king's. And as in the case of ship-money in England, human nature ignored the honest intention behind the arbitrary act, and assumed that the whole thing had been done in order to increase the power of the Crown.

Having thus combined a united opposition where his father had been careful to preserve for himself powerful sectional support, Charles pro-

ceeded with that ecclesiastical reconstruction which James had carried as far as he dared, thereby also attracting the sympathies of Puritan England, already sufficiently alarmed and irritated, to the cause of the Scottish Presbyterians. Scottish Presbyterianism too had already felt its sympathies aroused for the English parliament, both on account of its Puritanism, and because of the alarm generated by the Catholic successes on the Continent and the failures of Buckingham's administration.

In 1633, the year in which Wentworth was to go to Ireland and Laud was to become Archbishop of Canterbury, Charles visited his northern kingdom in company with Laud. He had already entered on the dangerous course of appointing Laudian bishops. The ritual of the services attended by the King of Scotland was alarming to Scottish Protestantism. The parliament summoned at Edinburgh was hardly permitted to express its antagonism to the bills laid before it by the Lords of the Articles, who in the nature of things were practically all king's men; moreover, it was placed in a difficulty by being required to reject or to pass the whole series *en bloc*.

Even under these conditions the bills were passed with difficulty, though Charles may have been unaware of the intensity of the antagonism which they aroused. In the main, they were confirmations of the Acts of the last reign and of the Act of Revocation. Soon after Charles left Scotland a widely-signed protest was drawn up by Lord Balmerino; whereupon he was prosecuted for treason, though the only punishment inflicted was a short imprisonment. For the first time since the Reformation a bishop was appointed to the Chancellorship—a fresh grievance to the nobles, and a fresh ground of hostility towards the bishops at large.

In 1636 a Book of Canons, or Ecclesiastical Regulations, was issued, with no warrant save that of the royal authority, in which the Presbyterian constitution of the Church was ignored; and in the following year was issued a new Service Book, which differed from that used in England only in some details which rendered it more anti-Calvinistic. It was assumed that Laud was responsible; erroneously, as it happened, because the most objectionable details had been introduced against his judgment at the instance of certain Scottish bishops, who were more Laudian than Laud himself.

A mere perusal of the new Service Book was all that was needed to drive the still existing moderate party into full opposition. On the first attempt to read the new service in St. Giles's in Edinburgh, an unseemly riot broke out; tradition affirms that it was opened by a woman named Jenny Geddes, who flung her stool at the head of the officiating Dean. Popular feeling was overwhelmingly on the side of the rioters, whom the magistrates did not dare to punish. All over the country, it became manifest that half the ministers would refuse on their own account to use the Service Book in spite of the Royal injunction, and the other half would not be allowed to use it by their congregations.

Petitions poured in against the innovations. A vast gathering of protestors was resolved into a group of elected committees known as the

"Tables," who acted practically as if they had been a legally assembled parliament of the nation. The Tables formulated the National League and Covenant for the defence of religion, and in March 1638 the whole Scottish nation was signing it. The document was based upon a Covenant of 1581 "against popery," which had been signed by King James himself; but it was accompanied by explanatory clauses explicitly condemning recent innovations. It was expressly and even fervently loyal to the Crown, but it was an emphatic refusal on the part of the whole nation to have forced upon it a form of religion which it regarded as intolerable, though it did not actually denounce Episcopacy.

Faced with such a unanimous resistance the king sent the Marquis of Hamilton to negotiate, with full powers, while Puritan England looked on and sympathised with the Scots. The Scots insisted on a free parliament, a free General Assembly, and the revocation of the new Service Book and the Book of Canons; and they would not listen to the king's demand that the National Covenant should itself be withdrawn. Charles was obliged to give way. At the end of the year a General Assembly met; the bishops refused to recognise its authority over them. The Assembly insisted; when Hamilton dissolved it, it paid no attention, but continued to act on its own responsibility, deposed the bishops, and abolished the Episcopate.

VIII

THE BISHOPS' WARS

It was not possible to pretend that the action of the General Assembly was legal. In plain terms, a crisis had arrived in which the will of the king and the will of the nation were in flat opposition, and the constitution provided the nation with no legal means of resisting the Crown. The General Assembly, in fact, constituted itself the governing body of the nation, and it did so with the approval of probably at least nine-tenths of the population. The Scots were well aware that they might be compelled to resort to maintaining the popular liberties in arms, and they had been making preparations for that possibility. They had been collecting subscriptions which were virtually compulsory though nominally voluntary. They now chose officers; troops were being drilled on all hands, and there were in the country experienced veterans who had fought under Gustavus Adolphus—soldiers who understood discipline, and captains competent to hold high command, of whom the chief was Alexander Leslie.

Charles, on his side, appeared to have no other alternatives before him than complete surrender or successful coercion, since the Royal authority had been practically defied. But he could not coerce Scotland with Scottish troops, for, apart from the remoter highlands and islands, the immense majority of the fighting men were on the side of the Covenant.

To coerce Scotland he must have an English army. He could rely on the loyalty of the Marquis of Huntly in the north, and of the city of Aberdeen ; elsewhere he could hope for very little support. In the spring of 1639 Montrose, for the Covenant, captured Aberdeen, and Leslie secured Edinburgh Castle. As General-in-Chief of the self-constituted government, Leslie, then, with a considerable force, proceeded to Dunselaw, in the neighbourhood of Berwick. Charles had succeeded in collecting some levies in England, and faced the covenanting force ; but his troops were untrained, his officers without experience, and the men were at the best half-hearted and quite unfitted to do battle with Leslie. The Scots had no desire for war, and Charles came to terms, which merely postponed the conflict, which is known as the Bishops' war. Under the terms of the treaty, both sides were to disband their forces, and a free Assembly and Parliament were promised. Assembly and Parliament met in August only to confirm the proceedings of the previous Assembly, and to order a universal signing of the Covenant.

For ten years, as we have seen, it had been possible to carry on the king's government in England without an appeal to parliament for further funds. But without further funds the organisation of an army competent to coerce Scotland was not possible. Wentworth, now raised to the earldom of Strafford, advised the step of calling a parliament. The voice of opposition had been so long silenced that the Deputy, long absent in Ireland, may well have imagined that a new parliament might be coerced or cajoled into satisfying the king's demand. If so he was mistaken. The assembly known as the Short Parliament met in April 1640, only to demand that grievances should be dealt with before supply. Strafford's Deputyship had carried him out of touch alike with England and Scotland ; and it is evident that he completely misjudged the temper of both peoples. His recommendations for a northern campaign had been based on the assumption that the Scottish resistance was merely superficial ; and even now he seems to have been under the illusion that in this emergency the English people would rally to the Crown.

But the Short Parliament would not grant the king the twelve subsidies for which he asked, even though he had offered to withdraw the claim to ship-money as the price. The king, certainly not by Strafford's advice, was unwise enough to reject the proposal put forward by the moderate party in the House of Commons, that the sense of the House should be taken on the question of granting a supply without committing them to any specific amount. It was tolerably certain that parliament would not grant all that he asked ; and, choosing to have either all or nothing, he dissolved the parliament when it had been sitting for only three weeks.

A considerable war-fund was raised by contributions which were strictly voluntary. Again Charles marched to the North, where he was joined by Strafford, who had in the meanwhile been back in Ireland arranging for the organisation of a force. But before his arrival the Scots had already crossed into England, easily routing the English at

Newburn; for the king's army was no better than it had been in the previous year. The Scots came, declaring themselves to be in no way hostile to the English. To fight under the existing conditions would have been mere folly. Again the king entered on negotiations, and withdrew to the South; leaving Northumberland and Durham in the hands of the Scots as security for the payment of their expenses. It was clear that without vigorous support from England the king would be compelled to concede to the subjects of his northern kingdom whatever they might demand. Without aid from an English parliament Charles was paralysed; and in the desperate hope that such aid might after all be forthcoming, the assembly known as the Long Parliament was summoned in November.

CHAPTER XVI

THE FALL OF THE MONARCHY

I

THE LONG PARLIAMENT


AMONG the supporters of the king there was a single commanding figure which utterly dwarfed all others, one man whom the Commons of England had learnt to regard as their deadly enemy, one man whom they hated because he was the man whom they feared—the apostate Strafford. Laud might be the object of popular detestation but no one was afraid of him, or of the crowd of intriguing courtiers who were much less likely to devise a working scheme of absolutism than to wreck by short-sighted jealousies the daring designs of the one master mind. While Strafford stood by the king, the Commons could devise no stroke without the fear that it might be defeated, and even turned against them, by the keen brain and the indomitable will of the great minister. Before anything else could be accomplished Strafford must go. Among the moderate men there were at least not a few who believed or hoped that if Strafford were removed the king and the nation might be reconciled. Charles, with no Buckingham and no Wentworth to dominate him, might submit to be guided by the moderates, and all would be comparatively well. But while Strafford remained nothing could be done. The Scots were in possession of the north of England, but the parliament and the English nation had nothing to fear from the Scots. The Houses had hardly been assembled when the Commons resolved on the impeachment of Strafford.

The earl, now fully alive to the temper of the people and the parliament, conscious that his enemies would leave no stone unturned in their efforts for his destruction, knew that both his own safety and the safety of the king would best be served, if only the king could be trusted, by his own withdrawal to Ireland; but the king dared not stand alone. Strafford remained to abide the storm. The Commons, led by Pym, impeached him of treason at the Bar of the House of Lords; he was arrested and confined in the Tower. Within six weeks Laud too was arrested on the charge of treason; others of the king's most prominent agents had fled the country in fear of a like fate.


Strafford had been some four months in prison before the preparations for the trial were complete. But when the case for the prosecution was un-

folded, it became more and more evident that the charge of treason must break down in law. Strafford had striven to subvert the constitution, as interpreted by the parliamentary lawyers; but seeking to make the Crown absolute could by no means be translated into treason in the technical sense. The Lords were sitting as the supreme legal court in the country, and were bound to give judgment according to law. The Commons' managers of the trial saw that they would be defeated. The most effective piece of evidence was contained in papers, in which, referring to the Scots war, Strafford had said: "You have an army in Ireland that you may employ to reduce this kingdom to obedience, for I am confident the Scots cannot hold out three months." But, however popular feeling might be inflamed by the charge that Strafford had meant to use the army in Ireland to coerce England, it was, in the first place, impossible to prove that England, not Scotland, was the country to be coerced, in which case the English Parliament had nothing to say in the matter; and, in the second place, it was more than doubtful whether the term treason could be stretched to cover words inciting the king to coerce his subjects.

The Commons then resolved on a step which set the struggle on a new footing. Hitherto they had taken their stand on the law; at all points they had claimed that they were asserting the legal rights of the House of Commons against prerogatives claimed by the Crown which had no place in the constitution. Now they found that the law was against them; not merely the law as interpreted by judges whose authority was deprived of weight by their personal dependence on the king, but the law as it must be interpreted by the House of Peers itself. They resolved to drop the impeachment and to proceed by bill of attainder. The argument that the attempted subversion of the constitution was treason against the State, and was therefore treason against the person of the king, would not hold in law; it followed that there was no law by which treason against the State, as distinct from treason against the king's person, could be punished. Punishment, therefore, could only be inflicted by a process overriding the law, and this could only be effected by a special Act of parliament dealing with the emergency; not a resolution of one House or of both Houses, but an Act by the king in parliament, the ultimate sovereign authority which alone can override all law. A bill of attainder condemning Strafford to die as a public enemy was introduced and carried in the House of Commons. It was carried in the House of Lords. The king had given Strafford the most solemn pledges that if he remained in England he should be protected by the Crown. Without the king's assent the Act was waste paper. Would the king veto it? Would he face the storm of popular resentment which was already beginning to clamour against the queen as well as the minister? Queen and courtiers hated the great man who was no courtier; they were blind to their own incapacity, to their own need of Strafford. Every influence was brought to bear upon Charles to persuade him to surrender. He yielded, and by the great betrayal sealed his own doom.



“ THE TRUE MANNER OF THE SITTING OF THE LORDS AND COMMONS OF PARLIAMENT
UPON THE TRYAL OF THOMAS, EARLE OF STRAFFORD, 1641 ”



“ THE TRUE MANNER OF THE EXECUTION OF THOMAS, EARLE OF STRAFFORD,
UPON TOWER HILL, THE 12TH OF MAY, 1641 ”

From etchings by Hollar, 1641.

Strafford's head had hardly fallen when the Commons set about reaping the fruits of their victory. In three months every instrument of absolutism on which the king had sought to rely throughout his reign was abolished. While Strafford was still in the Tower, government without parliament had been abolished by an Act requiring that parliament should assemble at least once in every three years, with or without the royal summons. An Act was now passed which forbade the dissolution of the existing parliament without its own consent. The right to ship-money, tonnage and poundage, and customs duties was formally abrogated. The arbitrary courts of Star Chamber, of High Commission, and of the Council of the North were abolished, so that no offenders could be tried except by the ordinary courts under the ordinary law.

So far Lords and Commons had acted together. Save in the matter of the attainder of Strafford, the whole series of Acts only abolished claims of the Crown which had never been admitted by the Commons, or removed glaring abuses. But now the Commons began to assert powers which they had never pretended to claim before King Charles ascended the throne. They attacked the bishops, in a bill which demanded their removal from the House of Lords and from the Privy Council; and this brought them into collision with the House of Lords, which rejected the bill. The advanced Puritan party in the Commons responded with a bill aiming not at a compromise but at the abolition of Episcopacy, known as the Root and Branch bill. For the first time the Commons themselves were divided, while the majority in the Lords was in direct opposition to the majority in the Commons.

But the contest was deferred. The Scots army had now been duly paid off, and Charles paid a visit to the Northern kingdom, where Montrose and others had now broken away from the Covenanting chiefs, headed by Argyle, whose domination was hotly resented in many quarters. The king, however, found the party of revolt so weak that he was obliged to place himself in Argyle's hands, and Argyle himself was strengthened by the discovery of a plot against his person, in which both the king and Montrose were implicated, though without justification, by popular rumour. And while the movement of affairs in Scotland was disturbing, events of a still more serious character were taking place in Ireland.

Wentworth had ruled Ireland with a strong hand. Disorder had been crushed and prosperity had begun to make its way. But the order and the prosperity both depended upon the unscrupulous vigour and ability of a fearless Deputy. When Wentworth vanished behind the portals of the Tower, there was no one to take his place in Ireland, and no one to curb the hostilities of the settlers and the native Irish, of Catholics and Protestants, of family rivalries. While Strafford lived, there was always the chance that he would return, and the certainty that if he did it would be in an evil day for any one who had tried to make trouble during his absence. But the restraining hand was gone, and in the autumn there

came a sudden savage outburst of the Irishry against the Englishry. Ghastly tales of brutal barbarity and of blood-thirsty massacres flew over England. The truth was hideous enough, and became fivefold more hideous in the telling. England raged for vengeance, but—where was the avenger? If an army were despatched to Ireland under the king's officers, what would that army do? Suspicions grim and foul were in men's minds. The rising was the work of Jesuits, of Papists; perhaps the king's French wife was at the bottom of it; it was a plot to provide the king with an army for destroying the liberties of England. For such wild suspicions there was no sort of justification; but the plain fact stood out,

that if an army were placed under the king's control the work which the parliament had just accomplished would almost inevitably be undone.

Almost at the moment when the news arrived from Ireland, the parliament which had been adjourned in August reassembled. The only constitutional action possible was to vote supplies for



A newspaper heading of 1641.

an Irish war, the control of which would be in the king's hands; which was precisely the thing which the parliament, or at least the Puritans, dared not do. The alternative was to show cause why the king should not be trusted with a control which was his by constitutional right.

So the Opposition leaders drew up the Grand Remonstrance, a detailed indictment enumerating all the arbitrary proceedings, all the misgovernment, with which the king had been charged. It was a statement of the case for parliament against the Crown. The Grand Remonstrance completed the work of dividing the Commons, which had begun with the Puritan attack on the constitution of the Church. It amounted to a virtual, though not a formal, demand for the abdication of the king's sovereignty. It rallied to the support of the Crown all those who, while they had been ready to insist on limiting the royal prerogative, dreaded the unchecked tyranny of an irresponsible House of Commons more than the tyranny of the king. Hour after hour the stormy debate raged; not till after midnight was the division taken and the Remonstrance carried by eleven votes. Then a motion was brought forward that the Remonstrance itself should

be printed and published; the storm broke out with redoubled fury when the minority proclaimed their intention to protest, a course for which there was no precedent. Swords were drawn; it seemed that blood would be shed on the floor of the House itself, when John Hampden succeeded in procuring the adjournment of the debate.

At the moment, the king was on his way back from Scotland. On his arrival in London he found that there had rallied to his support not only something like half the House of Commons but a great force of popular feeling in the city. The violence of the Opposition had so far overreached itself that a very little tact and skill would have sufficed at this period to turn the scale decisively in favour of the Crown. But the tact and the skill were both wanting. The king adopted a course which stiffened the Opposition and dashed the hopes of his own supporters. Perhaps he thought that the victory was already won; at any rate he proceeded not to conciliate, but to strike. One of the Lords and five of the leaders of the Opposition in the Commons were found to have held communication with the Scots, which was, undoubtedly, in the technical sense, treasonable. Charles laid an impeachment of the Members before the House of Lords, and on the following day came down to the House of Commons in person, attended by a troop of armed men, to arrest them.

News of his coming had already reached the House, and the five members had been sent off by water to the City where it was known that they would be secure. Charles entered, leaving his followers outside the still open doors, and advanced to the Speaker's chair amid cries of "Privilege" from every hand. Announcing that he had come to take the "traitors," he asked Lenthall, the Speaker, if they were present. Lenthall, kneeling, replied that he had neither eyes to see nor tongue to speak save as the House should direct him. Himself scanning the benches, and seeing that, in his own words, "The birds had flown," he withdrew, with a warning that if the House did not send them to him he must take his own course. All that he had gained by the proceedings over the Grand Remonstrance was lost, at least outside the House. London was united in solid support of the outraged Commons, who for safety held their sittings in the City instead of at Westminster. A week later the king left Whitehall, not to enter it again till the country had passed through the storms of civil war.



The Church Militant: a Bishop of 1642.
From a contemporary caricature.]

The next eight months were spent by both sides in preparations for an armed conflict, diversified by negotiations, futile because neither believed in the sincerity of the other. The moderates gradually left London to join the king; among the number were reckoned three-fourths of the House of Lords and about one-third of the House of Commons. The Houses, which continued to sit at Westminster, consisted entirely of the representatives of one side, although they were still technically the National Parliament. But virtually all real chance of peace had been ended when the king attempted to arrest the five members. Both sides were raising troops, appointing officers, and collecting money. The king sent his queen to get financial aid from her brother in France, and from Holland, where the young Stadtholder, William of Orange, had married, a year since, the English Princess Mary. Charles's nephews, Rupert and Maurice, the younger sons of the late Elector Palatine, left what was practically a lost cause abroad to take up the king's cause in England. Hull closed its gates to the king's followers; and the last semblance of peace vanished when the king unfurled his standard at Nottingham in August (1642).

II

THE FIRST STAGE OF THE CIVIL WAR

One immense advantage the parliament possessed; it had the fleet on its side, and held control of almost every port in the country. It controlled also the machinery for taxation, whereas the king was obliged to rely for financial support chiefly on voluntary contributions. The struggle at the outset was an English struggle; Scotland stood aside, and Ireland was too deeply plunged in its own embroilments to take a hand in the conflict on the east of St. George's Channel. In England, roughly speaking, the northern and western counties favoured the royalist cause, the midlands were divided, and the eastern counties from the Humber to the Isle of Wight favoured the parliament, while Devon and Cornwall at first hung in the balance. But the towns tended to favour the parliament, and all over the country Puritan gentry were to be found in the Royalist counties, and Royalist gentry in the Parliamentary counties. Precisely as the Reformation had taken hold readily in the eastern portion of England, while the north and the west clung to their traditional beliefs, Puritanism was accepted in the east, while the Conservatism of the north and west kept them, in the main, on the side of the Church and the Crown. As in the past, so now, London, Kent, and the Eastern Counties, were the districts most zealous in asserting popular rights. And now, as before, the seamen in the ports of the west as well as of the east were on the Puritan and popular side.

Only to a very limited extent was the war one of classes. It was no uprising of an oppressed population against the domination of an aristocracy.

There was, indeed, a preponderance of the aristocracy, of the landed gentry, on one side, and of the burgesse element on the other; but on both sides both were represented, and for two years the chief parliamentary commanders were the Earls of Essex and Manchester. The whole of the great English civil war was further characterised by an honourable absence of the ferocity for which the Thirty Years' War, still raging on the Continent, was distinguished. Both sides were fighting for principles which it was not inherently impossible to harmonise; on both sides the majority sought only the predominance of its own principles, not the complete destruction of its opponents. And in consequence the havoc wrought and the brutalities committed were extraordinarily small in comparison with those of other wars of equal magnitude. Even the damage wrought in churches and cathedrals by iconoclastic Puritanism was slight in comparison with what had been done under shelter of law, when there was no war at all, in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI.

The war in its initial stages was a war of military amateurs. There were few living Englishmen in 1642 who had ever seen a pitched battle or witnessed a scientifically conducted campaign under capable commanders. For its rank and file, one side had to rely mainly on city train-bands or on a very raw militia, while the other drew its recruits largely from the establishments of great landowners. The Royalists, or Cavaliers, were very much better furnished with horse, while the strength of the Parliamentarians, or Roundheads, lay in the stubborn valour of their foot-soldiers. The distinguishing feature lay in the great preponderance among the Cavaliers of the class corresponding to the public-school-boys of to-day. "Their troops," said Cromwell, "are gentlemen's sons, younger sons and persons of quality, gentlemen that have honour and courage and resolution in them. You must get men of a spirit that is likely to go on as far as gentlemen will go, or else you will be beaten still." With all the grit and courage which the Roundhead troops displayed in the first stages of the war, a grit and courage which frequently saved them from disastrous defeat, their training had not given them the audacity which was necessary to the winning of victories. The problem for the Roundhead leaders was to find that inspiration which would make their men fight to win instead of fighting to hold their own.

Hence for the first year of the war the parliamentary troops were habitually on the defensive; and the Royalists were the attacking party. But at the moment when the king's standard was raised at Nottingham, neither party was ready to strike. Essex, the Roundhead General-in-Chief, was collecting his forces at Northampton to block the way of a Royalist march on London. The king shifted to Shrewsbury, a better centre for collecting his main army; Essex moved to Worcester. When the king began his advance, Essex again moved to intercept him, and the armies met at Edgehill. The charge of the Royalist cavalry on the wings swept their opponents off the field, with the Cavalier horse in pursuit. But

the Roundhead foot in the centre held their ground, two regiments of horse which had not been swept away charged upon the Royalist flank, and Rupert reappeared on the field, which he supposed to have been already won, in time only to prevent a rout.

Still, the fruits of victory lay with the Royalists, who were able to continue their march to Oxford and establish headquarters there; Essex, however, was able to fall back and block the way between Oxford and London. The Royalists, though they carried Brentford, did not venture to attack his position at Turnham Green, and fell back upon Oxford, whence during the spring and summer of 1643 Rupert conducted cavalry raids; but no action of importance was fought. The parliamentary

cause, however, suffered a serious loss by the death of John Hampden in a skirmish at Chalgrove Field. During these months, the Royalist Association of the Northern Counties, organised by Newcastle, brought the North almost entirely under Royalist control, though the Parliamentarians under the Fairfaxes held possession of Hull. In the south-west, which at the outset hung in the balance, the first successes of the parliamentary general, Waller, were counteracted by those of the Royalist Hopton. In July the defeat of Waller at Roundway Down, and the surrender of Bristol, secured almost



Reverse of three-pound piece of Charles I. struck at Oxford, 1643.

the whole of the West country for the Royalists.

The parliament still sat at Westminster, and the successes of the royal arms almost induced the Houses to accept terms of peace which would have been a virtual surrender. But now there was a check. Rupert would have appeared to have designed a great converging movement upon London, the king advancing with his main army from Oxford, Hopton moving along the south, and Newcastle descending from the North through the Eastern Counties. But Newcastle and Hopton were not prepared respectively to leave Hull and Plymouth on their rear. Charles resolved to secure the West by the capture of Gloucester; and, by attacking it, drew Essex to advance to its relief. The relieving movement was itself successful. Charles, however, intercepted Essex on his withdrawal at Newbury. A decisive victory might have brought the war to an end at once, but Essex succeeded in cutting his way through, and the opportunity was lost.

Meanwhile Pym, the head of the administration at Westminster, had been at work on the design of drawing the Scots into active alliance with the English Parliament. Religion alone was the ground on which the Scots were prepared to intervene in England, and for them religion meant the establishment of Presbyterianism in the southern country. The parlia-

ment men adhered in general to the common view that uniformity of religion was to be enforced; they were committed to the demand for the abolition of Episcopacy, and Presbyterianism was the apparent alternative. The result of the negotiations was the signing of the Solemn League and Covenant for the common establishment of religion, reformed "according to the Word of God and the example of the best reformed churches." The form of the Covenant is attributed to the diplomacy of Sir Harry Vane, who by this means made the pledge sufficiently elastic to admit of the now growing demand for a much wider toleration than was contemplated by either English or Scottish Presbyterianism. The scheme itself was in some sense a development born of an Anglo-Scottish assembly at Westminster, which drew up the famous *Westminster Confession*, a formula for British Puritanism which corresponds to the Lutheran Confession of Augsburg. It must be remarked, however, that the English who were already in arms, and the Scots who were about to take arms, to coerce the Crown, both in the Covenant declared their loyalty to the king's person. The Solemn League and Covenant was the last achievement of John Pym, the greatest of the parliamentary chiefs; he died before the year was out. Early in the new year a joint committee of both kingdoms was formed to control the management of the war.

The man who discovered the inspiration of which the Roundhead armies stood in need was Colonel Oliver Cromwell, who had distinguished himself as a cavalry officer at Edgehill. Since that time he had not been prominent in the field, but had been preparing for great achievement by organising the Eastern Counties in such fashion as to render any Royalist movement there a sheer impossibility. Nominally as the subordinate of the Earl of Manchester, he set himself to the task of raising regiments imbued with a spirit which would make them a match for Rupert's gentlemen, and with a discipline which would give them a decisive superiority. In officers and men the great desiderata, according to the civilians assembled at Westminster, were respectability and orthodoxy. Cromwell wanted men who were full of enthusiasm for the Cause, and ready to submit to the severest discipline. For their orthodoxy he cared not a jot, though he required that they should be men of religion and of moral austerity. Given these conditions, military fitness was the sole quality he required in his subordinate officers. Out of such chosen material he constructed those picked regiments which under his leadership were to become the best troops in Europe. A first taste of their quality was given at Winceby fight, when a Royalist force had passed the Humber and entered



Coin portrait of Charles I. on three-pound piece of 1643.

the Eastern Counties before the end of 1643. That fight enabled him to relieve Hull, the one point in Yorkshire where the Fairfaxes, besieged by Newcastle, were still holding out.

His time had not yet come, but early in the year (1644) the Scots, commanded by old Alexander Leslie, Earl of Leven, and his distant kinsman, David Leslie, had crossed the Border. With this new enemy, Newcastle was no longer able to maintain his grip on the North. In April he was obliged to throw himself into York, where he was pressed by the Scots and by the Fairfaxes from Hull. In the south the defeat of Hopton at Cheriton removed immediate anxieties, and the army of the Eastern Counties Association under Manchester, with Cromwell as his cavalry chief, prepared to invade the North. Rupert, who had been detached from the king's main army to operate in Lancashire, made a successful dash to the relief of York, and raised the siege; but when the Roundhead army began to retire, he advanced and offered battle at Marston Moor. The forces on either side were the largest assembled in any engagement in the course of the war; Manchester's army of twenty-seven thousand men considerably outnumbering the Royalists. In the cavalry engagement on the wings, Cromwell's "Ironsides" routed Rupert's troopers, while Fairfax on the Roundhead right was routed by Goring. In the infantry engagement, the Roundheads on the left and the Royalists in the centre were victorious, so that the Scots on the right of the Roundheads were attacked on one flank by the victorious Royalist foot and on the other by those of the Royalist horse who had not ridden off in pursuit. The stubborn resistance, however, of the Scots, against overwhelming odds, enabled horse and foot from the Roundhead left to come to their rescue and cut the Royalists to pieces.

Marston Moor shattered the Royalist force on the north, and it established Cromwell as the first cavalry leader of the day. He had routed the hitherto irresistible Rupert, and he had shown a quality which Rupert never possessed, that of maintaining a perfect control over his troops in the moment of victory. Rupert, as a rule, swept all before him, but his men were not held in check, and continued a furious pursuit or turned to pillaging. Cromwell's Ironsides drove their opponents in rout, halted, reformed, and were again launched on the flank or rear of the adversary. Long ago the son of King Henry III. had been taught the great principle of cavalry fighting, to his cost, at Lewes, and never repeated the blunder which lost him that battle. Cromwell himself had applied the principle, as Rupert had ignored it, in the first pitched battle in the war at Edgehill; but Rupert and the gallants of England never learnt the lesson, and the Cavaliers paid the penalty in full measure at Naseby fight, within a year of Marston Moor.

If the Ironsides and the Scots had won the North of England, elsewhere matters were by no means going favourably for the parliament. Hopton's defeat by Waller at Cheriton gave the parliamentary generals an opportunity for taking the offensive against the king, who fell back to Worcester.

But Waller and Essex made the blunder of dividing their forces, the former remaining to deal with Charles, while the latter marched into Devon in hope of recovering the West country. Thus, a few days before Marston Moor, Charles was able to rout Waller at Cropredy Bridge, and marched south-west in pursuit of Essex. At Lostwithiel, in Cornwall, the parliamentary General-in-Chief was surrounded by a superior force, and though he was able to cut his way through with his cavalry, and himself to escape by sea, the bulk of his force was compelled to capitulate. The Royalists were again undisputed masters of the West.

Cropredy Bridge and Lostwithiel together were not an equivalent for Marston Moor. The victorious army of the North was stronger than the victorious army of the South. Nevertheless, it was only under severe pressure that Manchester was induced to leave the Scots behind him, and march south to cut off the return of Charles. Manchester failed in his task, to the bitter indignation of his second in command. He intercepted Charles at Newbury, and ought to have crushed him, but, though victorious in the battle, he allowed the Royalist army to escape past him, and, by refusing to press on its heels, allowed the king to rally his scattered forces. The moment for crushing him was lost.

Meanwhile events took a new turn in Scotland. The party of Argyle was completely predominant in the Lowlands, but the best troops and the best commanders were all engaged in England. Argyle himself, though an astute politician, was no soldier. The Highland clans had hitherto taken little part in the troubles which did not practically concern them, but to many of them the clan Campbell and its chief were extremely obnoxious. Advantage was taken of the state of feeling in the Highlands by Montrose, whose loyalty had been rewarded by a marquisate. Joined by Alastair Macdonald of Islay, at the head of a half-Scottish force from Ireland, he raised the royal standard in the North, and routed the troops of the Scottish Government at Tippermuir, following up his first success by the capture of Aberdeen; which was dealt with in a merciless fashion, strongly contrasted with Montrose's treatment of the same city when he had captured it for the cause of the Covenant five years before.

III

THE NEW MODEL

As the autumn of 1644 was passing into winter the critical moment of the war, though not the critical engagement, was immediately at hand. Although the biggest battle of the war had been fought and won by the Roundheads, with decisive effect so far as the North was concerned, only one fact of importance favourable to the parliament had emerged; they had found a cavalry leader who was more than a match for Rupert and

troopers who were more than a match for Rupert's gentlemen. But the second battle of Newbury had shown that under the existing system there was no prospect that the chiefs of the army would realise that it was their business to strike home and win. Again, Scots and English together had won the victory of Marston Moor, but it had not united them. The honours of the day had been divided between the Scottish pikemen and the Ironsides, and the Scots angrily resented the assumption of all the credit to Cromwell and his troopers. Nor was jealousy alone responsible for the rupture. The Solemn League and Covenant was interpreted by the Scots as a pledge that the English Parliament would establish the Presbyterian system on Scottish lines, to the exclusion of all sectaries, who were to them an abomination. But Cromwell had stepped into the front rank; half his troopers were sectaries, and he himself notoriously cared nothing for Presbyterian orthodoxy. His men might be Anabaptists, Baptists, Independents, anything, provided that the "root of the matter" was in them and they knew how to fight. But the Scottish cause in England was the cause not of parliament but of Presbyterianism; it was on that understanding that the Scots had crossed the Border. If Cromwell and the men of his kind won the victory for parliament, the Presbyterian ideal was not likely to be realised. Thus cordial co-operation between the Scots and Cromwell was not to be looked for. Moreover, as time passed on it began to be doubtful how long the Scots army would be ready to remain in England—whether it would not have to return across the Tweed to deal with Montrose, with whom Argyle was proving himself quite unable to cope.

Cromwell was not the only man who saw that there could be no decisive success without reorganisation; a reorganisation which meant the substitution of a new type for the present army chiefs, and for the present rules of discipline—the Cromwellian type in both cases. As matters stood, the best that the parliament could hope for was to say to the king, "You cannot beat us; let us come to terms"; and under such conditions satisfactory terms were not to be expected. In Cromwell's view, parliament could be and must be placed in a position to dictate terms. Hitherto he had not been prominent as a debater, though the force of the man had made itself felt on the rare occasions when he intervened. But now it was in parliament itself that the immediate battle must be fought; and Cromwell opened the campaign by a direct attack upon Manchester for neglecting his duty as a commander to crush the enemy when in his power. But it was the principle, not the man, which mattered; he had no vindictive feeling towards Manchester, and readily dropped the attack on him when the way was cleared for a more effective procedure.

The parliament itself had degenerated since its first meeting in 1640. Of its abler and nobler members not a few had taken their stand on the king's side. Since the outbreak of the war, the greatest statesman among its members, John Pym, had died, and Hampden, the most honoured and

respected of all, had fallen on Chalgrove Field. Others, like Waller and Cromwell, had been drawn away to active duty, and those who remained lost tone. There were politicians at Westminster, but few men of statesmanship. The politicians, however, were capable of realising that the war was being conducted on wrong principles, that an efficient army under efficient commanders would give it a new aspect. Cromwell, the man of the moment, must have his way for the moment; the turn of the politicians would come afterwards.

The first step, then, was the Self-denying Ordinance, under which every member of parliament in either House resigned his own command. It is usually said that an exception was made in favour of Cromwell; but technically, at least, this is inaccurate. The object of the Ordinance was the removal of incompetent commanders, but it did not preclude the reappointment of any one who was conspicuously fit. Not to have reappointed the one man who was obviously not only fit but necessary would have been an absurdity, although in the circumstances it would no less obviously have been out of the question to place him in chief command. For that office Sir Thomas Fairfax was chosen, a man who enjoyed the confidence of every one with whom he had been associated, welcome not only to Cromwell himself, who had fought beside him at Marston Moor, but on all hands, on account both of his military ability and his personal character. To Cromwell was presently given the post of Lieutenant-General, or second in command, which included the command of the horse. Promotion was in the hands of the General-in-Chief, who could be trusted to bestow it where it was deserved, regardless of other considerations than military ability.

The next step was to construct the New Model Army, a compact group of regiments entirely under the control of the Commander-in-Chief, regularly paid; a standing army, in short, very different from the miscellaneous local levies controlled by miscellaneous local committees, irregularly paid and under no systematic discipline. The pick of the veterans were promptly enrolled in the new regiments, comprising something over twenty thousand men, though the numbers were not made up without compulsory impressment. And the best of these troops, who soon set the tone for their comrades, were Independents or Sectaries of the type whom Cromwell had enlisted and promoted, regardless of Presbyterian orthodoxy.

While Fairfax and Cromwell were organising the New Model, it was becoming increasingly clear that they would not be able to count



A cuirassier, 1645.
[From Skelton's "Armour."]

on sufficient support from the Scots. The Leslies were much more inclined to think of returning to Scotland than of carrying their operations further south. Montrose in the Highlands flashed—no historian can avoid using the word—from point to point, falling swiftly and suddenly upon the Covenanting troops, harrying Argyle's own territory, and dispersing armies far larger than his own. His victory at Inverlochy, early in the year, almost warranted his promise to the king that before the end of the summer he would have won Scotland, and would be ready to aid Charles against his rebels in England. Even when Argyle was displaced by more efficient commanders, the swiftness of Montrose's movements enabled him to outmanoeuvre them.



The Cavalier as "England's Wolf."

[From a parliamentary broadside of 1646.]

But in England the generals of the New Model were determined to strike decisively. They realised that it was their business, not to capture and garrison strong places, but to bring Charles's main army to a decisive engagement and shatter it irrevocably. No one had attempted to shatter it before; Manchester, indeed, had deliberately avoided doing so. In June they started in pursuit, and came up with the Royalist army near Naseby, in Northamptonshire. The New Model did its work. On the Royalist right Rupert's charge swept away Ireton's cavalry. On the Roundhead right Cromwell and his Ironsides swept off the Royalist horse. In the centre, the infantry on both sides fought fiercely, and the fortunes of the day were in doubt until Cromwell crashed back upon the enemy's flank while Rupert's headlong horsemen were still far away. The victory was complete.

The Royalist horse escaped with curiously little injury, and Charles himself was forced to fly; but the Royalist foot were shattered beyond hope of recovery. The whole of the baggage and all the munitions of war fell into the hands of the victors.

There was still an army in the south-west, under Goring's command, which Fairfax proceeded without delay to shatter at Langport. During the month which passed between these two battles, Montrose in Scotland had again defeated the best of the Covenanting commanders; and about a month after Langport he won at Kilsythe a victory which seemed to have brought Scotland under his hand. David Leslie hurried to Scotland, but before he was across the Border the fleeting character of Montrose's success was manifested. The Highlanders, whose desperate charges routed their foes, understood hand-to-hand fighting but not campaigning. They scattered to their homes when Montrose descended to the Lowlands,

and Leslie with four thousand men caught the great Marquis at Philiphaugh with a very much smaller force counted by hundreds. Of these, some half fought with desperate courage; the rest hardly took part in the engagement. Montrose's men were cut to pieces; some of them were massacred in cold blood; even the women and children belonging to Montrose's Irish troops were slaughtered. Philiphaugh was an ugly revenge for the ugly deeds of which the Irishmen had been guilty. In Scotland as well as in England the last chance of the Royalist cause disappeared.

There were no more pitched battles. Charles had persistently followed the false policy of keeping his followers dispersed in garrisons all over the Royalist districts, instead of concentrating them to strike effective blows. The reduction of these garrisons now became the main business of the Roundhead force. The great manor houses and halls which could bid defiance to the onslaught of casual troops were wholly unfitted to stand siege when siege ordnance was brought up against them. Resistance where resistance is obviously useless, and can mean nothing but a sheer waste of life, is not countenanced by the laws of war. Only here and there, as at Basing Hall, did garrisons maintain a stubborn defiance in the face of palpably inevitable destruction; and except in such cases they were habitually permitted to surrender on honourable terms. The fierce spirit of hatred expressed in Macaulay's rousing ballad of *Naseby* had not yet come into play. The soldiers of the New Model were held under a stern discipline; robbery and outrage were practically unheard of.

But meanwhile the king, if he was unable to strike, was able to watch events. Victory in the field was out of the question, but the growing signs of dissension among his opponents gave him ample hope of victory by diplomacy. Within the year after Naseby, he placed himself in the hands of the Scots Army in England, as the most promising quarter from which to conduct his negotiations.

IV

DOWNFALL

The government of the country was in the hands of the parliament at Westminster; the army was the army of the parliament, and its officers were the parliament's officers. The politicians imagined that their turn had come; but the army was by no means disposed to allow its victory to be thrown away or to be utilised for purposes of which it disapproved. And it was quite certain to disapprove of much which the parliament and the Scots desired. In order to secure victory in the field parliament had suspended its Presbyterian rigour. The ranks of the army were filled with Sectaries; officers and men, including those who were themselves Presby-

terians, had no more mind to surrender liberty of religion at the dictation of Presbyterians than at the dictation of bishops. But they were led by men whom they trusted completely, and neither Fairfax nor Cromwell was willing to resort to force until force was proved to be the only available argument.

At the end of 1645, the year of Naseby, the narrow Presbyterian section in parliament lost something of its predominance. Several seats had become vacant, which were now filled up, and a large proportion of the new members were in sympathy with the broad ideas of toleration. The Presbyterians, however, still held a substantial majority, and some two months after Charles had joined the Scots they formulated their proposals. Parliament was to have complete control of the militia for twenty years, the king was to sign the Covenant, and Presbyterianism was to be established, while the Episcopal system and all kinds of sectaries were to be suppressed. Either the predecessor or the successor of Charles on the throne would have accepted those terms, trusting their own wits so to manipulate parties after the settlement that they should recover their own predominance. But Charles had neither the cunning of his father nor the keen political wit of his son. He had no more respect for the spirit of his pledges than either of them, no compunction whatever about tricking his opponents. But he had a conscience of his own, and the one thing that he would not do was to act against his religious convictions. Therefore he temporised, believing that all he required was to gain time—that the longer a settlement was delayed, the more certain it was that dissensions among the ranks of his opponents would enable him to make his own terms.



In fact, by accepting the terms at the moment he would have united the Scots and the English Presbyterians in his support, but his shifts to procure delay failed in their purpose. The Scots realised that he had no intention of signing the Covenant, the one matter of importance to them. Even at the best they were not too well satisfied with the English Presbyterianism, which rejected the Scottish doctrine of spiritual independence and maintained the subordination of the Church to the State. Having made up their minds that the object they themselves had in view was unattainable, they resolved to withdraw themselves from English affairs altogether. They signified to the English parliament that they held the king as a hostage, but would hand him over to the parliament when the moneys due to them for their expenses in the war were paid up; for it had been agreed as a part of the bargain, when the Scots intervened, that they did so at the charges of their allies. The sums claimed were promptly paid over; the Scots surrendered the king to the parliamentary commissioners and betook themselves across the Border. The king was placed at Holmby House in Northamptonshire.

The departure of the Scots pressed forward the crisis between Parliament and the Army. While the Army remained, it might interfere with the strong hand, if Parliament endeavoured to override its will. There

THE FALL OF THE MONARCHY

was no wish on the part of its chiefs to usurp the government, but on the fundamental point of general toleration, Parliament was not to be trusted, and on that point the Army was prepared to insist. Parliament, aware of



 Roundhead throughout the war.
  Became Roundhead after Marston Moor.

The unshaded portions remained Royalist throughout the war.

Royalist and Roundhead in the Civil War.

its danger, began to discuss the disbandment of the Army while it continued to negotiate with the king. In May 1647 Parliament came to terms with the king. Presbyterianism was to be established, though liberty of worship was reserved to Charles; but the agreement was to hold good for three


years only. But, meanwhile, it was known that Parliament was negotiating with the Scots for the establishment of Presbyterianism, and that the dominant party were propounding measures for rendering the Army powerless. The bulk of it was to be disbanded, mulcted of most of its arrears of pay. The remainder of it was to be recast under Presbyterian officers, excluding all members of Parliament, Cromwell of course among them. Of this Army a portion was to be despatched to Ireland, while the remainder would be merely an instrument in the hands of the Presbyterian government. The Army demanded guarantees for liberty of conscience and the payment of arrears before it would consent to disbandment. No such guarantees were forthcoming.

The Army chiefs, who had for long had a difficult task in restraining the troops, saw that the time had come for taking the law into their own hands. A troop of horse was despatched under Cornet Joyce to Holmby House, whence the king was conducted to headquarters at Newmarket. Then the troops marched upon London, occupied the city, and demanded the exclusion from parliament of eleven obnoxious members. The Army was master of parliament and of the situation.

But even now the chiefs were bent upon extreme moderation. It was not their business to undertake a constitutional settlement, or to set up a military government; but it was their business to secure the thing on which their hearts were set, liberty of conscience. They drew up certain "heads of proposals" which if they had been accepted would have settled the religious question. The penal laws against Romanists were to remain in force; but with this single exception, to which practically no one but the Romanists was disposed to object, there was to be complete toleration. Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Sectaries were to enjoy entire freedom of worship subject to no civil penalties or disabilities.

Neither the king, who was now domiciled at Hampton Court, nor the Presbyterians were ready to adopt the proposals. The chiefs reluctantly withdrew them and contented themselves with endeavours to secure a tolerable compromise. But Charles could not free himself from his conviction that by temporising and intriguing he would still succeed in effecting his own aims. He escaped from Hampton Court, but was stopped in the Isle of Wight and detained in Carisbrooke Castle, whence he continued to carry on open negotiations with Parliament and the Army, and at the same time other secret negotiations which were to prove his ruin. The Army was at odds with the Parliament; it was at odds now even with itself, for there had grown up in it a fiery democratic element, the element which became known as the Levellers. These men were imbued with the republican spirit, a contempt for social rank, hatred for the privileges of birth. They wanted the abolition of all such privileges; the destruction of the Monarchy and the Peerage. Every man, in their eyes, had a right to a voice in the government of the country. Moreover, while they demanded toleration for Sectaries, most of them included Anglicanism

in the general bann which nearly all Protestants extended to Romanists. Many of them were now denouncing Cromwell and Ireton, because those generals had hitherto set their faces against the republican doctrine and persistently advocated the toleration of Episcopacy.




The trial of Charles I.

[From a print in Nalson's report of the trial published in 1684.]

If the Army broke itself up now, the king might come by his own ; if the Royalists rose again they would surely be victorious. So Charles intrigued and plotted, and told the Scots that if they helped him to his throne in England he would establish Presbyterianism and make war upon the Sectaries. Scotland swallowed the bait, though not without opposition

from Argyle, who, despite his faults, was not without some qualities of statesmanship. In the spring of 1648 a Scots army, led by the Duke of Hamilton, crossed the Border, in arms for the King of England. Charles's intrigue bore fruit in a sudden blaze of Cavalier insurrections in Wales, in Cornwall and Devon, and in Kent and the south-east.

But the effect on the Army was not what the king had anticipated. While its chiefs, at the risk of their own popularity and to the danger of their own power, had been straining every nerve to keep the passions of the soldiery in check, striving honestly and openly to arrive at a reasonable compromise which should be tolerable to every one; while they had been abstaining from violence, and had appealed to a show of force only when



The execution of Charles I. in Whitehall, January 30, 1649.

[From a print of the year.]


self-defence left them no alternative; the king had been playing with them, plotting for the destruction of the liberties for which they had fought. Compromise, agreements which depended upon good faith, could no longer be considered. There was one thing to be done at once—to stamp out the flame of insurrection. And then the Army and its leaders would be at one.

Fairfax took charge of the insurrection in the south-east, suppressed it in Kent, and held the main body of the insurgents shut up in Colchester. Cromwell flung himself into Wales. By the time that he had crushed resistance there the Scots army, badly led and badly organised, was streaming into Lancashire. Near Preston, Cromwell fell upon the flank of the long advancing column, cut it in two, and destroyed it in a running fight which lasted for three days. Colchester surrendered to Fairfax. The spirit which had led the conquerors in the first civil war to act always with

humanity, and as a rule mercifully and even generously, was killed. This was a war wantonly stirred up, when the sword had already been sheathed and the king who had incited it was pretending to seek reconciliation. The insurgents were treated as rebels, and large numbers of them were shipped off to servitude in the plantations of Barbadoes.

The first step had been taken ; the insurrection had been stamped out. The victorious troops were returning, determined to dictate their own terms, when the news reached them that the king and the Presbyterian majority at Westminster had struck their own bargain. The Army would have no more bargains. On the 6th December Colonel Pride and a body of musketeers took up their stand at the door of the House of Commons, arrested fifty of the members, and excluded a hundred more. The remnant, the Rump, as they were called, then assumed the functions of parliament. On the 4th January they declared themselves the sole sovereign authority in the country, and pronounced that their enactments had the force of law whether the Crown and the Peers assented or no.

But behind this there was a more terrible determination. While the king lived there could be no peace. Charles had wrought treason against the nation ; it was he who had deluged the land in blood, he who had foiled every attempt to establish a basis for a lasting peace. The king must die, not because a republic was better than a monarchy, not because the Crown was in itself an evil, but because Charles, personally, was an impossible king, and while he lived neither a republic nor another king were possible. As for the justification, let the Blood of the Saints testify ! If the king were amenable to no human law, should the servants of the Lord be therefore debarred from acting as the instruments of His vengeance ? So reasoned Cromwell and the Army. Yet all should be done at least with a semblance of law. The Rump, as self-constituted sovereign, appointed a High Court of Justice to try "the man Charles Stuart." The king took his stand on the plain and obvious fact that such a court had no conceivable authority. He refused to plead. No one could even pretend that the authority of the Court rested upon the will of the nation any more than it rested upon law. The nation stood aghast, half paralysed, while Fairfax and many others who had been appointed on the Commission refused to take part in the proceedings. The responsibility lay with those who had the power to enforce their way, and did not fear to do what they had persuaded themselves was their duty. In the eyes of the nation the king had committed no crime ; now he played his part with a sincerity and a dignity which carried the popular sympathy to his side ; and which for all time has clothed the figure of King Charles the Martyr with a halo of reverential pity. But the stern men who had doomed him did not shrink ; for them he was the enemy of God and of the people. The Court pronounced sentence of death, and England saw the head of its king fall under the executioner's axe.



THE HOUSE OF COMMONS ABOUT THE MIDDLE OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

From a Dutch print engraved not later than 1649.

CHAPTER XVII

THE COMMONWEALTH

I

DROGHEDA AND WORCESTER

ENGLISHMEN above all people in the world love adherence to precedent and custom ; but in the government of England, now, precedent and custom were toppled into the abyss. Hitherto, for some four centuries at least, king and parliament had shared authority, though with differences of opinion as to their respective proportions. No one had ever dreamed of such a thing as the arraignment of a king before his own subjects for treason. None except kings had ever challenged the right of free access to parliament by its members, the right of freedom of debate, or the right of free decision. Kings, relying on the support of the will of the nation, had curbed barons ; barons relying on the same support had curbed kings ; kings had ruled autocratically when their policy harmonised with the national feeling expressed in parliaments ; parliaments with the will of the people behind them had refused submission to kings. But the Great Rebellion had reached a climax, when the monarchy was abolished altogether, and the authority of parliament was scattered to the winds because parliament had ceased to represent the national will.

In fact there was no national will, but a mere chaos of conflicting parties ; and out of this chaos had emerged one body strong enough to impose its will upon the rest. No other form of government was possible. That body had made up its mind to have done with the monarchy ; it did not wish to have done with parliament, but there were no visible means of procuring a parliament capable of exercising the functions of government. So it took the parliament that was there, purged it in accordance with its own views, abolished the House of Peers, and endeavoured to treat the Rump in the House of Commons as the Representative Assembly of the nation. Through the Rump it constructed an Executive Council, composed partly of military officers, partly of members of the Rump itself ; and Council and Rump together provided the government of the nation. The one thing vital for the moment was, for that government to establish and maintain its own authority, since reversion to chaos was the sole alternative.

The new government was threatened on every side, from without as well as from within. As a regicide government, every state in Europe

would have rejoiced at its downfall, and not least Holland, whose young Stadtholder, William II., was brother-in-law to the claimant of the English throne. Scotland was righteously indignant; for the people of England or their rulers had cut off the head of the King of Scotland, to whom the Scots had never ceased to profess loyalty, even when they were in arms against him, or when they handed him over to his English subjects. Moreover, Scotland was entirely hostile to the Sectaries, who had now taken control of affairs, and in particular to the Man who had led the Sectaries to victory. In Ireland, the death of Charles I. united against the regicide government the Cavalier element and the native Irish—to whom any English government was sufficiently detestable, but a rule at once English and Puritan was an abomination. In England itself, Cavalier loyalty and Presbyterian respectability were, according to circumstances, stung to fury or grievously shocked at the usurpation of Sectarians and regicides. Finally, in the victorious party itself, an angry spirit was aroused among many who had looked for liberty at least for themselves, and now saw, occupying the seats of the mighty, men who could not refrain if they would from acting despotically. Even of the fleet, a substantial portion declared at first against the new régime.

The government weathered the storm. A stern and remorseless discipline arrested the mutinous spirit in the army; in the navy, after the first moment of doubt, it became evident that the great preponderance lay with those who declared for loyalty to the Commonwealth. The last year's campaign had impressed upon Cavaliers and Presbyterians the futility of armed insurrection. Foreign Powers might be hostile, but they had other things to think of than intervention in English affairs. Scotland did not espouse the cause of Charles's son, would not even hasten to set the crown of Scotland itself on his head, until she had made her own terms with him. The pressing danger was in Ireland, where Cavaliers and Catholics together threatened to wipe out their opponents, and to provide a basis whence the combined elements of disaffection might organise an attack on the English Government.

To Ireland, then, Cromwell was despatched in the August after the execution of King Charles; and he dealt with that country on the general principle that his opponents were rebels; at any rate that those humane modifications in the commonly recognised laws of war, which had habitually prevailed during the contest in England, were not to be applied in Ireland. Here, at least, he acted on the conviction that by striking ruthlessly at once he would make a prolonged war and prolonged bloodshed impossible. He turned upon Drogheda, stormed it when it refused to surrender, and no quarter was given to those in the town who were in arms. Then he fell upon Wexford, which was treated after the same fashion, though this time the slaughter was carried out by the soldiery without direct orders. The massacres of Drogheda and Wexford served their purpose. When Cromwell had made it clear that resistance in the first place was futile, and in the

second place would be punished without mercy, resistance practically disappeared. Garrison after garrison surrendered after being summoned, and there was little more actual bloodshed. Cromwell was perhaps right in believing that so far as the immediate war was concerned the truest mercy was in inercilessness. Moreover, he suffered from the conviction common to practically all Englishmen, for at least a century past, that the Irish were too barbarous to understand other methods than those of barbarism ; they were savages, controllable only by terrorism. For the rest, again in common with all Englishmen, he believed in the full tale of the atrocities committed in the Irish insurrection of 1641, and imagined that the worst he did fell far short of being a just punishment for the crimes of the past.

Terror triumphed ; but Cromwell had not exacted the full penalty in the streets of Drogheda and Wexford. Sweeping confiscations of land followed, and numbers of the Puritan troopers were planted on Irish soil, to form an effective garrison for years to come. But if Cromwell's doings tended, as he believed, to save the effusion of blood, they sowed afresh the seeds of racial and religious hate, that monstrous crop which was to be reaped by generations upon generations as yet unborn, the black inheritance of the Curse of Cromwell.


Before Cromwell was ready to leave the completion of his work in Ireland to his lieutenants, the clouds were gathering in the North. Scotland and England were bound together solely by the one link of the crown, and that link England herself had severed when she abolished her own monarchy by cutting off her own king's head and rejecting his successor. Her action was not binding upon Scotland ; was on the contrary entirely repudiated by Scotland ; which, with entire justification, declared it to be a flagrant breach of the terms of the Solemn League and Covenant—a Covenant which pledged both countries to loyalty to the person of the king. But if Scotland chose to acknowledge Charles II., the situation for England would manifestly be dangerous.

Scotland would only acknowledge Charles on condition of his signing the Covenant. That most cynical of princes would, with perfect cheerfulness and entire good-nature, have signed a dozen covenants to gain his own ends, and would have torn them up afterwards as suited his convenience. But devoted loyalty, in the person of Montrose, was eager to set the young king on his throne untrammelled by ignominious promises. Charles always showed a gracious alacrity in encouraging his neighbours to self-sacrifice on his behalf. He temporised with the Scots from his safe quarters in Holland, while he suffered the heroic Montrose to go to his doom. The enterprise was hopeless. Montrose landed in Scotland, not in the regions where the kilted hosts were ready to flock to the standard of the brilliant leader who would launch them against the hated Argyle and the Campbells, but in the far north, where the name of McCallam Mohr roused no passionate hostility. Instead of gathering an increasing host, he soon found himself alone and deserted, was taken prisoner in Ross-shire, handed over to the

Government, and hanged as a traitor, leaving a heroic memory cherished by all lovers of self-sacrificing loyalty and splendid self-devotion.

Since the "Great Marquis" had lost the hazard, Charles, with superb cynicism, accepted the terms offered him by the men who had just slain his most loyal servant as a traitor. He accepted the Covenant and landed in Scotland, where he probably learnt to feel something more akin to repentance than he suffered at any other time of his life. For Charles could endure hardship and privation, but he loathed seriousness, and in Scotland he had to wear the mask of seriousness every day and all day, and a specially lugubrious mask on the Sabbath.

In Scotland, then, the nation had accepted a covenanted king, on whose person was focussed all the sentiment of loyalty in England which had been evoked by his father's tragedy. If he claimed the throne of England, there would be on his side not only the Cavaliers, but the whole weight of orthodox Presbyterianism, reinforced by numbers of the moderate men who had been shocked by the high-



The Scots keep their young king's nose to the grindstone.

[From a broadside of 1651 satirising the acceptance of the Covenant by Charles II.]

handed illegality whereby the Commonwealth had been created. And behind Cavaliers and Presbyterians would be the Scots. Yet nothing could be more obvious than the right of the Scots, an independent nation over whom England exercised no jurisdiction whatever, to maintain the monarchy and to acknowledge the king in whose veins ran the blood of the Bruce. Once more the English government had before it the question whether government should be overthrown in the name of the law, or maintained by a palpable breach of law. Once more it resolved that the security of the State is the supreme law—and the security of the State demanded the coercion of Scotland.

An initial difficulty presented itself. Fairfax, the General-in-Chief, now as before refused to act against his conscience. England had no moral right to coerce Scotland. He would not seek to impose his own will upon England, but he would not lead an army into Scotland. He was obdurate to Cromwell's persuasions. It was no ambition of his own which had set him in command of the forces of the Commonwealth. His resignation was the only way out of the difficulty, and was accepted with more reluctance than it was offered. Cromwell became the General-in-Chief of the Commonwealth army.

In July Cromwell was in Scotland, but the government of the Covenant

would not listen to his arguments, and when he advanced upon Edinburgh he found that the skill of David Leslie had posted their troops impregably. He had no alternative but to fall back upon Dunbar, followed and shepherded by the Scots. Supplies were running low, the Scottish generals were not to be outmanœuvred, and it seemed that Cromwell would be driven to escape as best he could to the ships which were in attendance. He was saved by the unspeakable folly of the enemy. Leslie was over-ridden by the ignorant fanaticism of the clerical counsellors, who cried out to him to smite the blasphemers and sectaries whom the Lord had delivered into their hands. With amazement and thanksgiving, Cromwell saw the Scots repeating the supreme folly of Flodden and Pinkie-Cleugh, and defiling from the position in which to attack them would have been madness, apparently with the idea of cutting him off from the sea. As he had smitten them at Preston by hurling himself upon the centre of their straggling column, so now he smote them in the rout of Dunbar. He was as sure as the enemy themselves had been that this thing was the Lord's doing.


But if it was the Scots whom the Lord had delivered into the hand of the English, and not *vice versa*, Dunbar did not by any means suffice to annihilate the Scottish resistance. Cromwell occupied Edinburgh, but Cavaliers and Covenanters in combination were still able to block his further advance and to reject his negotiations. His own activity was checked by illness, but in the spring he advanced upon Perth, with the effect which he had perhaps anticipated. The way lay open for a Scottish invasion of England; and the Scots, carrying the king with them, seized their opportunity and marched for the Border. They entered England by the same route as before, streaming down through the Western Counties. Cromwell was swift to follow, while another English force, under Lambert, moved towards Worcester to intercept them. But the English Cavaliers and Presbyterians did not venture to rise. Cromwell following hard on the heels of the Scots overtook them at Worcester, and there won the crowning victory. The Scots army was shattered, the young king became a fugitive, and after sundry hair's-breadth escapes succeeded in finding at the village of Brighton a boat which carried him to safety across the Channel. It was never again necessary for Cromwell to take the field.

In fact, the English Cavaliers, after the campaign of 1648, had despaired of further warfare on land and betaken themselves to the sea, where Prince Rupert appeared in a new rôle. He found, however, more than his match in the great admiral of the Commonwealth, Robert Blake; who after the fashion of the times was placed in command of the fleet because he had proved his capacity as a soldier ashore. Blake swept Rupert off the English seas, and driving him into the Mediterranean laid the foundation of that English ascendancy in the great inland sea which played so tremendous a part in her subsequent wars. The victory of Worcester laid Scotland at the mercy of England, and in that country the military control was left in the hands of General Monk.

II

THE RUMP

The personality of Cromwell so completely overshadows that of any other man among his contemporaries, from Marston Moor to the day



Oliver Cromwell.

[From a miniature by Samuel Cooper.]

of his death, that we are somewhat apt to think of him as a military dictator who imposed his arbitrary will upon England throughout that period. That conception, however, is erroneous. Until after the battle of Preston, he did indeed embody in his own person the will of the Army, but neither he nor the Army attempted to seize for themselves the functions of government. They stood only as the champions of liberty of conscience, battling for a settlement which should secure that liberty; and their demands were urged

under the sanction of their ability in the last resort to apply force. But Cromwell was so far from being a dictator that he did not succeed in inducing the actual government to make the settlement which he desired, though he prevented them from making the very different settlement which they desired.

After Preston, the will of the Army, still embodied in Oliver, enforced the construction of a form of government intended to be as constitutional as the circumstances allowed; a government whose first business was to make itself secure, because that seemed the primary condition without which peace could not be re-established. But neither in form nor in fact did Cromwell assume the political direction of that government. From

the death of the king to the battle of Worcester, he was entirely engaged upon military duties, and upon the affairs of Ireland and Scotland, not upon the affairs of England, from which he was, for the most part, absent. Her affairs were in the hands of the Rump and the Council of State. It was not Cromwell who dictated the admirable administrative policy by which Sir Harry Vane on the Council, and Blake on the sea, reorganised the navy, and established England on an equality with Holland, as a Naval Power which had no other rival. It was not Cromwell who guided the financial policy which supplied the heavy demands of the Treasury from the estates of the Cavaliers. It was not Cromwell who refused toleration to Anglicanism and Anglican services, and replaced Anglican incumbents by Presbyterians, Baptists, and Independents. Finally, it was not Cromwell who directed the foreign policy of the government.

Long before Worcester was fought, the fleet had been reorganised by Vane, and the might of the English Navy had been established by Blake. England's one rival upon the seas was Holland, and commercially England was far behind Holland. The great Thirty Years' War had come to an end in the last year of King Charles I. The religious question on the Continent had been more or less solved by the virtual partition of Germany into Protestant States in the North and Catholic States in the South; among which Austria retained an immense predominance, while the Imperial Crown was now permanently associated with the House of Hapsburg. But the mutterings of religious strife were not yet over; and English Puritanism was still moved by the dream of a league of Protestantism against a still aggressive Catholicism. No European Power, however, was ready to offer the hand of friendship to the regicide Republic. The death of the Dutch Stadtholder in 1650 established in Holland an unqualified Republic, which was not disturbed by the birth of the posthumous son who grew up to become William III.; and this change in Holland inspired a momentary hope in the English government of a Dutch alliance. But the English overtures were rejected; so that the hostility engendered by commercial rivalry was allowed free play.

England, then, since its proffered friendship was refused, assumed an aggressive attitude. About the time when Cromwell was winning the battle of Worcester, parliament was passing the Navigation Act. The enormous mass of the carrying trade of the world was in the hands of Holland. The Navigation Act renewed the ancient but ill-observed rule that English imports and exports must be carried either in English ships or in ships belonging to the exporting or importing country. The intention now was simply to deprive the Dutch of a large part of their carrying trade, and to transfer it to English bottoms. But further, the English government resolved to reassert its own dignity and authority, and to compel its own recognition, by insistence on the old rule of saluting the English flag in the narrow seas. If war resulted, so much the better. It would certainly be popular with the fleet, and probably with the merchants, because it was

directed to English commercial expansion. That it was not viewed with favour by Cromwell or by the Army, which was desirous of friendship with the Protestant Powers, made it rather the more desirable from the point of view of the parliament men who were jealous of military influence. The Navigation Acts which writers generally conspire to describe as Cromwell's were not attributable to him at all.

The Dutch war, which consequently began early in 1652, was waged with stubborn valour on both sides. So far as the fighting went it could never be claimed that either side showed a decisive superiority. Both sides had one or two admirals of the very highest class, and others who would be included in a large first-class list. Both fleets were full of excellent seamen; and if one or the other got the upper hand for a time, the even balance was soon recovered. The commerce of both, however, suffered seriously, that of Holland disastrously; and the English parliament lost popularity instead of gaining it as they had expected, although a salutary respect for the English Navy was inspired in the continental nations.

Worcester had made the Commonwealth finally secure; the government by the Rump and the Council of State, however well it had done its work, was an emergency government. The Rump saw no reason for changing the existing state of things; they themselves were in control of the State, and formed an oligarchy which treated all appointments as a preserve for their own kinsmen and friends. They, not the Council of State, were actually the supreme authority, the fountainhead of law, the controllers of taxation, to whom the Executive authority of the Council of State was responsible. It was their very natural desire to perpetuate this arrangement. A representative parliament was out of the question. Such a parliament would have in it a large Cavalier element, and government by it would be impossible. Their own idea of the best thing for the country was to avoid the appearance of establishing themselves as a permanent oligarchy by summoning a new parliament; but the sitting members, in their plan, were not to vacate their seats at all, and were to have the power of excluding from the new body such of the members returned as were not to their liking.

This solution was not equally satisfactory to any one else. The Rump had forfeited the confidence both of the Army and of the general public; Cromwell himself was ill pleased at the unfairness with which many Royalists were being treated. Members were more than suspected of bribery and corruption. There was no guarantee that if the oligarchy were perpetuated it would not develop into a self-seeking tyranny as intolerant as that of the Long Parliament before Pride's Purge. On the other hand, no clear plan had been formulated for the constitution of a satisfactory sovereign authority, and at the beginning of 1653 the Rump was pushing its own plan forward.

Cromwell then urged that the scheme should be suspended, and that the first necessity was the formation of a committee of members of parlia-

ment and army officers to discuss the provision of proper securities against an arbitrary tyranny; while the soldiers were demanding an immediate dissolution and the election of a Free Parliament, regardless of the fact that a Free Parliament in the existing circumstances would inevitably degenerate into a chaos of factions. The Rump, on the other hand, saw in its own scheme the only way of averting such a chaos or a military ascendancy. On the day after he had extracted from several of the parliamentary leaders a promise not to proceed immediately with their bill, Cromwell learnt that the House had assembled and was pushing the bill



Cromwell ejecting the Rump, 1653.
[From a contemporary Dutch print.]

through. Once more he found forced upon him the necessity for intervening arbitrarily on his own responsibility. If the parliament was the only body in England which had any semblance of legal authority, it was now using that authority to override every principle for which the Civil War had been fought. Cromwell, with a small band of soldiers behind him, burst into the Chamber, stormed at the members, summoned his followers to "Remove that bauble," the mace, and ejected the Rump.

The Rump was down; but what was to take its place? The General and his council of officers resorted to the desperate expedient of summoning a nominated assembly. The Independent congregations were instructed to send in a list of "fit and godly" persons, from whom Cromwell and the

officers selected one hundred and forty, who constituted the assembly known to history as the Barebones Parliament, so called because one of its members bore the attractive name of Praise-God Barebone. It had no pretence of being a representative assembly; it was not much more than a fortuitous gathering of persons whose morals were unimpeachable and their intentions excellent, while they were wholly devoid of political knowledge and experience. The idea undoubtedly was that the assembly of nominees was to inaugurate the rule of the saints; but the saints, lacking the wisdom of the serpent, were not at all likely to prove as harmless as doves. The more intelligent among them very soon realised the fact for themselves, rose up early one morning, met together, and passed sentence of dissolution on their own body. The experiment had failed ignominiously. Once more it was laid upon Cromwell and the officers of the Army to devise a scheme under which the government of the country could be carried on.

III

THE PROTECTORATE GOVERNMENTS

The deliberations of the officers of the Army issued in the publication of the decree called the Instrument of Government. Until the overthrow of Charles I. the English constitution had been developed by regular growth. There had been no revolutions in the system, however violently dynastic changes had been effected. The Civil War had effected a revolution and necessitated the invention of a constitution which had not grown out of the past, of which the most that could possibly be said would be that a simulacrum or semblance of some features of the past was reproduced in it. The first experiment had produced the Rump, which was a travesty of a parliament, coupled with the Council of the State, which was a quite practical equivalent for the various forms which the Executive Council of the Crown had formerly taken. If the Rump had been a travesty, the Assembly of Nominees was a burlesque. Now in the Instrument of Government the Army officers made their third experiment the rough and ready framework for a constitution which affords an instructive contrast to the mathematical accuracy and the logical perfection of the various impossible constitutions with which France was saddled when she started in the search for an ideal government in 1789.

The government must have a head, and the head of the government must have an Executive Council. Unless the head and his Council had very large powers, any government in the then state of England would be impossible. On the other hand, the people had a right to a voice in affairs of state, and therefore must have a representative assembly. Practical sense

singled out one man as the only possible head, the man whose personality was irresistibly dominant, Oliver Cromwell. Cromwell then was to be Lord Protector, a title revived from times when a minor or an imbecile had occupied the throne and a practically regal authority had to be vested in a subject. The Executive power was vested in the Protector and the Council of State, which was a permanent body with power to fill up its own numbers. But neither Protector nor Council had the power of legislation or taxation, which, by the decree, were appropriated to a representative parliament entirely elective and forming a single Chamber. When the Chamber was not sitting the Executive could issue decrees, but those decrees had effect only until the parliament decided to abrogate or to confirm them. Cavaliers were not eligible to the House. The entire control of the Army lay with the Executive. The parliament was to meet not less than once in three years, and was in no case to be dissolved until it had been sitting for five months.

The Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell began in December 1653. Its sanction was nothing but the will of the Army and the sulky acquiescence of a nation which had no alternative. For something less than five years Cromwell's will was supreme. He had been primarily a champion of

the liberties of parliament; after the defeat of Charles I. he had been urgent in his endeavours to restrain the rising spirit of antagonism to the Crown as such, earnest in his pursuit of a compromise. Now the champion of liberty could find no way of ruling in England except by despotically imposing his own will on her. He did not want to dispense with parliaments; throughout his rule he summoned them according to law; but when they met, parliament and Protector habitually found themselves arriving at a deadlock, from which the only escape, just as in the case of parliament and Charles I., lay in the decisive assertion of the supremacy of one or the other. But, unlike Charles, Cromwell never had any difficulty in proving the decisiveness of his own supremacy. He had what Charles had not—the obvious superiority in physical force. There was no gainsaying the fact, and no failure in the Army's loyalty to its chief, whose ideals it shared.

The nine months which passed between the establishment of the Protectorate and the convening of the first parliament gave opportunity for



The Great Seal of the Commonwealth, 1651.

Cromwell to show what kind of ideals were working in his heart and brain. Cromwell, more effectively than any of his predecessors, grasped at the idea of the union of England, Scotland, and Ireland, a union which should not destroy national differentiation. Scotland and Ireland were to have their share of representation at Westminster as members of the Commonwealth. The Executive Government of Scotland remained in the hands of a Scottish Council, though the Englishmen upon it were for the present the controlling force, and the troops under arms were Commonwealth troops. The treatment of Ireland was vitiated by the principle which virtually recognised only the Puritan settlers as free citizens. Freedom of

trade within the Commonwealth was an invaluable boon to the two poorer communities; whatever benefits England derived from the Navigation Act they shared, as also did the colonies.

In England itself the religious question was still the one of primary importance, and toleration was Cromwell's ruling principle, accompanied by the doctrine that religion should be maintained out of public funds. The exclusion of Anglicanism from the churches Cromwell admitted as a political necessity; but the tithes and endowments were neither abolished nor secularised, but were applied to what was virtually



The Great Seal of the Commonwealth, 1651.

the concurrent endowments of the three principal religious bodies outside the Anglicans and Roman Catholics—the Presbyterians, Baptists, and Independents. Anglicanism was repressed, because the assembling of Anglican congregations would have provided the nucleus for Cavalier disaffection. But besides the bodies among whom churches and parsonages and their endowments were distributed, the sects were free to form and maintain congregations of their own. That liberty was extended even to the Quakers, whose peculiarities rendered them obnoxious to every other religious denomination for varying reasons. It was Cromwell's government which at last after three centuries and a half readmitted the Jews to England.

Once more, it was Cromwell who at last initiated for England an active foreign policy rooted in Protestantism. The obstinate struggle with the Dutch was brought to an end, and already in 1654 Cromwell was contemplating the use of the mighty fleet which the Commonwealth had created, for battle not with the Protestant Dutch but with the Spanish

power, which still to him, as to the Elizabethans, seemed the champion of aggressive Papistry.

The idea that the Instrument of Government could be used as a step towards the real revival of a Free Parliament was soon dispelled. The country had learnt to hate the Rump, but it had not learnt to love a military domination. The representatives who came up to Westminster in September 1654 were not at all satisfied with the Instrument of Government. Cromwell gave them to understand that they had been assembled to attend to business, not to reconstruct the constitution; but constitution making is an amusement from which popular assemblies in revolutionary times are seldom capable of abstaining. In spite of the exclusion of a hundred members, who declined to accept the Instrument, the remainder still persisted in proposing changes. Among other things they suggested that, in place of maintaining toleration on its present lines, there should be a definition of heresy, followed by the suppression of heretics. Of course, at bottom, the question at stake was whether the real government of the country should be vested in parliament or in the Protector. From the point of view of the Army the Protector's powers were necessary to the preservation of the State. Backed by the sentiment of the Army, Cromwell seized the earliest possible moment to dissolve the obstinate parliament, even straining the letter of the law by interpreting the five months' minimum as meaning lunar months, not calendar months.

The constitution propounded under the Instrument of Government did not require the summoning of another parliament until after a considerable interval. During that interval the fact of the Military Dictatorship became more palpable than ever. A perfectly futile Cavalier rising at Salisbury, dignified by the name of Penruddock's Rebellion, was the occasion of the demonstration. The government was not endangered by this foolish and abortive performance, but it was significant of the prevailing unrest, of the undercurrent of feeling that a government so unpopular must be easily destroyed. The government was unpopular, not so much because the things it did were wrong as because the authority by which they were done was a usurped authority, a military authority, a thing hitherto unheard of in England. Englishmen had a lively sense in themselves that they would rather be ill-governed by their own representatives than enjoy any amount of benefits thrust upon them by a power whose sanction was the sword. Toleration was good in itself, but the number of people in the country who wanted toleration except for their own private "doxy" was small. They did not want toleration for Quakers, whom they did not understand in the least. They did not want toleration for the Fifth-Monarchy men, who imagined that the world had been ruled successively by four great empires in the past—the Assyrian, the Persian, the Macedonian, and the Roman—and that now the "fifth empire" had begun, the rule of the Saints whose monarch was Christ. And they did not want to have toleration for any one forced upon them by gentlemen with a Bible in one hand and a sword

in the other, and texts out of the Old Testament and the Apocalypse in their mouths.

Penruddock's Rebellion was the symptom of this unrest, and the only answer to it was the uncompromising assertion of the authority of the government. All semblance of popular liberty disappeared when Cromwell mapped out the country into eleven military districts, and set over each district a major-general, who was the supreme administrative authority. Like Strafford himself, the major-generals ruled without fear or favour, dealing out justice with an even hand. But if Strafford's rule, resting on the authority of the king, was intolerable, the rule of major-generals, whose authority rested on the Army, was still more so. Moreover, the exigencies of the case compelled Cromwell to adopt expedients which he had quite rightly condemned when the Rump had employed them. Money was needed, and the extra money was extracted from the estates of one class of the community, the Cavaliers; and under these conditions the oppression of the Cavaliers excited a new popular sympathy. And to all these causes of discontent must be added the austerity of a Puritanism which sternly repressed an unseemly indulgence in the carnal pleasures of the ungodly; including most innocent forms of amusement.


Cromwell's second parliament met two years after the first. It is noteworthy that it embodied popular resentment not against Cromwell personally but against the Army. It recognised in Cromwell himself the indispensable man. Like its predecessor, this parliament too was "purged" by the exclusion of about a hundred members. The successes attending the Protector's foreign policy, to which we shall presently revert, increased his personal prestige. The discovery of a plot against his life awakened a vivid consciousness that Oliver himself was the keystone of the arch, the structure of the Commonwealth, which would collapse in ruin if he were removed. It seemed necessary at least that the Commonwealth constitution should be modified in two directions. The office of the Protector must be so modified that its functions could be efficiently discharged without danger to the State when Oliver himself should be no longer Protector; and the power of the Army itself must be reduced, even if in the process the personal authority of the Protector himself were increased.

A new constitution, then, was promulgated by the parliament, under the name of the Humble Petition and Advice, after the major-generals had been withdrawn and a bill sanctioning the taxation of Cavalier estates had been thrown out. It must be remembered that Cromwell's arbitrary powers were suspended whilst parliament was in session. The Petition went so far as to make the office of Protector permanent, to empower Cromwell to nominate his own successor, and actually to offer him the title of king. The Rump had been intolerable because there had been no check on the arbitrary exercise of authority by a single Chamber. The Petition sought to prevent the resuscitation of this danger by reconstituting a second Chamber, a new House of Lords nominated by Cromwell but subject to the approval of the

House of Commons. On the other hand, the Protector was to surrender the right which he possessed under the Instrument of Government of arbitrarily excluding members from the Commons. The principle was at the same time formally laid down that all forms of Christian religion were to be tolerated except the Romanist and the Episcopalian. Socinianism, which rejects the Divinity of Christ, was outside the pale.

The Humble Petition and Advice was accepted and became law, with the exception of one point. Oliver declined the title of king, not, it would appear, without reluctance. But a sufficient reason for the refusal must be found in the strong antagonism of the Army to the proposal. Oliver could not afford to make the army hostile. Policy, too, demanded the refusal for other reasons, since in Englishmen's minds at least the idea of kingship was hedged about with the traditions of long centuries, traditions belonging to the office, not the individual, and wholly incompatible with the elevation to that office of a man with whom they could by no possibility be associated. In a minor degree the prestige even of the new House of Lords was similarly threatened; it was remote from the associations which gave dignity at least to the old House of Peers.

Nine months had elapsed between the first meeting of the new parliament and the installation of the Protector under the new constitution. Parliament was not dissolved but prorogued, and met again in the following January, 1658. But a change was at once apparent. The pick of Oliver's supporters had been transferred to the Upper Chamber, and the hundred elected members of the Lower House whom he had excluded were necessarily admitted under the new constitution. Thus, there was really a new House of Commons, which at once proceeded to attack the constitution which a parliament nominally the same had only just set up. Almost its first movement was to attack the new House of Lords in the endeavour to re-create that despotism of the House of Commons, the curbing of which was the precise object with which the Second Chamber had been constituted. Once more the attempt to invent a working constitution had failed. Once more Oliver had no alternative but to assert his own supremacy. He dissolved his second parliament. Alone upon his own shoulders he bore the burden of the State during the few months of life which remained to him.



A dinner-party under the Protectorate.

[From the English edition of the *Janua Linguarum* of Comenius.]

IV

FOREIGN POLICY

A system of government which depends for its effectiveness upon one man of exceptional capacity and unique moral force cannot be permanent. It was created in England under the Commonwealth because the man was there; the old system had broken down, and for the time being there was no practical possibility either of reconstructing it or of setting up any other in its place. The period of the Commonwealth presents a breach in the continuity of constitutional development which was resumed with the Restoration. For the first and the only time in English history England had attempted to break with tradition, and the experiment collapsed with the disappearance of the great figure in whom it had centred. But it is remarkable that in the course of the experiment England won for herself such prestige as she had before known only in the latter years of Queen Elizabeth's reign, in Henry V.'s day of triumph, and during a part of the reign of Edward III.

After the storm of the great Civil War, England, instead of being exhausted, organised the most powerful navy afloat and could put in the field troops superior to any in Europe. She could interfere with effect on the Continent, and made her alliance desired by States which at first refused even to recognise the regicide Commonwealth. The fighting strength of the Puritan soldiery and mariners lay in the combination of complete discipline with religious enthusiasm, superimposed upon the normal qualities of Englishmen. Officered by men selected on account of their proved capacity, while the services were moulded by organisers of the highest class, English fleets and English troops could go anywhere and do anything if they felt themselves to be fighting for The Cause. Even with baser and more material incentives they played their part manfully, as in the Dutch War, a war in which the religious motive had no place.

Cromwell, then, had the instrument to his hand for carrying out an aggressive Protestant policy; and to guide him in such a policy he had the Elizabethan tradition, the tradition not of Elizabeth herself but of the Elizabethan seamen. That tradition fixed upon Spain as the enemy of Protestantism and the legitimate prey of Protestant sailormen. Cromwell had hardly made his peace with the Dutch, very advantageously for England, when he turned his eyes upon Spain as the fitting object of attack by English ships. But for once he blundered into under-rating the efficiency of the enemy and the quality of the force required to attack him within his own seas. Although there was no war between England and Spain, a fleet was despatched across the Atlantic at the end of 1654, under the Admirals Penn and Venables, which found itself under orders for the Spanish Main. But the fleet had been fitted out hastily and carelessly. It failed completely

before Cartagena; but, while retreating, it seized upon the then very slightly inhabited island of Jamaica, which was thenceforward retained as an English colony. The result was a declaration of open war between Spain and England.

The challenge to Spain was thrown down quite in the Elizabethan spirit, and precisely on the old excuses, that Spain treated the wealth of South America as a private preserve, and that English sailors in Spanish ports were refused the free practice of their religion. When the two countries were at open war again the blunder of the first expedition was not repeated. The work to be done was placed in the competent hands of Blake, who had just been congenially occupied in smiting the swarms of Arab and Berber pirates who infested the African shores of the Mediterranean. Blake blockaded the Spanish coasts, and one of the incidents especially favourable to Cromwell at the moment when his second parliament was called in 1656 was the arrival in England of a Spanish prize laden with vast wealth. The most striking of all Blake's victories was that achieved in the following year, when he drove the Spanish fleet to take shelter under the guns of Teneriffe, silenced the land-batteries with his own guns, sailed in, and sank the Spanish fleet without losing a ship of his own.

Before opening his attack on Spain there was perhaps some uncertainty in Cromwell's mind as to the correctness of that policy. Puritanism hesitated to decide whether France or Spain was the real foe of Protestantism. France and Spain were anyhow at enmity with each other, their quarrel having been left undecided when the Thirty Years' War was brought to a close by the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. Richelieu, and after Richelieu Mazarin, in France, aimed at the policy of toleration within the country, the policy of the Henry IV. tradition, the policy of national consolidation. Political factions, however, had associated themselves with the religious parties for their own ends, and Spain, in order to foster disintegration in France, was giving support to the Huguenots. But when Cromwell made overtures to Spain, he immediately found that she was as bigoted as ever in her Romanism. Hence he attacked her without waiting for a French alliance. Indeed, he was quite ready to fight France as well as Spain in the cause of Protestantism; and, even while his fleets were pursuing their first unsuccessful career in the West Indies, he was threatening France with armed intervention on behalf of the Vaudois, the Protestant mountaineers who were suffering from the persecution of the Duke of Savoy. The persecution was stopped, and the French government welcomed an English alliance, to be directed against Spain.

The sham religious basis of the civil troubles in France itself broke down, and the armies of the state were captained by the Huguenot Turenne. In 1657 the Anglo-French alliance was completed. In 1658, the last year of Cromwell's life, English Puritan troops were fighting under Turenne in the Spanish Netherlands, winning in June the battle of the Dunes, which gave Dunkirk to England as her share in the spoils of the alliance. A hundred

years after the loss of Calais England once more had a foothold on the Continent.

Ostensibly the continuity of Cromwell's foreign policy was preserved by Charles II. at the Restoration—ostensibly, because the French alliance remained in force. But the whole meaning of the policy was changed. Cromwell united England with a Power which appeared likely to recognise the principle of toleration more thoroughly than any other, and which had every political inducement to stand in antagonism to the Hapsburg leaders of aggressive Romanism. England and Holland together could sweep the seas. England, Holland, and France together could dictate at least toleration to the Catholic States. If France played her allies false, England, with her new Calais and with Holland behind her, could be dangerous on land, and her fleets would be able to command the Mediterranean as well as the Channel and the French Atlantic ports.

Cromwell's scheme was perhaps fundamentally erroneous, because the time was past for the opposition between Catholic and Protestant to be made the basis of a national policy. Also it was no doubt a fundamentally false position for England to seek deliberately to involve herself in the affairs of the Continent. She would not have been able to bear the strain of posing as a Power of the first magnitude both on sea and on land. It was an error also to seek war rather than to seek peace. But it was for none of these reasons that Cromwell's policy actually failed after Cromwell was dead. It failed because Charles II. deliberately played into the hands of France and helped the aggrandisement of France, precisely when, if Cromwell had been alive, she would have found herself under the necessity of adapting her policy to that of the Protector or else of facing the immediate and vigorous hostility of the Puritan fleets and armies. In fact Cromwell's foreign policy, like his government in England, was powerful and effective so long as Cromwell himself was at the head of affairs. It would have failed even with a second-rate Cromwell. But with Charles, who skilfully preserved its outward semblance while entirely transforming its spirit and intention, it was more than a failure; it was converted into an instrument for the aggrandisement of Louis XIV. Yet for England one feature of the Commonwealth foreign policy survived, the feature which made the preservation of naval supremacy supreme over all other considerations.

The battle of the Dunes was the last triumph of the Puritan arms. Cromwell was not yet sixty years old, but his mortal frame was worn out by the tremendous labours and responsibilities which had fallen to his lot for the last fifteen years. Two of his great victories, those of Dunbar and Worcester, had been won on the 3rd of September. On the 3rd of September his great lonely soul passed away. Three days before a terrific storm had burst over England; "the devil," the Cavaliers said, "had come to claim his own." But Cromwell went before another Judgment Seat than that of the Cavaliers.

V

THE END OF THE COMMONWEALTH

Oliver had refused the crown, nevertheless it appeared that he had some thought at least of creating a dynasty; for on his deathbed he named as his successor his son Richard. For that choice there can be no other explanation. Cromwell cannot have imagined that Richard could take his own place as the Atlas bearing the Commonwealth upon his shoulders. The younger son Henry was a man of capacity, who may have been ruled out because of his fiery temper. But Richard was wholly incapable of serving as anything more than figurehead, nor had any man come to the front who was in the least fitted to maintain an autocratic rule. The Commonwealth required a ruler, who, whether he was in form an autocrat or not, should be one in actual fact.

In January a new parliament was assembled. No one challenged the nominal position of the Protector; no one recognised his authority as a reality. The immediate question was merely whether the parliament or the officers of the Army were to be the supreme authority. The officers had fixed upon Fleetwood, a capable soldier and Cromwell's own son-in-law, for the vacant post of General-in-Chief. Had Fairfax been an ambitious man, he might have formed a party of his own in spite of his abstention from public life for the last eight years; but he chose to remain in retirement. Parliament, intent on asserting its own authority, proposed that Richard Cromwell should be made General-in-Chief. Richard, as the head of an army, would have been absurd, but the calculation was that the army would obey its chief, and its chief would obey parliament. The officers had no intention of submitting to such an arrangement. There was among them no personality of commanding force, but the most active of their leaders was Lambert. The Protector, incapable of taking a line of his own, submitted to the pressure of Lambert and the officers, dissolved parliament in May, and finished the farce of his Protectorship by resigning. Once more the country was without any government which could pretend to a legal title.

Still the Army did not wish to assume official responsibility for the government of the State. Lambert devised the plan of resuscitating the Rump which Oliver had turned out of doors. Here was at least a sort of parliament, whose members had been elected, which, by the Statute of 1641, could never be dissolved except by its own consent. In fact it never had been legally dissolved; it had only been illegally suppressed by an arbitrary authority. In short, the members of the Long Parliament could clearly



Richard Cromwell.

[From a miniature by Samuel Cooper, 1664.]

claim as a matter of mere law that they were to this day the legal House of Commons; though it would not be so easy to prove that the Commons by themselves legally constituted a parliament, or that the Rump by itself could claim to be the legal House of Commons so long as those other members were shut out who had been excluded by Pride's Purge.

The Rump, however, had no qualms. From December 1640 down to Cromwell's *coup d'état* it had acted as the sovereign body of the realm, and had all but succeeded in establishing itself permanently. It was still persuaded that it was the legitimate sovereign, and it acted upon that doctrine. It at once assumed the tone of high authority over the soldiers who had reinstated it, threatened to declare all the proceedings of the Protectorate

invalid, and showed every sign of intending to revive all the old pretensions which had made its ejection by Cromwell temporarily popular. The Cavaliers imagined that they had found their opportunity in the dissensions at headquarters; but if the Army was politically at sea, it understood at least its own business of fighting. The insurrection



Unite, or sovereign, of the Commonwealth, 1660.

[The only English coins with legends in English.]

was crushed at Winnington Bridge, and Lambert returned from this campaign resolved on another *coup d'état*. The Rump found itself shut out from the Chamber. But Lambert was no Cromwell; departmental management was going to pieces, and the soldiery discovered that their pay was not forthcoming. Before New Year's Day the Rump was back again. But on New Year's Day, General Monk crossed the Scottish Border into England to take control of affairs on his own responsibility.

For eight years past Monk had been practically the ruler of Scotland. For the greater part of the time he had held supreme command of the Commonwealth Army of ten thousand men in that country. The administration had been in the hands of a small Council containing a majority of Englishmen, and in that Council Monk himself was the controlling force. Strong, clear-headed, and imperturbable, he was moved by no extravagant dreams of personal ambition. He was perfectly loyal to Oliver, as he would have been perfectly loyal to any established government, simply because it was the government. As Cromwell's lieutenant he ruled with a firm hand in the realm of which he was in charge; he would have continued to do so as Richard Cromwell's lieutenant if Richard had not chosen first to prove himself impossible, and then to abdicate. But when "Tumbledown Dick," as the great Protector's son was popularly called, vacated his office, and Lambert would neither grasp the reins himself nor set anybody else in the

saddle, Monk began to think it was time for some one to take a hand and deal with the state of the nation in a business-like fashion. Monk had been attending strictly to his own business in Scotland, and when he crossed the Border at the head of his troops he had not made up his mind to anything more definite than the attempt to set up a stable government in which, when it should be set up, he himself had no intention of playing the part of Cromwell. It was not till he was in England, and felt himself in touch with public sentiment, that he arrived at the definite conclusion that England must have either a Cromwell or a Stuart Restoration.

Fairfax issued from his retirement to join Monk at York, and his doing so was at once accepted by public opinion as a guarantee that Monk was himself to be trusted. For Monk was a dark horse, but no one had a doubt of Fairfax's single-minded integrity and public spirit.

Five weeks after crossing the Border, Monk was in London. He had arrived without any intention of effecting a revolution; with the object of maintaining Oliver's principles, which were incompatible with the ascendancy of either Cavaliers or Presbyterians. But the fact immediately presented itself that neither the Rump nor the Army officers represented public opinion or the principles of Cromwell. He had hardly arrived when the city of London announced its refusal to pay taxes at the bidding of a so-called parliament in which it was unrepresented. There and then, with the approval of his own officers, he sent to the Rump a demand that writs should be issued forthwith for filling the vacant seats—there were hardly over forty members sitting—and that arrangements should be made for a dissolution and a free parliament within three months. The Rump ignored the demand, whereupon Monk summoned the rest of the surviving members of the Long Parliament, who still had precisely the same title as the Rump to take their seats. The Rump was swamped by a majority which forthwith voted for a dissolution and the summoning of a new parliament.

Neither Monk nor the nation had taken long to recognise that the time for experiments was past. A Military Dictatorship had been tolerable only because the Dictator was Oliver Cromwell. The sole possible form of settled government was a Stuart restoration under guarantees for the liberties of parliament. Monk immediately entered on negotiations with Charles in Holland, with the result that the Declaration of Breda was issued. Charles proclaimed his readiness to grant a free pardon to every one not specially excepted by parliament. There should be no disturbance of the conditions of landownership established during the interregnum. There should be no penalties for religious opinions unless they were subversive of public order. Immediately after the publication of the Declaration the new parliament met. The disabilities imposed on the Cavaliers under the Commonwealth were ignored, and there were present a substantial Cavalier element and a still more substantial Presbyterian element, now readily converted to a royalism which seemed to have promised toleration, and at least guaranteed deliverance from the rule of sectaries and men of the sword. The soldiery might have

defied them if there had been any chief to whom they could rally as they had rallied in the past to Cromwell; but they were as sheep having no shepherd. A great reactionary wave of royalism swept over the country, and parliament and people with a strange enthusiasm summoned the unknown king from over the water to come and enjoy his own again. On May 25 applauding crowds hailed Charles on his landing at Dover, and four days later he made his entry into London.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE RESTORATION

I

THE KING'S RETURN

THE great bulk of the nation hailed the restoration of Charles II. with delight. The Protectorate had been in effect a despotism, resting upon the support not of the nation but of the army which had itself represented the sectaries. It had been detested alike by the Cavaliers, by the mass of the Presbyterians, and by the Constitutionalists, whose cause had been that of the supremacy of parliament. Through the return of the king the Cavaliers hoped to obtain restitution if not revenge. The Presbyterians, while they knew that Anglicanism must be restored, nevertheless counted upon the extension of complete toleration to themselves. The Constitutionalists felt assured that there would be no attempts to resuscitate the claim of the Crown to arbitrary powers which had been abolished by statute before the actual outbreak of the Civil War. Even the sectaries acquiesced in view of the promises of toleration.

No one knew the mind of the new king, nor did he intend any one to know it. Throughout his reign he succeeded in completely hoodwinking not only the nation at large but his own ministers. For him there was one consideration which controlled all others—he did not intend to go on his travels again; therefore he would not set public opinion at defiance until he had placed his own power on a footing which would secure him against all risks. He intended to secure that power, and had no moral scruples whatever as to methods; but it was imperative that his purpose should not be suspected, and he concealed his deep political design under a mask of reckless frivolity which at once gave free play to his own natural inclinations and disarmed suspicion.

It was the business of the Convention—so called because, not having been summoned by the royal authority, it was not in strictly technical form a parliament—to deal only with the immediate settlement of the most urgent questions. It set about its task on the lines of compromise. The lands of Cavaliers which had been sequestered by the Commonwealth Government were restored, but the lands which had passed out of their possession by sale remained in the hands of the purchasers. An Act of Indemnity and Oblivion was passed, though it was denounced by the Cavaliers as one of indemnity for the king's enemies and oblivion for his friends, From

the general pardon regicides were formally excluded, though vindictiveness added to their number Sir Harry Vane, and went so far as to exhume the bodies of Cromwell, Ireton, and Bradshaw, the President of the High Court of Justice, in order to inflict upon them the penalties of treason. The claims of the soldiers to arrears of pay were met, and the Army itself was disbanded, though a fanatical outbreak of the group who called themselves Fifth

Monarchy men gave a warrant for the retention, in the interests of public order, of the regiments which had marched from Scotland with Monk, who were formed into the Coldstream Guards. It was not realised at the time, unless by Charles himself, that the nucleus of a Standing Army was thus provided.

At the same time the great question of taxation was definitely settled, somewhat on the lines of the "Great Contract" proposed by Robert Cecil fifty years before. The Crown was granted a fixed revenue, conferred for life, in return for which it surrendered all the old claims for feudal dues and for the imposition of indirect taxation—direct taxation was admittedly not within the power of the Crown. The revenue thus provided, being insufficient for the purposes of administration, required to be



Charles II.

[After the engraving by Vanderbanc.]

supplemented by parliamentary grants, and thus the suspension of parliament was rendered impossible. So at least it seemed, for the parliament had not reckoned that the King of England might obtain extraneous supplies by becoming the pensioner of the King of France. The arbitrary Courts of Justice, abolished in 1641, were dead, nor was there any attempt made to revive the claim of the Crown to the power of arbitrary imprisonment. The whole of the settlement by the Convention Parliament was in strict accordance with the constitutional principles which had been asserted by the Long Parliament while it was still a practically unanimous body.

The convention was an English parliament. The Protectorate had incorporated the legislatures of Scotland and Ireland with that of England.

The Restoration cancelled the Union; as before, Scotland and Ireland resumed their separate legislatures. They had acquiesced in the Union, not without some resentment, since in Scotland at least the incorporation was felt to be subordination, in spite of the commercial advantages accruing from the removal of commercial disabilities. The Union had not been the outcome of a national demand in any of the three countries; it had been a piece of policy on the part of the Government in England. Scotland demanded its dissolution, and Charles was well aware that it was to his personal advantage, to the advantage of the Crown, to have three kingdoms to deal with instead of one.

II

CLARENDON

The primary business of the Restoration was settled by the Convention. The acuteness of Charles and the shrewdness of his chief counsellor Edward Hyde, who was shortly afterwards made Earl of Clarendon, prevented it, by means of the amnesty and the land settlement, from being converted into a partisan triumph for the Cavaliers, while the disbanding of the Army removed all danger of armed insurrection. On the other hand, the revenue settlement made it impossible, for the time at least, that the Crown should attempt to dispense with parliaments. But Hyde had successfully postponed one question of vital importance, the settlement of the religious problem. This was to be dealt with by a new parliament regularly summoned by the king, not by the Convention. The Presbyterians were hardly nervous. They were carefully encouraged to believe that all would be well with them. There was to be a conference of divines as a preliminary to settlement, and in the meanwhile the king nominated leading Presbyterians among his private chaplains.

But bitter disappointment was in store. The Savoy Conference, the meeting of the divines, came to nothing. The Royalist reaction in the country resulted in the return of a Parliament in which there was a great preponderance of Cavaliers, many of them young men whose sympathies were vehemently Anglican and anti-Puritan. Clarendon himself was intensely Anglican. He had originally been prominent among the moderate Constitutionalists in the first days of the Long Parliament, and had led the resistance in the Commons to the Puritan attack upon the Episcopate and to the Grand Remonstrance. With Falkland he had joined the Royalists, had been a leading member of the councils of Charles I., and had remained the Chief Minister, if that term may be used, of Charles II. during his exile. Now, at the Restoration, he was not unfaithful to his old ideals. He was no advocate of absolutism, and his stiff solemnity made him distasteful to the Cavaliers, and especially to the court, which soon became notorious for its frivolity and

licentiousness. But he was at one with the Cavaliers in the determination to restore the supremacy of Anglicanism.

Clarendon's ecclesiastical policy took shape in the series of enactments which are known as the Clarendon Code. Already the spirit of the new parliament had made itself manifest. It restored the bishops to the House of Lords, and ordered the Solemn League and Covenant to be publicly burnt by the hangman, besides denouncing all levying of war against the king. The first measure of the Code, which came at the end of the year 1661, was the Corporation Act, which required every member of a corporation to renounce the Covenant, to affirm that it was unlawful to take arms against the king, and to take the Sacrament according to the rights of the Anglican



Edmund Hyde, Lord Clarendon.

[After the portrait by Loggan.]

Church. The Corporation Act was followed up by the Act of Uniformity, which required every incumbent who had not already received the Anglican ordination to do so before St. Bartholomew's Day. Ordination was to be in future the condition of holding any ecclesiastical preferment. The clergy were to declare their complete acceptance of everything laid down in the Prayer-book, and not only the clergy, but teachers of all sorts were to take the oaths required under the Corporation Act. An immense number of livings were now occupied by Presbyterians who had not received episcopal ordination. These men stood loyal to their convictions with a wonderful unanimity. More than two thousand of them resigned

their livings, and the great Presbyterian body became a sect outside the established Church; that is, for the first time, the Nonconformists separated themselves definitely from the official ecclesiastical organisation.

The expulsion of the Presbyterians from the pulpits which they had so long occupied might have been excused as a warrantable retaliation for the expulsion of the Anglicans under the Puritan régime, although at the best it was a manifestly vindictive measure. It was a severe blow to Nonconformity; still it left the Nonconformists free to worship as their own consciences prescribed. But two years after the Act of Uniformity came the Conventicle Act, which forbade, under severe penalties, all assemblies for public worship, under other forms than those of the Church, at which there were gathered more than four persons besides the members of the household.

Still more outrageous was the Five Mile Act, which followed the devastations of the Great Plague which fell upon London in 1665. During that year more than a hundred thousand persons died beneath that fearful scourge. Multitudes fled from London; those who remained hardly dared to leave their houses lest they should come in contact with infection; still less would

they dare to enter the house of their neighbour. In those terrible months the ejected ministers displayed a more splendid spirit of self-sacrifice than their Anglican successors, who failed in their dangerous duty. Fear that the Nonconformists would recover their ascendancy drove the parliament to pass a measure which forbade any Nonconformist minister or teacher to teach in schools or to come within five miles of any corporate town or parliamentary borough where he had officiated, under penalties of fine and imprisonment, while substantial rewards were given to informers who revealed breaches of the law. As was always the case in England the excuse put forward was that Nonconformity was used as a cloak for sedition.

Meanwhile Charles was leading the nation upon a course of foreign policy which he himself perfectly understood, though the nation did not. Charles wanted the personal friendship and support for himself of his cousin Louis XIV.; and Louis had designs not for the formation of a Protestant League, but for establishing a French domination in Europe. The Hapsburg ascendancy was to give place to that of the Bourbon. The price of Cromwell's alliance would have been that policy of toleration, if not of aggressive Protestantism, which had not been unacceptable to France while Oliver ruled in England. The price of Charles's alliance was not the pursuit of an ideal; it could be calculated in terms of the currency. It was necessary, however, to persuade the people of England to believe that the alliance was in their interest, and to conceal from them the terms upon which it rested. It would not suit Louis to see England closely allied with either Holland or Spain, and, unlike Louis, neither Holland nor Spain would give Charles their alliance on the necessary terms. The renewal of the Navigation Acts in a still stricter form repelled Holland, while Spain held out for the restitution of Dunkirk and Jamaica. But over and above alliance, Louis wanted from Charles merely the understanding that the king would do his best to reinstate Roman Catholicism, which Charles was quite ready to promise, while he asked in return the money which Louis did not grudge. Commercial rivalry weighed more than religious sentiment with popular opinion in England, so that it was easy to cultivate hostility towards the Dutch Republic, against which Charles himself bore grudges, not the least being the refusal of the dominant oligarchy to recognise the hereditary title to leadership in Charles's young nephew, William of Orange. All tradition also was opposed to alliance with Spain; and Charles played into the hands of Louis by choosing for his bride a princess of the house of Braganza, a dynasty still insecurely seated on the throne of Portugal, of which Spain claimed the crown.


The Portuguese marriage brought with the dowry of Catherine the possession of Bombay in India, and of Tangier on the coast of Africa; and the acquisition of Tangier gave Charles an additional excuse not for restoring Dunkirk to Spain, but for selling it to France. The transaction was unpopular, but it was fully sanctioned by Monk (now Duke of Albemarle) and the military authorities, who saw that its practical value could

be maintained only at an intolerable expense, and that in fact Tangier and Dunkirk could not both be effectively occupied.

Dutch and English were in a state of perpetual hostility on the high seas. The Dutch had planted in North America the colony of new Amsterdam, which formed a wedge between the Northern and Southern English colonies, while the English claimed that this territory was already theirs in right of earlier occupation. In the Indian Seas and in the Spice Islands the East India Companies of the two nations were perpetually at odds, and the strained relations, intensified by the Navigation Act, brought about the open declaration of war in 1665.

As in the case of the early war between the Commonwealth and the Dutch, this war was signalised by mighty naval battles, in which both sides fought with desperate obstinacy, and hardly inflicted defeats alternated with hardly won victories, which left it almost impossible to say that either of the combatants had the better of the other. Of these engagements the most famous were the first, a victory of the English led by the king's brother James, Duke of York, off Lowestoft, and the tremendous four days' battle of the Downs in the following year between Ruyter and Van Tromp on one side and Monk and Prince Rupert on the other, in which both sides claimed the victory, though the English losses were far heavier both in ships and in men. Yet six weeks after that great fight the Dutch were fairly defeated in another great battle. Nevertheless, between wanton wastage and real expenses the cost of the war was enormous. It came at the moment when London was devastated by the Plague, and the Plague was followed in 1666 by the tremendous three days' fire, which made of old London a heap of charred ruins. By way of economising, the authorities elected to lay up a large portion of the fleet, with the result that the triumphant Dutch sailed up the Medway, and the thunder of their guns was heard by the revellers of King Charles's court. How conscious the Dutch were of the illusory character of their triumph and of the shame they had inflicted upon England was shown by the Treaty of Breda, which was actually in course of negotiation at the time and was ratified a few weeks later. Both sides retained what they had actually won, and New Amsterdam was converted into New York.

Two other great consequences followed upon the war. The first was constitutional. Popular feeling had been wholly in favour of the war, and parliament at the outset voted very large supplies. The indignation was all the greater when it became apparent that the money was being scandalously squandered. But hitherto, while parliament had voted or refused to vote the supplies called for by the king and his ministers, it had hardly attempted to claim control over the actual expenditure. Now it insisted that the supplies voted for the war should be expended on the war. The principle of the "appropriation of supply" was for the first time laid down; that is, it was claimed that parliament could vote money for a particular object, and was entitled to see that that money should be spent upon that object and not




THE ATTACK ON CHAPHAM BY THE DUTCH IN JUNE, 1667

From an etching by Romeyn de Hooghe in the Bodleian Library.

upon something else, a claim which involved parliamentary control over the national accounts.

The second consequence was a personal one; it led to the fall of Clarendon. He had been called to guide the affairs of state at a moment when the first necessity was the establishment of an equilibrium between parties still smarting and sore from the effects of a great civil war and a series of revolutionary governments, and of an equilibrium between the Crown and the parliament when Crown and parliament each was seeking so to manipulate affairs as to procure its own ascendancy. Partisanship would have won the minister a cheap popularity with one section or another of the opposing forces. Clarendon had given way to partisanship only on the



A view of London at the time of the Great Fire. 1666.

[From a print by Visscher.]

Church question. By so doing he had alienated the Puritans, but had not won popularity with the Cavaliers, or at least the courtiers, because he at the same time assumed the attitude of a censor of court manners and morals. He opposed the parliamentary claim to appropriation of supplies as an interference with the royal prerogative, and he opposed the claim put forward by Charles that the Crown could suspend the operation of the penal laws as unconstitutional. He was not responsible for the war or for its mismanagement, but popular opinion held him responsible for both. When the Dutch sailed up the Medway popular indignation demanded a scapegoat, and all parties found the most convenient scapegoat in Clarendon. He was threatened with impeachment, which he was prepared himself to face; but Charles, who was afraid of awkward revelations, persuaded him to flee from the popular wrath to France. He was impeached and condemned in his absence. In his exile he wrote his stately, and in some respects invaluable,

History of the Great Rebellion. The king was released from the hampering control of a mentor, who, however useful he might be on occasion, was exceedingly tiresome and uncomfortably exacting.

III

THE CABAL AND DANBY

The executive government in the past had been in the hands of the Crown and the Privy Council. The character of the Restoration had made it necessary that both the old Roundheads and the Cavaliers should receive recognition from the king; and the general effect was the admission to the Privy Council of so many members from both groups that the body itself became too unwieldy to conduct the business of the State. The real business passed into the hands of a small informal committee, which began to be known as the Cabinet or Cabal. The name of the Cabal has become permanently associated with the group who formed this inner council after the fall of Clarendon, popular attention having fastened on the fact that their initials—Clifford, Ashley, Buckingham, Arlington, Lauderdale—spell the word Cabal.

Parliament had not formed into definite parties, and the ministers did not represent a party. They were the men with whom the king concocted his designs or pretended to do so, and through whom he carried them to execution. Lauderdale managed Scotland. Ashley, who afterwards became Lord Shaftesbury, had sat in the Barebones Assembly. No man could have been less of a Puritan, nevertheless he associated himself politically with the Puritan antagonism to Clarendon and to Popery. Buckingham, the most profligate and resplendent member of a profligate and brilliant court, elected paradoxically enough to associate himself with the same political connection. Clifford and Arlington, like the king's brother James, Duke of York, were either actually Catholics or ready to become so. It was perhaps almost the strongest desire of Charles himself to reinstate the Roman Catholic religion and himself openly to join the Roman communion; to Louis XIV. he had probably already pledged himself to both these objects, though always with the proviso that he was not to be expected to sacrifice his crown for a Mass. The facts, if known to Clifford and Arlington, were carefully concealed from Ashley and Buckingham as well as from Lauderdale.

Now it was no easy matter for Charles to carry out his private designs. The only theory on which the French alliance could be made to appeal strongly to the English people was that which regarded France as a Protestant Power for political purposes, a Power opposed to aggressive Catholicism, a Power which held Hapsburg aggression in check. This was the theory on which Cromwell had undoubtedly entered upon the alliance. Louis had not up to the present time displayed animosity to Protestantism. But it was already clear that the French king had embarked on a policy of French



Southwark, London Bridge, the City and the Tower, in 1666.
[From Visser's "General View of London."]

aggrandisement which was a menace not only to the Hapsburgs but to Europe at large. To Holland for a century past Spain had been the enemy, but Holland was just becoming aware that Spain was no longer capable of endangering her liberties. The Spanish Netherlands lay as a buffer between France and Holland; Louis coveted them, and if they passed from Spain to France, Holland would be in much more danger from her powerful neighbour than from distant Spain. Again, although Louis was by no means on good terms with the Papacy, it was being realised in some quarters that the centre of aggressive Catholicism was not the Papal Curia, but the Jesuit order. In fact the Papacy and the Hapsburgs, Austrian and Spanish, had completely departed from the ancient attitude of Philip II. and the Popes of Elizabeth's time. But the Jesuits had not departed from that attitude, and the Jesuits, now in disagreement with the Papal authority, were dominant in France. The time was coming, though it had not yet come, when Catholic and Protestant Powers would have to unite against the aggression of France, revealed as the open enemy of toleration. The position was not as yet generally grasped in England; but England was uneasy and restive on political more than on religious grounds. Louis had recently put forward a claim to provinces of the Spanish Netherlands on behalf of his wife, who was the elder sister of the infant King of Spain, the basis of the claim being certain local customs of succession which could not in the eyes of any one except Louis apply to the sovereignty. England was feeling extremely suspicious of Louis's ambitions.

Hence Charles found himself constrained to give open assent to the formation, through the diplomatic agency of Sir William Temple, of the Triple Alliance between England, Holland, and Sweden, with the ostensible object of inducing France and Spain to come to terms. That object was accomplished, since Louis was not at this stage prepared to defy such a coalition. But Charles had been careful to explain privately to his cousin that he was not a free agent in the matter. The Triple Alliance must be looked upon merely as a temporary check. The two kings entered on a course of secret negotiations which resulted in the most shameful compact in our annals. By the secret Treaty of Dover, of which the true details remained unknown until revealed by modern research, Charles undertook to join Louis in a war against Holland. In return for his alliance Charles was to receive substantial subsidies from the French king. This portion of the compact was confirmed by a treaty made in the following year to which all the members of the Cabal were privy; but the iniquity of the secret treaty lay in clauses which were concealed from Ashley and Buckingham. Charles pledged himself to reinstate the Roman Catholic religion and himself to join the Roman communion, as his brother James had already done, as well as Clifford. And the price of this pledge was the promise of a substantial pension, a sum down when the king's conversion should be publicly announced, and a guarantee that Charles should be supported by French troops if his subjects revolted.

Charles himself and all the members of the Cabal were advocates of toleration, though for different reasons. For the principle of toleration Charles cared nothing; he had no sympathy with Puritanism or the Puritans. But he and Clifford and Arlington were shrewd enough to perceive that it was hardly possible to seek for a relaxation of the laws against Roman Catholics without also relaxing those against Protestant dissent. Ashley and Buckingham, on the other hand, were allied to the dissenters. But the Cavalier parliament was hotly intolerant alike of Romanism and of Nonconformist Puritanism. Buckingham and, what was infinitely more important, Ashley were both duped by Charles, and, knowing nothing of the secret treaty, favoured the French alliance against the Dutch; relying upon the commercial advantages which would accrue and upon the sentiment of hostility to Holland, the desire to avenge the disgrace of the Medway affair, to make a Dutch war popular. To keep the hands of the government free parliament was prorogued from 1670 to 1673. In the interval the sham second treaty with France was negotiated; Charles, instigated by Ashley, who was made Earl of Shaftesbury and Lord Chancellor, issued a Declaration of Indulgence suspending the operation of the penal laws; and in 1672 war was declared in conjunction with France against Holland. "No clap of thunder on a fair frosty day could more astonish the world," wrote Temple in his memoirs.

The approach of war at a moment when it would have been dangerous to meet parliament drove the Cabal to a dangerous expedient. Government had, according to custom, obtained a temporary loan from the goldsmiths of about a million and a half, which was to be paid back when the taxes for the year were collected. The money in the treasury and the taxes for its repayment were now attached for the purposes of the war. The money which the goldsmiths had lent was to a great extent money which had been deposited with them by merchants. This "Stop of the Exchequer," as it was called, deprived them of the means of repaying the deposits, and widespread financial ruin resulted.

The war itself went ill. The Dutch, fighting single-handed and threatened with utter destruction by the combined attack of France and England, this time proved themselves a match for the united forces of their enemies on the sea; and when they were in danger of being overwhelmed by land fell back on their last defence—opened the dykes, and laid the country under water. A revolution swept away the oligarchy which controlled the State, and set at its head young William of Orange, who thus began his career as the implacable foe of Louis XIV.; but this same change also changed the attitude of Charles towards the Dutch Republic. William, the grandson of Charles I., stood next in succession to the English throne after the king's brother James and his daughters, for Charles's wife, Catherine of Braganza, had borne him no children. Charles hated the Dutch oligarchy; but a Holland dominated by William of Orange was another matter. In 1674 articles of peace were signed between Holland and England.

There were other reasons, too, which led to this result. In 1673 it had become no longer possible to repeat the prorogation of parliament, and parliament met in resentful mood. The royal prerogative had been asserted in a manner not to its liking. Clarendon of old had checked Charles's first attempt to exercise the dispensing power and to relieve individuals from religious penalties and disabilities. Now members returned, indignant, to find Roman Catholics in high favour. Very decisively parliament dispelled any illusions that may have existed in Charles's mind with regard to their hostility to Romanism by passing the Test Act, which required all persons

holding public office to receive the Sacrament according to the Anglican rite and expressly to deny the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation. The most intolerantly Anglican of parliaments was as bitterly Anti-Romanist as if it had been composed of Presbyterians. Even the Protestant dissenters made it obvious that they would rather submit to Corporation Acts and Five Mile Acts themselves than be relieved at the price of toleration for Papists. From that moment Charles, however reluctantly, entirely abandoned his design of reinstating Romanism, and the Declaration of Indulgence was formally withdrawn.



An English ship of war, *temp.* Charles II.
[From a medal.]

Louis may have recognised that circumstances were too strong for his cousin, but he realised at the same time that the purposes of the secret treaty were for the time being out of reach; he could not gravely resent the withdrawal of England from the Dutch War.

But the Test Act and the Peace of Westminster were not the only results of the reassembling of Parliament. The Test Act itself excluded from office the Duke of York and Clifford with other Roman Catholics. Shaftesbury, more than suspicious that the king had tricked him, went into opposition along with Buckingham. The Cabal was dissolved, and Charles called to his counsels the High Anglican and Cavalier, Sir Thomas Osborne, who was made Earl of Danby and Lord Treasurer.

From the Danby Administration may be dated the beginnings of the division of parliament into two organised parties, though they cannot as yet be defined as Ministerialists and Opposition, because some time was still to elapse before it became a matter of course that all the ministers of the Crown should be chosen from the one party. But although the principle of

forming a united ministry, with its corollary of collective responsibility, had not yet come into play, during the rest of the reign of Charles II. parliament was shaping itself into the two divisions which became known as the Court Party and the Country Party, and ultimately as Tories and Whigs. Now also was inaugurated that extensive system of party management, by the distribution of places and emoluments and still more flagrant forms of bribery, which so corrupted parliament during the ensuing century.

Charles chose Danby as the champion of Anglicanism and Royal Prerogative in spite of the fact that the minister was exceedingly hostile to France. For the time being it suited Charles very well to make a show of independence of Louis. He intended to make his bargain with the French king, but he could get improved terms, even at the cost of a temporary estrangement, though the estrangement must not go too far.

Shaftesbury was determining upon his line of policy, of which the primary aim was to be the exclusion of the Roman Catholic Duke of York from the succession to the throne, while the immediate design was to procure a dissolution in the expectation that a new parliament would set the country party decisively in the ascendant and compel the dismissal of Danby. But, when parliament met after an extended prorogation, Shaftesbury and Buckingham over-reached themselves in their opposition and were relegated to the Tower.

By this time Charles was in fact fencing with Louis. Danby was allowed to push forward his anti-French policy. The Princess Mary, the Protestant daughter of the Duke of York, and heir-presumptive to the throne if she should outlive her father, was married to William of Orange, Holland being still at war with France; and Danby joyfully believed that England would now be carried into the war on the side of Holland. But Danby was to be disappointed. Through the first half of 1678 elaborate intrigues were going on. Louis wanted to bring his Dutch war to an end. He was in communication with sundry leaders of the Opposition in England, who, while they could not risk the unpopularity of openly opposing a French war, were bent on the overthrow of Danby, who was conspicuously identified with the war policy. On the other hand, Charles merely wanted to use the threat of war in order to extract better terms for himself from the French king. By Charles's orders and very much against his own will Danby was compelled to write to the English ambassador at Paris offering English aid in bringing the war to a close for a substantial cash consideration. A secret treaty was ultimately framed, under which Charles was to get his money and was to disband the troops then being raised for the war, conditions which gave to Charles what he most wanted and to the Opposition leaders what they most wanted, while Louis made his terms with the Dutch without English intervention. But the letter which Danby had written was presently to be employed as an instrument in procuring his fall.

IV

THE POPISH PLOT AND THE EXCLUSION BILLS

So far the country party had been baffled. They had been unable to obtain either the overthrow of Danby or the dissolution of the parliament which had been sitting for seventeen years. Although the Triennial Act of the Long Parliament was in force, requiring that the Houses should meet at least every three years, there was no statutory provision limiting the time during which a parliament once summoned might remain undissolved. Nor



“Dr. Oates discovereth the plot
to ye King and Council.”

[From a 17th century playing card.]

were the Opposition now (1678) provided with any really effective cry for attacking the Government. Failing aid from the High Gods, they moved the Powers of Acheron, or the Powers of Acheron moved on their behalf. Charles learnt that the ordinarily sober English people were capable of going perfectly mad on one subject, and that subject was Popery. With singular opportuneness for Shaftesbury, the No Popery frenzy laid sudden grip upon the nation. Titus Oates invented, and, having invented, revealed the popish plot.

Oates was an unspeakable knave who, being the son of a Baptist minister, had himself disgraced the Anglican Church by taking Orders, and had then joined the Church of Rome. Among the Jesuits he had gleaned enough to suggest to him the fabrication of a portentous and elaborate lie, having in it a leaven of truth, just sufficient to save it from immediate detection. The Jesuits had given up hope of the conversion of England by Charles, and were fondly anticipating the accession to the throne of his brother James, who had long been an avowed member of the Roman Church. Incidentally, Oates ascertained that a Jesuit meeting had been held on April 24. Oates proceeded to lay information before the king of the Jesuit plot for his murder. The city of London was to be provided with another great fire, Ireland was to be roused to insurrection, French troops were to come over, and there was to be a general massacre of Protestants. A copy of this declaration was lodged by the informers with a magistrate of the highest character, Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey. Oates was summoned before the Council, and stuck to his statements, though the king at least was perfectly satisfied that he was lying. Private papers were seized which implicated Father Coleman, who was officially the secretary of the Duke of York's wife, in what was certainly treasonable if futile plotting. The papers confirmed some of Oates's statements and were consequently regarded as proving his veracity.

In the wild panic which ensued, every lie produced by every informer was

swallowed with avidity. Godfrey was found murdered in a ditch, and though nothing was ever proved, the frenzied public assumed that he had been murdered by the Jesuits. Catholics and suspected Catholics were swept into prison and condemned to death after a mockery of trial. Nobody dared to raise hand or voice in an attempt to check the popular rage. A bill was carried and received the royal assent for the exclusion of Catholics from the House of Peers, the Duke of York alone being excepted by a bare majority of two votes. A direct attack on the succession of James was only evaded by the king's assurance that he would accept restrictions of the prerogative for a successor who was not a Protestant—for which James never forgave Danby. Then in order that the king might marry again a wife who might bear him a son and so shut James out of the succession, Oates brought a charge against the unlucky queen and her physician of attempting to poison Charles, which was probably instigated by Shaftesbury. But Charles drew the line at this monstrous accusation against the wife whom he so shamelessly wronged. The charge against her was dropped, and the Chief-Justice, with the help of a conscientious and valiant jury, acquitted the accused physician.

The attack on James's succession had failed, and Danby was not even shaken; but at this stage the vindictiveness of the French king came into play. Danby's letter, before referred to, was produced and read in the House of Commons. The secret bargaining with France was revealed.

It was of no avail that the letter had been written by the king's order, as attested by his own hand-writing. The doctrine of ministerial responsibility was definitely laid down. The king could do no wrong, but the minister who did wrong in his name could not shelter himself from punishment behind the king's authority. Danby was impeached.

For eighteen years the king had abstained from dissolving the Cavalier Parliament, although it had never been subservient to the royal authority, and had been increasingly insistent on its own; Charles had always been shrewd enough to perceive that a new parliament would probably be more, not less, hostile. But the only chance of saving Danby now was that a new parliament might after all be more amenable. The Cavalier parliament was dissolved.


The new parliament was not more amenable. Shaftesbury had a large majority in the Commons, and Danby was again impeached. Thereupon he produced a royal pardon which stayed the proceedings; but the threat of a Bill of Attainder drove Charles to dismiss him from office, and to lodge him in the Tower lest worse should befall. At the suggestion of Sir William Temple an academic device was adopted to avoid a deadlock. The king dismissed the whole of his Privy Council and appointed a new Council of thirty members, fifteen being officers of State, while the other fifteen were



Contemporary Medal of the Godfrey murder.

non-official. A preponderance was given to Shaftesbury and his followers; but for practical purposes the new scheme was still-born. The king still ruled through ministers of his own selection. On the other hand, a new Exclusion Bill was introduced and passed by the House of Commons; James was declared incapable of succeeding to the Crown, which, in the event of the king dying without male issue, was to pass to the nearest Protestant heir. Charles was determined not to allow the exclusion of his brother, and he prorogued the parliament, but not till it had passed, almost if not quite by accident, the Habeas Corpus Act. In principle there was nothing new in the measure. Theoretically an accused person could procure a writ of Habeas Corpus

THE SUCCESSION AFTER CHARLES II.



which required that he be either brought up for trial or set at liberty. But the lawyers had discovered devices enough by which the issuing of the writs could be deferred almost indefinitely. The new Act required that trial or release should take place within a definite time after application for the writ. There is good reason for believing Burnet's story that the majority of nine which passed the bill in the House of Lords was really a minority, the tellers by way of a jest having counted one particularly fat lord as ten.

But the Opposition were already divided. Shaftesbury, bent on the exclusion of James, had determined to fix the succession on the Duke of Monmouth, an illegitimate son of the king, who enjoyed high favour with his father and general popularity in the country. The great difficulty in the way was that Charles himself could not be induced to say that Monmouth's

mother had actually been his lawful wife. Another section, headed by Halifax and Sunderland, objected to the Monmouth candidature, and sought rather to impose close restrictions on the royal power if enjoyed by Roman Catholics. The ultimate succession was by their plan retained for the Duke's daughter Mary and her husband William of Orange. The Halifax group had enraged Shaftesbury by supporting the prorogation; they now urged the king to a dissolution, and the king acted on their advice. Fortune had just favoured Charles by giving him a new lease of popularity. He was seized with an illness so severe that his life was despaired of, and the country suddenly realised that there was every prospect that his death would plunge it into civil war over the succession question. Charles, however, recovered.

A new parliament met in October, only to be immediately prorogued to the following January (1680), and then prorogued again. The prorogations broke up the Halifax group. Petitions poured in, demanding that the Houses should be assembled, and were met by counter-resolutions from the king's supporters, whence for a time the two parties were known as the Petitioners and Abhorrrers, since the counter-resolutions expressed "abhorrence" of the petitions. But in the course of the year these nicknames were finally displaced by the appellations of "Whig" and Tory," the names commonly applied to Scottish Covenanters and Irish brigands. When the parliament did at last meet in October, an Exclusion Bill was once more passed by the House of Commons, but the debating skill of Halifax procured its defeat in the Lords. The Commons were furious, turned upon Halifax, and threatened to refuse supplies unless their demands were satisfied.

The calculating coolness with which the king faced the crisis cannot but command admiration. The belief was general that his refusal would bring about civil war; but Charles rightly judged that Shaftesbury was not the man to play the part of Pym and Hampden, however furiously he might threaten. Moreover, in the last resort, the king had what his father had never possessed, and what the Whigs did not possess now, a standing army. There were the household troops in England and a large force in Scotland, besides the troops which held Tangier. He did not give way, but dissolved parliament, and summoned a new one to meet at Oxford in March 1681.

Charles had tried to counteract popular hostility by an appearance of antagonism to France. It was now apparent that he could not win upon those lines. The moment had come for a final bargain with Louis. The bargain was made. Louis would give him an adequate pension if he ruled without parliament at all, and lent himself to the French king's policy.

It was of set purpose that Charles had selected Oxford instead of London as the gathering place of the parliament. No parliament sitting at Westminster could escape the consciousness of pressure from the force of public opinion in London. Shaftesbury had systematically organised the City; a hint from him might easily raise a riot of a very dangerous kind. Oxford was safe. The undergraduates were not in residence, and the atmosphere of

the place was extremely royalist. The colleges were filled with the members of the two Houses, and the town swarmed with their retainers, flaunting the Whig and Tory colours. The Houses were met with a final proposal for a compromise. The king would not assent to any deviation from the legitimate rule of hereditary succession, but he would consider anything short of exclusion. A definite scheme was submitted which probably originated with Halifax. James was to become king of England if he survived his brother, but his kingship was to be merely nominal. He himself was to be banished from the country, and the royal functions were to be discharged by a regent. That regent was to be his elder daughter Mary, and, failing Mary, his younger daughter Anne. The two princesses, it must be noted, were the daughters of James's first wife, Anne Hyde, Clarendon's daughter, and both adhered to the Anglican form of religion in which they had been brought up. If the Duke's second wife, the Roman Catholic Mary of Modena, should bear him a son, and that son were brought up as a Protestant, the regency would cease when he came of age.

Charles knew perfectly well that Shaftesbury and his following would not accept that compromise; had it not been so he would probably not have made the offer. Shaftesbury imagined it to be a last desperate attempt to save the situation; if Charles would agree to those terms it could only be because he felt himself beaten. Shaftesbury had his own offer; let the king put an end to the discord by acknowledging Monmouth. The king refused to acknowledge Monmouth; the Commons refused to adopt the regency scheme. Once more Shaftesbury brought in the Exclusion Bill. Charles, urbane as usual, interested himself in the arrangements for finding the Commons better accommodation for their debates in the Sheldonian Theatre, in place of the cramped chamber which they now occupied. Only the inner ring of the king's advisers had a suspicion of his intentions.

On the Monday morning the Lords assembled at their meeting place in the Geometry Schools. Thither the king betook himself privately, his state robes being conveyed in a separate sedan chair. All suspicions had been lulled. The Whigs had no fear of Louis; he had kept his own counsel, and his money was jingling in not a few of their pockets. A summons came to the Commons to attend at the bar of the House of Lords; they came in gleeful anticipation that Charles was about to announce his surrender. They knew nothing of those robes of state which had been carried so secretly to the Geometry School, the robes he must wear in pronouncing the dissolution of parliament, the robes he was wearing when they entered the chamber. The king spoke; the thunderbolt fell. When he ceased speaking there was no longer a parliament. And no other parliament was called until his successor was on the throne. Charles had sold himself to the French king, and it mattered nothing to him that the constitutional source of supply was closed. The sword upon which the House of Commons had relied was snapped at the hilt. Shaftesbury saw that the game was lost. The king would not have dared to act as he had done without the certainty that he

held the winning cards. To attempt an armed rebellion would have been madness. In impotent rage and fear the discomfited Whigs scattered to their homes.

V

SCOTLAND

For Scotland the era of the Restoration was a period of storm and stress. In that country the return of Charles II. was to the full as popular as in England. The country in general had remained loyal to the theory of a monarchy, and clung to the royal house which had inherited the English Crown, although the sentiment of loyalty was combined with a deep-rooted insistence on the national religion. Republicanism and incorporation with the Commonwealth had inevitably been accepted after the battle of Worcester; but the return of the Stuart king and independence of England were generally welcomed except by the extreme section of Covenanters, who were to be found for the most part in the western Lowlands.

But Scotland had to pay a heavy price for the restoration of the monarchy and of national independence. She at once lost the commercial advantages of the Union. Her shipping had enjoyed all the advantages of the Commonwealth Navigation Act; and of these she was at once deprived by the Navigation Act of the Convention Parliament in England, which confined the carrying trade to English bottoms. Moreover, while in England the Restoration ostensibly established a constitutional government under parliamentary control, in Scotland it in effect established despotism. Further, while the old despotism had been checked under Charles I. by the alienation of the magnates from the Crown and their consequent alliance with the Kirk, the Kirk had now alienated the magnates, who had gone over to the Crown. Even the very large body among the clergy, of moderates who were known as Resolutionsers, failed to make their influence practically felt with the Government.

There were few actual victims of the Restoration. Argyle was naturally singled out for vindictive treatment; his execution was legally inexcusable, though it was not difficult to regard it in the light of a just retribution for the death of Montrose. By the disappearance of Argyle the old Covenanters were left without a leader among the lay magnates. After a short but sharp rivalry between the thorough-going Cavalier Middleton and the ex-Covenanter Lauderdale, the former was defeated, and Lauderdale secured the virtual control of the Scottish government, which he retained for nearly twenty years.



Archibald Campbell, Marquis of Argyll.

[From the portrait by George Jamesone.]

Like the English Puritans, the Scottish Covenanters had used their power too aggressively; in high places the reaction was complete. The clergy for the most part held to their principles, though some, like James Sharp, made haste to agree with the enemy while they were in the way with him. Sharp had been sent to London in the interests of Presbyterianism; he returned to Scotland a convert to Episcopalianism. The parliament which met in 1661 was, after the manner of Scottish parliaments, an instrument which worked the will of the effective government, and the effective government consisted of the king's ministers and Privy Council. They wiped out all legislation subsequent to the bishops' wars, and left the religious settlement to the Crown. The Crown, which at the moment meant Middleton rather than Lauderdale, restored Episcopacy, and Sharp was made Archbishop of St. Andrews. Office-holders were required to denounce the Covenant and to affirm the doctrine of non-resistance. Broadly speaking the constitution of Church and State stood where they had stood thirty years before, but in both the power of the Crown was less assailable than it had been at the earlier date.

Against this system there was no national uprising like that which had produced the bishops' war. But in Scotland, as in England, the ecclesiastical settlement drove a large number of ministers to resign their livings for conscience' sake; though the liturgy was not enforced, the principle at stake was the one always dominant in Scottish ecclesiastical politics, spiritual independence. In the south-west the Covenanting spirit was roused to a stubborn defiance, whilst the laws against Nonconformity were enforced by the government even more rigorously than the Clarendon Code was applied by Cavalier magistrates in England.

The hostility of the Galloway Covenanters, already displayed by the process of "rabbling" ministers who had taken the places of those who had given up their manses, came to a head in the Pentland rising at the end of 1666. Following on a scuffle with the soldiery engaged in breaking up conventicles, a band of insurgents assembled in arms. Thomas Dalziel, a brutal veteran whose service in Russia had taught him an exceptional savagery, was placed in command of the government troops. The insurgents marched to Edinburgh under the delusion that the capital would side with them. They had hardly discovered their mistake when they were caught and routed by Dalziel at the fight of Rullion Green.

The Pentland rising was followed by a sharp persecution directed against those who were supposed to have fostered the rebellion. Torture—the boot and the thumbscrew—was freely used, though with little success, as a means of extracting information, and some scores of offenders were put to death. These things had taken place in the absence of Lauderdale. He had personally taken the line of rather discouraging persecution, and allowing the odium of that policy to be borne by his colleague and rival Lord Rothes and Archbishop Sharp. The practical outcome was that Lauderdale now became supreme. He at once procured from a subservient parliament an Act definitely establishing the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Crown, a measure

little to the liking of the bishops, and still more objectionable to the Presbyterians with their doctrine of spiritual independence. But the Act also affirmed that the entire administrative control was a prerogative of the Crown; and with this instrument in his hands Lauderdale set himself to a still harsher penal legislation enforced by an increasing standing army virtually controlled by himself. Disaffection developed along with the severity of the government, especially when it was demanded that the landholders should bind themselves, together with their families, servants, and tenants, not to attend conventicles or to harbour unlicensed preachers. To suppress the disaffection an army of ten thousand men, mainly from the Highlands, was quartered upon the disturbed districts, where the "Highland host" treated the population very much as conquering troops were wont to treat a hostile country in seventeenth-century warfare.

The results were such as might have been expected. A party of desperadoes were lying in wait for an informer on Magus Muir near St. Andrews when accident threw Archbishop Sharp into their hands. They murdered him before the eyes of his daughter. Four weeks later a sympathising band of Covenanters routed at Drumclog a party of soldiers under the command of James Graham of Claverhouse, who had been actively employed by the government in the suppression of conventicles and the dispersal of open-air gatherings.

There was no organised rebellion. The victors of Drumclog were for the most part zealots, of whom a large proportion applauded the murder of Sharp, while probably every one of them would have sheltered the murderers as a matter of course. But there would have been no rebellion at all, organised or otherwise, if the population had not been goaded by the tyrannical harshness of the law and the brutalities of the troops in government employ. The command in Scotland was placed in the hands of the Duke of Monmouth, whose rôle it was to seek popularity. Three weeks after Drumclog the insurgents were dispersed at the battle of Bothwell Brig, where four hundred of them were killed and more than a thousand prisoners were taken. Very few of them were put to death, but most of them were kept through the winter in wooden sheds in the Greyfriars' Churchyard, where they suffered very severely. Then the majority were allowed to go home on pledging themselves to keep the peace, though some were obstinate enough to refuse the promise.

Monmouth got general credit for his leniency; but immediately afterwards he was removed from his office, and his place was taken by the Duke of York. Practically at this stage (1680) James became the governor of Scotland instead of Lauderdale, with Dalziel in command of the troops. A steady persecution set in which found its warrant in the action of the extreme leaders of the Covenanters, Cargill and Cameron, from whom the zealots soon came to be known as "Cameronians." This section issued the Declaration of Sanquhar, in which all allegiance to Charles Stuart was renounced.

The Cameronians in fact elected to declare themselves rebels, and as such the government treated them. A rational leniency would in all probability have resulted in effective pacification; but the government chose to enforce the law with the utmost rigour, while the rebels openly declared their own intention of retaliation. The persecution of the Covenanters throughout the ensuing years is a very ugly chapter of history, luridly depicted thirty years afterwards in the narratives of Wodrow and Walker. But even here the theory of the government was that the victims were avowed rebels; and deeply as the name of Graham of Claverhouse has been execrated, no instance has ever been brought home to him in which he exceeded the positive instructions under which he was acting, or executed any one who had not refused to abjure the declaration against allegiance. The suppression of conventicles was monstrous; the subjection of obviously harmless persons to the death penalty was monstrous; but the blame lies on the shoulders of the government, and to some extent on the zealots themselves, rather than on the officers who carried out their orders.

VI

THE VICTORY OF THE CROWN

The rout of the Whigs, when the Oxford parliament was dissolved, was complete. The acute Charles, who, when he gave his mind to business, probably had a keener insight than any man in England, had realised that Shaftesbury was ruining his own cause by claiming too much. In that course Charles deliberately encouraged him by his professed readiness to make such concessions as had been offered at the last parliament. The adoption of the Monmouth candidature was a fatal error, since, despite the Duke's popularity, the world at large did not seriously believe that he was legitimate, and the country could not be united upon a proposal to set a bastard on the throne. Moreover, Charles realised that a reaction against the popish terror was already setting in. Men were awaking with shame to the consciousness that they had completely lost their heads and had been guilty of flagrant and unreasoning injustice; and they were angry with the men who had encouraged the panic. Popular opinion had swung round, and the discomfiture of Shaftesbury's party, with its strong majority in the House of Commons, aroused no indignation.

Had the country known either of the old Treaty of Dover or of the latest agreement between Charles and Louis, matters would have gone very differently; but there were not half-a-dozen men in the country who were in either of those secrets. Charles had indeed a difficult task in keeping faith with France without arousing suspicions; but it was one to which his consummate powers of deception were quite equal. He could prove to his Dutch nephew that he could not join a league against Louis without appealing to parliament, and he could not appeal to parliament without having to

face either a new Exclusion bill or at best a bill which would seriously limit his successor's prerogative; and neither of those alternatives was at all to the taste of James's son-in-law and prospective heir. At home the safe policy was to revive the sentiment of Anglican royalism which had been so active in the early years of the reign, and to avoid injudicious movements in the direction of toleration either of Puritan dissenters or Romanists.

Still it was necessary for Charles to obtain further securities for the royal power. A time might come when, in spite of his present comfortable relations with Louis, he might be obliged to face the parliament; and in the meanwhile his control over the Courts of Justice was not such as he desired. The judges might be as subservient as those of his father, but his father's arbitrary Courts had been abolished, and juries might, and did, prove independent. When Shaftesbury was charged with treason a London Grand Jury threw out the bill in defiance of the directions they received from the judge. Whiggery was inconveniently prevalent in the boroughs; the corporations would be only too likely to return Whig members to a parliament if summoned, and the corporation officers would empanel juries disagreeably imbued with Whig traditions.

But all this could be remedied. When the government procured the appointment of Tory sheriffs for the city, Tory juries were secure, and Shaftesbury promptly removed himself out of danger to Holland. What Charles required was to obtain control of the corporations. Writs of *Quo Warranto* were issued to inquire into the authority by which the corporations, beginning with the City of London, exercised their powers and privileges. It was not difficult to show that the actual powers conveyed by the charters had been transgressed, and charter after charter was forfeited or surrendered; to be restored, with this vital change, that the corporation officers were appointed either by direct nomination of the Crown or subject to the Crown's control instead of by free election of the burgesses.

While the boroughs were being robbed of their independence and were in effect being transformed into instruments of despotism, Whig mismanagement was playing into the king's hands. The clear policy for the party to follow was to drop Monmouth, ally itself with William and Mary, and trust to the indiscretion of Louis XIV. or of the Duke of York to provide it with the certain means of exciting public opinion once more against the succession of James and association with France. Even before the flight of Shaftesbury, which was shortly followed by his death, the Whig leaders were taking the opposite course of encouraging Monmouth to court popular favour. The real ruin was wrought, however, not by the leaders, but by the irresponsible hot-heads who in 1683 concocted the Rye House Plot. Charles and James were to be seized and perhaps to be assassinated on their way from Newmarket to London. The plot was betrayed, and although it had been carefully concealed from the Whig leaders, several of them were charged with complicity.

The Earl of Essex committed suicide in the Tower. Enough evidence

of Russell's association with some of the plotters was found to warrant his condemnation by a partisan court. The great scandal was in connection with the doom of Algernon Sidney, against whom only one witness could be produced, though the law of treason required two. But among his papers was found an essay in favour of republicanism. It had not even been published, but it was admitted as the equivalent for the necessary second witness. Sidney was condemned and executed. The subsequent indignation at this travesty of justice was for the time being suppressed by the present indignation at an assassination plot.

The Court became more popular than it had been at any period of the reign ; repeated breaches of the Test Act and Corporation Acts were allowed to pass unchallenged ; high Anglican doctrines of non-resistance to the royal authority predominated on all sides, and Tory magistrates applied the persecuting Acts against dissenters with renewed energy. In the spring of 1684 Charles felt himself strong enough to refuse to summon a parliament, in defiance of the Triennial Act, and even although the boroughs were now so completely in his hands that he would have been sure of a subservient House of Commons. Danby and certain Roman Catholic lords who had been confined in the Tower at the time of the Popish plot were set at liberty, although they had hitherto been detained on the ground that they had been committed to prison by parliament, and that only the authority of parliament could release them. In defiance of the Test Act, James was restored to his old office at the head of the Admiralty. In the general paralysis it mattered little that the voice of England was silent on continental affairs, and that Tangier was finally abandoned.

Charles had won the game ; but no time was given to him to follow up his victory. In February 1685 he was seized with apoplexy. On his deathbed he received the last Sacraments as a member of the Church of Rome. Monmouth was out of the country, and James II. succeeded to the crown unchallenged. The "merry monarch" preserved to the last his reputation with the nation as a good-natured *fainéant*

"Who never said a foolish thing
And never did a wise one—"

a popular reputation which survived for a century and a half, an unparalleled example of triumphant dissimulation.

CHAPTER XIX

NEMESIS

I

QUEM DEUS VULT PERDERE—

THE position created by the accession of James II. was decidedly paradoxical. England, Ireland, and Scotland were officially Protestant States, in which Roman Catholics were not only barred by the law from holding any public office, whether in the service of the State or of the municipality, but were further penalised for participating in their own religious rites, and for abstaining from participation in the rites of a Church which they accounted heretical. Yet at the head of these Protestant States was a zealous Roman Catholic, who, long after reaching maturity, had deliberately chosen to separate himself from the official established religion and to join the proscribed body. In Ireland it is true that he shared the faith of the great bulk of the population, but in England and in Scotland Protestantism was not merely official; to the bulk of the population the papacy was the Scarlet Woman of the Apocalypse. It was tolerably manifest that the king was bound to demand at least some relaxation in the stringency of the laws against his own co-religionists; but it was no less manifest that concessions could be procured only by tact and maintained or extended only by the exercise of conspicuous moderation.



James II.

[After the engraved portrait by Giffart.]

On the other hand, the masterly dissimulation of Charles II. had enabled him to leave the Crown stronger than it had been at any time since the

death of Elizabeth. A standing army had been created which, if not large, was still large enough, so long as it remained loyal, to secure the king against any serious danger from armed insurrection. For supplies it was true that, unless the king held fast to a policy of extreme economy, he was dependent on the goodwill either of the King of France or of parliament. But the Commons at least were no longer an independent body. County representation was controlled by the country gentlemen who were mainly Tories, and the reconstruction of the corporations had given the Crown the practical control over the boroughs where otherwise Whiggery would have predominated. The clergy of the established religion, moreover, were for the most part committed to doctrines of divine right and of non-resistance. An unobtrusive extension of the principles of toleration ought not to have been out of reach.

Unfortunately for himself and for his cause, James was personally wholly unfitted for his task. He was of all men the most tactless, in a position where tactfulness was a supreme necessity. His incapacity for successful dissimulation had procured him a somewhat spurious reputation for straightforward honesty, but that extremely useful reputation he failed to maintain. As a young man he had been conspicuously fearless in the battle-field, but while he had all the obstinacy which tends to produce crises, he lacked the nerve to face a crisis when it arrived. Within three years of his accession he had successfully alienated all that loyalty which Whig blundering, the crafty duplicity of Charles, and some fortunate accidents had combined to place at his disposal. The revolution of 1688 was a Whig triumph, but it was brought about by royalist Tories and Anglicans not less than by the Whigs. And for that fact the blundering of James himself was chiefly responsible.

Nevertheless the king's first acts had an encouraging aspect. His first declarations affirmed his intention of proving his loyalty to the existing order. The ministers most employed by Charles in his last years had been Rochester, Sunderland, and Godolphin. Although the two latter had both supported the Exclusion Bill they were retained in high office. Rochester had opposed exclusion, like Halifax, but, being Clarendon's son, he represented the tradition of political Anglicanism; he too was retained as Lord Treasurer. It was true that James paraded his own personal adherence to Romanism, but as yet the public at large were content to attribute this not to sinister intentions but to an open honesty. The merciless punishment inflicted upon Titus Oates and his principal accomplice was generally accepted as a mere act of justice; nor was any active resentment aroused when James proceeded to order by royal proclamation the collection of the Customs which had been accorded to Charles for life but had not yet been conferred by parliament on his successor.

Within five months of James's accession the strength of his position had been completely demonstrated. In Scotland the Scottish Estates were convened; and although they emphatically confirmed all the existing statutes

for the security of Protestantism, they increased the severity of the laws against conventicles, extending the application of the death penalty, and introducing that worst period of the persecution known to Scottish tradition as the "Killing Time." In May an English parliament assembled, and the House of Commons showed an overwhelming Tory preponderance. An emphatic declaration on the king's part that he would defend the Church sufficed to secure the enthusiastic loyalty of the Commons. The revenue granted to Charles was renewed to James, and a further large grant was made for naval purposes.

Meanwhile the extreme Whigs, the Exclusionists, who had taken flight from the country after their final rout, made their own desperate attempt. Argyle landed in Scotland and sought to raise an insurrection which was promptly crushed with complete ease; Argyle himself was captured and executed. While the insurrection in the North was collapsing Monmouth landed at Lyme Regis, the south-western corner of Dorsetshire. He asserted his own legitimacy, while professedly leaving his title to the Crown to be decided by parliament. His pose was that of the champion of Protestantism and generally of the constitutional principles advocated by the Whigs. The appeal to Protestantism was effective among the rural population of Somerset and Devon, who flocked to his standard, ill enough armed but full of enthusiasm. But the Whig magnates did not join him, and he destroyed such chance as he had by deserting his first position and proclaiming himself king. Monmouth's valiant rustic levies met the king's troops at Sedgemoor, where they were completely routed in spite of the stubborn valour of their resistance. Monmouth himself was caught and carried prisoner to London, where an Act of Attainder had already been passed against him, and he was as a matter of course executed after unedifying appeals for mercy, which were rejected by the king with equally unedifying harshness.

The king's lack of nerve was shown not only by his alarm on the occasion of Monmouth's rising but by his encouragement of a vile vindictiveness in the punishment of the West Country which followed its very easy suppression. The savageries of "Kirke's Lambs," the troops just returned from Tangier, were only the precursors of the brutalities of Jeffreys, who was sent to conduct the judicial campaign. Foul-mouthed abuse of accused persons and bullying of witnesses smoothed the way for the scandalous sentences which have stamped the memory of Judge Jeffreys with indelible infamy, and have given to his proceedings the name of the Bloody Assize. The number of persons put to death exceeded three hundred, and nearly



The Sedgemoor Campaign, 1685.

three times as many were transported to convict slavery in the West Indies.

Unwittingly, however, Monmouth had done almost the worst possible disservice to James and the best service to Protestantism and constitutionalism that he could possibly have rendered, by getting himself executed. Monmouth was the rock on which the Whigs had split. The moment Monmouth was out of the way every one who was ill content turned his thoughts to the Dutch Stadtholder and his Stuart wife, the heiress-presumptive of the English throne. Neither nobles nor gentry nor commons in England would take up arms to set the crown of England on the head of the son of Lucy Waters merely because a number of Whig leaders had chosen to pretend to believe in his legitimacy. If James had had the wit to spare Monmouth, as his brother would have done in the like case, James's antagonist would have found it exceedingly difficult to procure the intervention of the Prince of Orange. But vindictiveness blinded James to the more subtle policy, and by his own act he smoothed the way for his supplanter.

Before parliament, which was prorogued in the summer, met again in the winter, other events had taken place which materially influenced the situation. For some time past Louis XIV. had been pressing heavily upon his Protestant subjects, who had already begun to seek safety in emigration. In September he revoked the Edict of Nantes, the charter of Huguenot liberties, which for a hundred years past had secured at least a degree of toleration for French Protestants. The revocation let loose a storm of persecution, and Huguenot refugees began crowding to Brandenburg, Holland, and England. The antagonism to popery which had been quieting down was roused anew, in spite of the fact that the Pope and the Hapsburgs, Austrian and Spanish, both denounced the methods of the French king.

James could have selected no worse moment for championing the cause of his co-religionists in his own country. The French king was employing his soldiery for the persecution, and that fact roused anew the general English hostility to a standing army, the more so when Englishmen who turned their eyes northwards saw what the king's troops were doing in the south-west of Scotland. Nevertheless, James met his parliament with a demand for the increase of the standing army, the need of which he thought had been proved by the Monmouth rebellion, and with the announcement that he had nominated as officers men in whom he had personal confidence, but who also happened to be barred from all such appointments by the Test Act. The change in the sentiment of parliament was at once apparent, though it was by a majority of only one that the House of Commons insisted on giving the question of the Roman Catholic officers precedence over that of supply. The victory over the Opposition brought waverers over to their side. In the result a resolution was presented, in which the House engaged to release the officers from the penalties to which they had rendered themselves liable by taking office in defiance of the Test Act, but which in effect invited the king to cancel their appointment. The House of Lords followed suit. The

angry king denounced the conduct of both Houses and prorogued the parliament, which was not again assembled, though it was not actually dissolved till the midsummer of 1687.

II

—PRIUS DEMENTAT

Never did monarch quite so deliberately seek his own ruin as James II. The strength of the monarchy in England rested upon the support of the Church, and the loyalty of the gentry in intimate alliance with the Church. The clergy and the squires might, not without reluctance but without violent opposition, have been induced to accept a gradual relaxation of the penalties attaching to Romanism constitutionally conceded by themselves; but James fell back on the old plan of forcing his will on the country by the exercise of the royal prerogative, and of doing so in direct defiance of Anglican sentiment. Moreover, by recklessly reviving a parliamentary opposition in a House of Commons which had met filled with a loyalty which was prepared to run quite considerable risks, James had lost his international independence. At the moment of his accession he could have carried England into the general combination of European Powers, Protestant and Catholic, which was shaping for resistance to the aggressive policy of the French king. After his quarrel with parliament, which he prorogued without obtaining the supplies for which he had asked, James was forced to appeal to Louis for the financial aid which was not forthcoming from elsewhere; practically he had to come to Louis as a suppliant not as a bargainer, and even Charles's ingenuity had found it hard work to reconcile England to his own covert union with his cousin of France.

James then set himself to widen the breach with the Anglican Church and those who, having at the outset been prepared to support him loyally, had swelled the ranks of the Opposition at the end of 1685. Every one who had helped in his defeat was dismissed from office, and a direct attack was made on Compton, the Bishop of London. James created a new Court of Ecclesiastical Commission on the lines of the old Court of High Commission; and on it there were only two bishops, with five laymen, the President being Jeffreys. Compton was immediately suspended for refusing to suppress a preacher who had taken up his parable against popery.

The king's next step was to procure a judicial decision in favour of the dispensing power. Before a select court a test case was collusively brought against the Roman Catholic Colonel Hales for holding his commission without obeying the requirements of the Test Act. Hales pleaded dispensation from the Crown, and the court, with one dissentient, gave judgment in his favour. A batch of Romanist peers was admitted to the Privy Council, a Romanist was made Dean of Christchurch at Oxford, and it was commonly believed that the Archbishopric of York was being held open while the king

tried to obtain leave of the Pope to appoint to it the Jesuit Petre. A "No Popery" riot in London gave James an excuse for concentrating a force of sixteen thousand men on Hounslow Heath. While Sunderland was only waiting to avow himself a Roman Catholic, Rochester, at the beginning of 1687, resigned the Treasurership when he found that dismissal was the only alternative to changing his religion. At the same time Rochester's brother, Clarendon, was recalled from Ireland, where he held the deputyship, which was now placed in the hands of the Romanist Richard Talbot, Earl of Tyrconnell.

By this time it was sufficiently manifest that James was aiming at establishing a complete Romanist ascendancy by the use of the royal prerogative. It was also clear that he had completely broken with Anglican Toryism. But the English Roman Catholics provided a foundation far too narrow for the throne to rest upon with safety. James and his Jesuit advisers—for it must be remembered that he, like Louis, had allied himself not with the Pope but with the Jesuits—resolved to seek the alliance of the Protestant dissenters. The issue of this resolve was a Declaration of Indulgence, put forth by the royal authority alone, which granted liberty of public worship to all Non-conformists, Protestant or Romanist, and suspended the application of all religious tests to holders of public offices. Anglicanism was scarcely reassured by the accompanying declaration that the established church was to be maintained and the lay holders of what had once been ecclesiastical property were not to be disturbed.

Toleration then had been granted at a stroke, and for the moment James felt that he had won, since grateful addresses poured in from the Non-conformist bodies. But the surprised delight of the dissenters soon gave place to alarm. It was true that they at once began to find themselves displacing in the corporations the Tories who had for so long held the monopoly, but it very soon became apparent that the higher offices of State were not to be open to all, but were to be made a preserve for Roman Catholics, and that all the more important administrative offices were to be filled after the same fashion. Oxford itself, the headquarters of Anglicanism, was attacked; and Magdalen College was cleared of its Anglican Fellows, whose places were taken by Roman Catholics.

These proceedings had the double effect of goading the Anglicans out of their attitude of non-resistance and passive obedience, and of alarming the Nonconformists. Toleration in itself was good; toleration by royal decree was questionable; toleration as exercised by the Crown might very soon be translated into a Romanist tyranny. The first Nonconformist enthusiasm was rapidly changing to a suspicious antagonism. James made another bid for the support of the dissenters by issuing a second Declaration of Indulgence, followed by an order that the clergy should read it from their pulpits on two appointed Sundays.

By that order passive obedience was strained to the utmost. A meeting of London clergy resolved on the exceedingly moderate course of presenting

a respectful petition to the king praying that the order might be withdrawn, and challenging the legality of the suspension of statutes by royal prerogative. The petition was presented in the name of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Sancroft, and six more bishops; the saintly Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells, Trelawney of Bristol, White of Peterborough, Lloyd of St. Asaph, Lake of Chichester, and Turner of Ely. This was two days before the Declaration was to be read. Next day the petition was printed and circulated. On the Sunday the churches were filled with anxious congregations, but only in four places was the Declaration read; to the joy of dissenters as well as of Anglicans. The king plunged forward along the fatal path which he had chosen. He resolved to prosecute the bishops for publishing a "seditious libel." Three weeks after the presentation of the petition the seven bishops were lodged in the Tower to await trial, their passage thither being accompanied by the sympathising applause of the populace.

Public excitement was already at fever heat; two days later it was roused to a still higher pitch by the announcement that at last a son had been born to James. With that strange infatuation which clung to every act of the king, the strict ceremonial attending the birth of a royal infant was neglected. Nine-tenths of the public believed, as might have been expected in the circumstances, that the story was a fiction; that the babe was supposititious, not the offspring of the queen at all. There were several details which gave colour to the rumour. The birth provided an heir-apparent to the throne who would certainly be brought up as a Roman Catholic. The child would exclude Mary of Orange and her husband, unless, as the Princess Anne remarked, it "became an angel in heaven." Hitherto Protestants had reckoned with confidence that, whatever James himself might do, it was at least certain that his successor would be a Protestant. The certainty vanished with the birth of the boy. Excited Romanists, including the king, discovered that a miracle had been wrought; excited Protestants discovered not a miracle but a monstrous fraud.

Again three weeks passed and the day of the trial of the bishops arrived. At first it was hoped that the charge would collapse upon technical points, but the Crown surmounted the technical difficulties. The case was fought out on its merits. Of the four judges, two summed up in favour of the Crown, two in favour of the bishops. The jury at first declared themselves unable to agree. They were shut up for the night to argue it out. In the morning it was announced, to the frenzied joy of the populace, that the seven bishops were acquitted. Ominously enough for the king,



The Seven Bishops.

[From a medal contemporary with the trial.]

even "Kirke's Lambs" on Hounslow Heath shouted their Protestant satisfaction.

James had urged on the prosecution, fanatically credulous that the birth of his son had been a signal mark of Heaven's favour for the course which he was pursuing. On the night after the seven bishops were acquitted, Admiral Herbert, disguised as a common seaman, was carrying to The Hague a letter inviting the intervention of William of Orange; it bore the signatures of the Tories Danby and Lumley, of the Whig Earls of Devonshire and Shrewsbury, of Henry Sidney and Edward Russell, brothers of the two chief victims of the Rye House Plot, and of Compton, the Bishop of London.

III

FULFILMENT

William of Orange was primarily a Dutch patriot whose ruling passion was the desire to curb the aggression of Louis XIV. If he wanted the crown of England, which, until the birth of King James's son, had seemed likely to descend to his own wife in the natural course of events, it was not from motives of personal ambition, but because it would secure England as the ally of Holland against France. As matters stood, while James reigned in England the king, if left to his own devices, was very unlikely to join an anti-French coalition, although English sentiment was notoriously hostile to France. William had no idea of coming forward as the champion of an English party to eject James from his throne and seat himself on it as an obvious usurper. The defence of Holland against Louis was much more to him than the acquisition of an exceedingly unstable throne which would prevent him from throwing all his energies into European politics. But it would be a very different thing if he reinforced English public opinion so as to enable it to compel James to act as it directed. To do so, however, it was imperative for him to be quite certain that his intervention would be acceptable to public opinion, and that the policy he advocated would be endorsed by it. The birth of the prince gave him a fresh incentive. There was no longer any reason to expect that sooner or later his wife would succeed to the throne without any intervention on his part. Already in spring he had gone so far as to promise that he would intervene in arms if a request that he should do so came from sufficiently influential quarters. That request had now come, backed by the urgent advice that he should cancel his first formal recognition of the birth of an heir to the throne, and should assert his wife's title to the succession, repudiating the legitimacy of the lately born infant.

Louis XIV., unfortunately for himself, played into the hands of his adversary. In order that William might take active steps in England it was in the first place necessary for him to have an effective force of Dutch troops at his disposal to take part in the enterprise, since it would by no means


have satisfied him to depend upon insurrectionary levies in face of the king's troops. In the second place William could not move if Holland itself were being immediately threatened by Louis ; in such circumstances Dutch troops, the Dutch navy, and the Dutch Stadtholder could not absent themselves. In the third place it was desirable to avoid giving the enterprise the appearance of an anti-Catholic crusade lest William's Catholic allies on the continent should be offended.

Now Louis, by the great persecution of his own Protestant subjects, had secured the predominance of the anti-French party in Protestant Holland ; suspicions of an alliance between James and Louis fostered there the sentiment which favoured William's plan. The Stadtholder found no great difficulty in procuring means for substantial armament, nominally for the defence of Holland. Again, if Louis had realised what would be the outcome of William's intervention in England, he might have secured himself against future woes by merely keeping the Dutch in fear of invasion. But he grasped at the prospect of an immediate gain instead of warding off the future danger. The office of Archbishop of Cologne, whose holder was one of the seven electoral princes of the Empire, was vacant. Louis's candidate for the electorship was defeated by the Imperial and Papal candidate, through the action of the Pope, and Louis resolved to enforce his claim at the sword's point. French troops entered the Palatinate. Louis, if the phrase may be permitted, killed two of William's birds for him with one stone. He had in effect made an aggressive attack at once on the two heads, ecclesiastical and secular, of Roman Catholic Christendom, the Pope and the Emperor. There was no fear that those powers would now quarrel with William for an enterprise to restrain James from associating himself with Louis. And further, by invading the Palatinate, Louis had committed himself to a campaign which precluded him from making any immediate attack upon Holland, and had thereby set William and the Dutch troops and fleet free for independent action.

No one except Louis and James had any ostensible ground for opposing William's policy. More than twelve months ago, in response to James's attempt to procure his endorsement of the policy of "toleration," he had very expressly made known his own view—that freedom of worship was desirable, but that the religious tests, as conditions of holding public office, ought not to be withdrawn. That satisfied nine-tenths of the people of England, and satisfied also the Catholic Powers.

Meanwhile, for nearly three months after the acquittal of the bishops James continued to blunder along the old line, dismissed the two judges who had been in favour of the bishops, threatened the clergy who had abstained from reading the Declaration of Indulgence, and shut his eyes to William's preparations. Then he took sudden alarm. Troops were hurried over from Ireland and summoned from Scotland. Despairing of vigorous support from the dissenters, the king executed a *volte face*, and made a series of concessions to the Anglicans. Officials who had been dismissed for adhering to the Test Act were reinstated. And yet although he had

announced his intention of summoning a parliament—in which the Commons, for reasons already explained, would have been in effect a packed assembly, and the Lords could have been controlled by the creation of peers and the readmission of Roman Catholics—he feared the risks; parliament was not summoned. Louis had tried to save him by warning the United Provinces that any movement on their part against James would be treated as an act of hostility to himself. To conciliate the Dutch James made overtures to them, accompanied by declarations that there was no treaty between himself and Louis. The Dutch took the overtures for a trap, and declined to be ensnared; but Louis was extremely irritated, and at once cancelled the pre-




The Embarkation of William of Orange for England, 1688.

[After a contemporary print.]

parations which he had just resolved upon for direct measures against Holland.

At the end of October all that William needed was a favourable wind; until then westerly gales had defeated all attempts to set sail. But on November 1st a "Protestant wind" from the east carried William's ships to sea, while it held James's fleet wind-locked in the estuary of the Thames. William passed down channel unmolested and landed at Tor Bay on November 5th.

William's arrival aroused no enthusiasm. He was not naturally endowed with the superficial qualities which make for an easy if insecure popularity, nor did he ever condescend to cultivate them. He had none of the winning graces on which Shaftesbury had relied when he chose Monmouth to be the rival of James. Moreover he was a foreigner, and Englishmen are seldom ready to take a foreigner on trust. Also the nation was not in love with revolutions, and was doubting whether a revolution would be really



THE LANDING OF WILLIAM III AT BRIGHAM, TORBAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1688

From a painting by an unknown artist at Hampton Court Palace, by permission of the Lord Chamberlain.

necessary to secure its present aims. The king had conceded so much during the last weeks that there was reasonable hope of extracting the rest of the national demands without proceeding to the last extremities. Had a Tudor been upon the throne of England William would not have been long in the country unless as a prisoner.

But James, as usual, carefully threw away all his chances. The obviously politic course he could hardly have been expected to follow. That course would have been the immediate summoning of a parliament and the dismissal of Romanist officials. James, in plain terms, could have secured his throne if he could have brought himself frankly to accept the principle which William had publicly recommended—of toleration for all forms of worship accompanied by religious tests for public office. His son-in-law would have been left with no justification for remaining in the country, except the demand that James should deny the legitimacy of the infant prince, a demand which it would have been quite impossible to make good.

With this James would not be content; but he still had an alternative. If he had appealed to the nation as the national king, declining to accept the dictation of English affairs by a foreign prince backed by a foreign army, the probabilities were that his appeal would have been successful. That chance he spoilt by his conspicuous mistrust of Englishmen. Even his own English troops were already disgusted by the arrival of the Irish regiments; instead of assuming that all true patriots must be on his side, and would join him in teaching the foreign invader a severe lesson, he made it obvious that he was afraid to fight William. By behaving as if his cause was already lost, he ruined a more than respectable chance of victory. A rapid march to the west would have created a conviction of confidence which would have secured the waverers on his own side; vacillation and the display of his desire to remove the infant prince out of the country to safe quarters in France had the precisely contrary effect. With every day's delay the certainty increased that the malcontents would declare for William, and when once they began to do so openly a steady stream of desertions was assured. And meanwhile William was carefully abstaining from any action which might arouse hostility, and was maintaining the theory that he was in England not to claim the crown, but to secure a free parliament and a constitutional government.

Ten days after William's landing men began to declare themselves, many of the gentry of the west joining William's standard. Danby in Yorkshire and the Earl of Devonshire in the Midlands began to raise troops in those regions. James had given the command of his troops to the incompetent Lord Feversham, who was a Frenchman born. When it was decided that the forces, which were assembled at Salisbury, should fall back to cover London instead of taking the offensive, John Churchill and the Duke of Grafton went over to William; they were followed immediately by George of Denmark, the husband of the Princess Anne, and then by Anne herself.

Before the end of the month James had made up his mind that the game was lost and that flight was the only course left for him, although in the meantime he had agreed to a course which might have saved his throne. The Tories who had remained loyal to him, reinforced by Halifax, extracted from him the promise to summon a parliament in January, dismiss the popish officers, break off alliance with France, issue a general amnesty, and send three of their own number—Halifax, Nottingham, and Godolphin—as commissioners to treat with William. But even when the commissioners were treating he succeeded in despatching his wife and child out of the country; and on the same night he himself took flight, dropping the great seal into the Thames by way of embarrassing any possible administration, after having, with the same object, destroyed the writs for the assembling of parliament.

The king's flight cleared the way, or seemed to do so, for William to establish a provisional government. Some of the most unpopular of James's adherents attempted to follow his example; Judge Jeffreys, amongst others, was caught and hardly saved from the fury of the mob, to die soon afterwards in the Tower. And yet James was given another chance. By sheer accident the fugitive was caught by some fishermen and detained at Sheerness. The Council of Peers, who had temporarily assumed the functions of a government, brought him back to London, where, in the curiously oscillating state of public opinion, his return was received with bonfires, bell-ringing, and general acclamation.

Nevertheless the flight itself had really sealed James's fate. It had seemed for the moment to give William what he could not venture to claim; for it was one thing to eject James by force, and quite another to act on the assumption that his voluntary flight was equivalent to an abdication. It had carried over Halifax and others of James's ablest supporters to William's camp, and it was now William's object to frighten James into a repetition of the performance, and to take care that this time his escape should be unhindered. Some display of coercion was all that was needed to give effect to William's design. On December 22 James fled for the second time, to be hospitably received by the king of France, who established him in the palace of St. Germain.

The disappearance of the king left no legal government in England. There was no parliament, and no existing council which could claim authority. William was the only person who could deal with the emergency, and he did so characteristically. He summoned an assembly consisting of all those who had sat in any of the parliaments of Charles II.; not members of James's parliament, because elections since the suspension of the charters were held not to have been free. To these were added fifty members of the corporation of London. This assembly promptly resolved that a free Convention should be summoned, a parliament in all but name, like the Convention which recalled Charles II. Till this body should be assembled William was requested to exercise the executive functions of government, and to this request he

acceded. The boroughs elected their representatives under the old charters which had been cancelled in the last years of Charles II.

The Convention's first step was to pass two resolutions—that James by his flight had abdicated the throne, which was therefore vacant; and that it was against public policy that it should be occupied by a prince of the popish religion. By the Lords, however, the first resolution was so far changed that it did not assert the throne to be vacant. The Commons, among whom there was a great Whig preponderance, in effect declared that a monarch was to be elected; the Lords implied that some one or other was already *de jure* monarch. The settlement was not a very simple matter. Many Tories clung to the old plan of a regency. Danby and others, supported by some of the Whigs, desired to claim the crown for Mary herself. According to the strict law of hereditary succession, if the infant prince were excluded, Mary stood first, Anne and her children next, and after them William. These three came to the rescue. Mary de-



A medal commemorating the flight of James II.: the breaking of the oak and the flourishing of the orange tree.

clined to accept the crown unless it was shared by her husband. Anne recognised that it would be to the public advantage that William should reign, and that her own succession should be deferred till after his death as well as Mary's. William recognised that this was a personal arrangement, and that in the event of his having children by another wife than Mary, Anne and her offspring should have precedence of those children. It merely remained for William to remark that he did not claim the throne for himself, but that he had no intention of remaining in England in any capacity except that of king. If the crown were offered him he would accept it; if it were not he would return to Holland. Both Houses were now ready to accept the solution which placed William and Mary on the throne as joint sovereigns, the sovereignty being continued to the survivor. If they had children, those children would succeed their parents in due course; if not, Anne and her children would succeed. William being the next heir, his children by any subsequent marriage would stand next in the succession, and after them the Protestant who stood nearest to the throne, whoever that might be.

It was further resolved that, before the throne should be actually filled, securities should be obtained for the national laws, liberties, and religion. But it was clearly impossible to wait for the preparation of a detailed written

constitution ; and the Houses satisfied themselves by drawing up the Declaration of Right. The practices of the last two reigns which were regarded as subversive of the constitution were precisely set forth. Thus once more the exaction of money without a direct parliamentary grant was expressly prohibited ; the suspending and dispensing powers—the right, that is, of suspending the general operation of a statute, as in the case of the Declaration of Indulgence, or of granting dispensations from its operation in particular cases, as in the appointment of Romanist officials—was pronounced contrary to the law ; so was the maintenance of a standing army without consent of parliament ; so was the establishment of arbitrary courts, such as that of Ecclesiastical Commission. Popular rights were further definitely asserted ; the right of presenting petitions to the king, violated by the treatment of the seven bishops ; the right of free election and free debate in parliament ; and the right to the frequent assembly of parliament. The crown was offered to William and Mary conditionally on their acceptance of this latest charter of national liberties. Their acceptance was accompanied by the Act of Settlement fixing the succession on the lines laid down ; and William and Mary were proclaimed king and queen of England and Ireland on February 13, 1689. Thus was the Glorious Revolution of Whig tradition carried to completion ; and since the official New Year was still dated not from the January 1 but from March 25, 1688 remained the titular date year of the new order.

CHAPTER XX

THE REVOLUTION

I

THE REVOLUTION SETTLEMENT

KING WILLIAM III. had neither sought nor accepted the crown of England as a nominee of a political party. He was king because if James and his son were excluded from the throne Mary and her husband were in effect the only possible occupants. Being king, he was resolved to rule conscientiously and impartially, but the government of the new kingdoms was in his eyes secondary to his aims as the leader of European resistance to French aggression. So long as he could best serve those aims by retaining the English crown, that crown was of use to him, but if he found himself hampered in his foreign policy by the action of English parties, England would be merely an incubus. His strength lay in the fact that England could not afford to let him go.

On the other hand, he was accepted without enthusiasm by any party. Of the Tories many were wedded to the doctrine of passive obedience, and only acquiesced in the new order because of their fears of a Romanist domination, with doubt in their hearts if not on their lips whether their allegiance to James could be discarded on any pretext whatever. Half the Whigs, on the other hand, wanted in effect to have a republic with a royal figurehead, not a monarch with a will of his own. One party, in short, was inclined, if provoked, to challenge his title, and the other to curtail his prerogative, but neither was prepared to go so far as to drive him to resign his crown. And William did not himself wish to resign his crown so long as the possession of it served the purposes of his continental policy.

Now, unlike William himself, the English people were more keenly



William III.

interested in their domestic concerns than in the problem of bridling the ambitions of Louis XIV. They were unfriendly to Louis mainly perhaps on account of his persecution of the Protestants. They were quite willing to see him bridled, and they were very unwilling indeed to support him actively; but foreign affairs were in their eyes secondary to domestic concerns. William chafed, while the Convention, transformed into a parliament by his establishment on the throne, insisted on giving precedence to the affairs which in its eyes were of primary interest.



Queen Mary II.

One of the first Acts of the parliament incidentally solved a problem which had been left unsettled by the Declaration of Right. A regiment on the point of embarkation for Holland mutinied and declared for King James. A Mutiny Act was consequently passed which, while it provided for the maintenance of the army for six months, afterwards extended to twelve, subjected deserters to punishment by martial law. In effect it followed that at the conclusion of the twelve months the standing army would cease to exist unless the Act were renewed. By making twelve months the period of the Act, the parliament also made it necessary that the Houses should be summoned annually; that is, that twelve months should not pass without their being assembled. The duration of parlia-

ment was not touched, nor was there any formal Act requiring that parliament should meet; but its annual assembly was from thenceforth an administrative necessity. Like the Habeas Corpus Act, this measure, of great constitutional importance, was unpremeditated, and became law almost by accident.

The first obviously necessary step was the imposition of an oath of allegiance to the new Government, the penalty for its refusal being disability to hold office. Apart from the clergy there were not many refusals; even those who held that James was still king *de jure* accepted William's *de facto* sovereignty. Among the clergy, however, there was a less ready acquiescence. Many of them were thoroughly committed to the doctrine of non-resistance, and felt unable to transfer their allegiance. Five of "the seven bishops" demonstrated their loyalty to principle by refusing the oath, and their example was followed by some hundreds of the clergy,

who, as a necessary consequence, resigned their preferments. No further penalty however was exacted, and the "Non-Jurors," as they were called, for the most part continued to find congregations or patrons who approved of their principles and provided them with a livelihood.

The Declaration of Right left unsettled sundry constitutional questions which still required to be dealt with by statute; but before these came up for consideration it was necessary to arrange religious affairs. William himself was a Calvinist, while his wife was an Anglican; sentiment and policy caused both of them to favour toleration. But the events preceding the Revolution had hardened popular feeling against Romanists, while they had clearly given to the Protestant dissenters a very strong claim for consideration. The latter, in spite of strong temptation, had declined the benefits conceded to them by the Declaration of Indulgence, when they found that the price to be paid for them involved absolutist innovations and Romanist ascendancy. Churchmen, in consequence, had gone far towards committing themselves at least to a relaxation of the laws which pressed upon dissenters. The Revolution itself and its stability were in so great a degree due to the attitude of the Nonconformists that the Revolutionary Government could not have left their position unaltered.

The first method of dealing with the situation proposed was a Comprehension Bill, which was intended to admit within the pale of the Church a large number of the Nonconformists, a measure on the lines which had been anticipated by the Presbyterians on the Restoration of Charles II. But during the years intervening the barrier between Nonconformity and orthodox Churchmanship had hardened. While the theory of comprehension was perhaps generally approved, the practical difficulties were not easy to overcome, and the bill was dropped before reaching the final stage. A substitute was found in a Toleration Act, which virtually conceded freedom of public worship and cancelled the whole effects of the Conventicle and Five Mile Acts. But there was no relaxation of the laws as applied to Papists, or to those whose rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity excluded them from recognition as Christians. But if freedom of public worship was granted, the retention of the Test and Corporation Acts still shut out Nonconformists as well as Papists from the official service of the State or the municipality, military and naval as well as civil, and they continued to be debarred from the education of the universities. Not till the nineteenth century were these disabilities removed, although their effect was minimised partly by technical devices, and partly in course of time by annual Acts of Indemnity for breaches of the law. In effect what the Toleration Act did was to leave the position of Romanists unchanged and to retain the disabling Acts against Protestant dissenters, while relieving them from the penal portions of the Clarendon Code.

William, in accordance with the principle upon which he always desired to act, selected his ministers from both parties, while his real confidence continued to be given to his own compatriots. Danby and Nottingham

came from the Tory side, Shrewsbury was a Whig, Halifax had acted independently of party, and had at one time or another led and opposed both sections. Churchill's services procured him the earldom of Marlborough. Danby, with a painful disregard for the convenience of future generations, was made Marquis of Caermarthen; five years later the confusion was made worse by his elevation to the dukedom of Leeds. Having noted the fact, it may be found simplest to refer to him throughout by the first and most familiar of his titles. This recognition of Tories was displeasing to the Whigs with their substantial majority in the Commons, since they had intended to make the victory their own, to appropriate the spoils, and to punish vindictively all those who had aided and abetted the Crown in excluding them from power. Danby and Halifax were the special objects of their hostility. William, on the other hand, was convinced that he needed the support of the Tories as a body, and was strongly opposed to taking measures which would inevitably alienate them. The Whig proposal to retaliate on the Tories, by disabling every one concerned in the upsetting of the old corporations from holding municipal office, brought about the dissolution of the Convention Parliament and the summoning of a new one in March 1690.

Before the dissolution the Declaration of Right received statutory confirmation as the Bill of Rights. The bill was not precisely identical with the Declaration, since it was more precise and complete in the abolition of the dispensing as distinct from the suspending power. Hitherto it had been generally assumed that the former might legitimately be exercised upon occasion; but the abuse of it which had converted an exceptional privilege into a normal procedure caused it to be done away with altogether. There was also much discussion as to distinguishing the next Protestant heir by name. This was in fact Sophia, the wife of the Elector of Hanover and sister of Prince Rupert. But there were various possibilities that other persons with a prior legitimist title might become entitled to precedence by adopting Protestantism before the succession became an immediate question, and her nomination was rejected. The Protestant succession was secured, however, by the requirement that every future sovereign should make the Declaration laid down in the Test Act, and that marriage with a Papist should be a bar.

When the new parliament met Halifax was driven to resign office by the violence of the attacks upon him. The general result was that the Whigs lost their majority in the Commons, while Danby became the predominant figure in Council. There was not, of course, a formal reconstruction of the ministry on party lines, but practically the Whigs in parliament assumed the character of an Opposition. The king, however, checked the attempt at reprisals for the past by proposing an Act of Grace, from the benefits of which only a few persons were excluded, chief among whom was Sunderland. When the parliament had bestowed upon William and Mary for life the permanent revenue which had been conferred upon Charles

and James, the most pressing parliamentary questions were settled, and William left Mary in England associated with a group of "Lords Justices" in control of the Administration, while he himself went over to Ireland where danger was threatening.

II

IRELAND

In England, and, as we shall presently see, in Scotland, the strength of Protestantism ensured the rule of William and Mary against anything like a national insurrection. Nothing of the kind was attempted in the one country; in the other, though Dundee raised the standard of King James, it was with the knowledge that the Jacobite cause could not succeed without reinforcements, and when Dundee himself fell in battle the victory of the government was assured. With Ireland, however, the case was very different. There the great bulk of the population was Roman Catholic. That population had its particular grievances, besides the general grievance of subjection to England; but it had every reason to favour a Stuart régime with its promise of a Catholic ascendancy, in preference to that of a government pledged to Protestant principles and the repression of Romanists.

In Ireland, then, while there was no particular sentiment of loyalty to the House of Stuart, personal interest drew the majority of the population to favour the Jacobite cause. In Ireland, moreover, the rule of Tyrconnell under James II. had in effect transferred political power to the Romanists. In Ireland, as in England, the corporations had been manipulated, but in Ireland there was no Test Act to preserve their Protestantism. And for Ireland the restoration of James would mean a revolution and the upsetting of the Land Settlement, made on the restoration of Charles, which had kept the proprietorship of the soil in the hands of the Protestant minority.

Now, England had not forgotten the Irish insurrection of 1641, nor the fears of an Irish army being employed for the coercion of England when Strafford was Deputy. James looked to Ireland as the base from which he would be able to recover the crown of England. But to William that country appeared to be of minor importance; he had no inclination to withdraw troops from England to serve in Ireland, especially as Tyrconnell, who had the whole Irish administration in his own hands, appeared willing to negotiate. The king sent over Tyrconnell's brother-in-law to arrange terms, but the agent promptly associated himself with the Earl, who, after a very brief delay, threw off the mask. The Protestant settlers outside Ulster were quickly overpowered, and, in Ulster, were swept into Londonderry and Enniskillen. Before the end of March, 1689, James himself had landed at Cork without any attempt having been made to obstruct his passage, and proceeded to Dublin, where he summoned a parliament.

The action of that parliament showed the use which the long depressed majority intended to make of the advantage which they believed themselves to have won. Their declaration in favour of James was a matter of course; so was their announcement of toleration for all religions. Next came a series of acts oversetting the claims of the English parliament and English authorities to override the parliament of Ireland. Landowners were in future to pay the tithe to their own Church; but, as the overturning of the Land Settlement practically displaced all Protestant landowners in favour of Catholics, this meant that the tithe would go to the Roman Catholic clergy, who were no longer to be barred from holding ecclesiastical appointments. But the most subversive measures referred to the land. All forfeitures and settlements since 1641 were cancelled; the land was to be restored in possession to the representatives of those who had possessed



Londonderry about 1680.

[From a contemporary drawing in the British Museum.]

it at that date. The lands of persons now in "rebellion" against James II. were to be appropriated to the Crown, and from them compensation was to be provided for those persons who had bought land since the Settlement and were displaced by the restoration of such land to its former owners. How the land of these rebels could be at the same time appropriated to the Crown and restored to the original owners the legislators did not pause to inquire. Parliament went on to pass an Act of Attainder containing the names of some sixty peers and more than two thousand commoners. Their property was forfeited, but they were to have the opportunity of taking their trial, and recovering it if they proved themselves innocent. The amazing proceedings of this parliament may perhaps account for the extreme vindictiveness displayed when a Protestant parliament recovered the mastery.

During the summer months it appeared quite possible that the Protestants might be wiped out altogether. Enniskillen was hard pressed, and

Londonderry was subjected to a rigorous siege and close investment. Within those towns, however, there was a fine spirit of stubborn resistance. The Derry garrison was resolved to hold out to the last gasp. After long delay English troops, under the command of the notorious Colonel Kirke, reached Lough Foyle, only to declare themselves unable to force the boom which guarded the river. But when the garrison was on the verge of sheer starvation urgent advices from England put an end to Kirke's inaction. The boom was forced, Londonderry was relieved, and when once the blockade was broken the siege was useless. On the same day the garrison of Enniskillen met and routed at Newton Butler a superior force which had been sent against them.

In William's own view the sound course of action was not to divert forces to Ireland, but to employ them in a direct attack on France, since the French were assisting King James with men, money, and stores. But he could not resist the pressure of public opinion, and his principal marshal, Schomberg, once a Huguenot officer in the armies of King Louis, was despatched to Ulster. But his force was attacked by sickness, and he was unable to adopt an offensive strategy. As the spring of 1690 advanced William resolved to bring the Irish War to a conclusion—to throw a large force into the country, and to take command of it himself.

It is not easy to understand why so little had hitherto been done by the fleets either of France or of England. To either, the effective command of the seas should have secured effective mastery in Ireland. Apparently each was afraid to challenge the other. Under the influence of Colbert France had acquired a powerful fleet even in the time of the last Anglo-Dutch War. But while England had only made one abortive attempt to sever the communications between France and Ireland, when Admiral Herbert was defeated at Bantry Bay, France now made no attempt to interfere with the passage of William, his troops and his supplies, to Ireland. When the thing was done the able French Admiral Tourville took the seas and inflicted a disastrous defeat on the combined English and Dutch squadrons off Beachy Head, thereby creating a panic in England. But for the purposes of the Irish War his victory was perfectly futile. The engagement at Beachy Head took place on June 30th; on July 1st William routed James's army at the Boyne Water. James hastily concluded that his cause was lost and fled to Waterford, whence he found his way by sea to France.

Apart from the fact that William had to effect the difficult operation of forcing a ford in the face of the enemy, no great interest would have attached to the battle of the Boyne if it had not moved James to take flight. As it was, Ulster and Leinster were lost to the Jacobites, but their hold on Connaught and Munster was not relaxed. The French were predominant on the sea, and four important Irish harbours were open to them. England for the moment was almost denuded of troops, and probably the invasion of England was more immediately practicable than at any time before or since. But Louis declined to make the attempt, and the next time that the

French and English fleets met the balance was to be turned decisively and permanently in favour of England.

The panic caused by the battle of Beachy Head was somewhat allayed by the news of the Boyne, and by the discovery that the French fleet intended to make no further use of its victory. William's own return to England was delayed by his desire to capture Limerick, into which a valiant band of Irish Jacobites threw themselves when both Tyrconnell and the French General Lauzun had lost heart. But William was eager to leave Ireland and take the command of the armies in Holland, and when his first approach was repulsed by Patrick Sarsfield he withdrew. Marlborough, however, undertook a campaign in the south, which at once deprived the Jacobites of the valuable harbours of Cork and Kinsale. In June and July of the following year Ginckel, to whom William had now entrusted the Irish command, defeated the French commander St. Ruth at



A medal of 1690 commemorative of the Battle of the Boyne.

Athlone and Aghrim, and only Limerick remained to offer a desperate resistance. When Ginckel brought up the siege guns which had hitherto been wanting, Sarsfield saw that the defence could not be maintained. He succeeded in obtaining terms which were the well-deserved reward of a heroic defence. The garrisons were given free leave to depart and enroll themselves in the Irish regiments, which were to render splendid service to France in her wars for many a year to come. But beyond this, pledges were given that the Irish Roman Catholics were to have the same religious freedom as in the reign of Charles II. Practically the terms of the capitulation of Limerick itself were to be applied to all the remaining Jacobite garrisons, who had the choice of free withdrawal or of remaining as the liege subjects of King William in the enjoyment of a complete amnesty. The capitulation was in effect a general treaty to which the alternative would have been a prolonged guerilla war which it was of the utmost importance to William that he should avoid.

The disastrous breach of faith which followed the capitulation and the self-chosen exile of Ireland's most enterprising sons was the most

shameful episode in the history of the relations between Ireland and England. The English parliament at Westminster passed a law for Ireland which was, broadly speaking, an application of the Test Act to all office-holders and members of parliament in Ireland. The result was the assembly of an exclusively Protestant parliament in Dublin, and that parliament made haste to tear up the Treaty of Limerick. The proceedings of James's Irish parliament were annulled, and a series of penal laws against the Catholics were enacted. Papists were forbidden to teach in schools, to carry arms, or to send their children abroad to be educated. The Romanist clergy were exiled. The estates of Roman Catholics descended not to the oldest son but to all the sons; if one of them elected to turn Protestant the whole estate passed to him; and if a Protestant heiress married a Papist she forfeited her title. In a country where four-fifths of the population were Romanists every Romanist was cut off from participation in public affairs, from military service, from educating his children, from acquiring land, or from handing down a consolidated estate to later generations. The utter helplessness to which the Catholics were reduced is shown by the paralysis which fell upon them. Jacobitism never again lifted its head in Ireland, not because the Irish would not have been Jacobites if they could, but because they could not if they would.

III

SCOTLAND

The reign of James II. or James VII. had opened in Scotland that period of cruel persecution known as the "Killing Time." To this era belong the most famous of the martyrdoms, the shooting of the carrier John Brown before the eyes of his wife, and the drowning of Margaret Wilson and Margaret M'Lauchlan in the Solway, with the latter of which, it may be remarked, Claverhouse was in no way concerned. But the persecuting policy was no more possible for James in Scotland than in England; it inevitably gave place in the Northern as well as in the Southern country to the policy of theoretical toleration. In Scotland, as in England, it was not possible to aim at the advancement of Roman Catholics, or even at their general relief, without conceding a like freedom to the Nonconformist Protestants. In proportion as the law bore more hardly on a larger portion of the population, the Scottish Presbyterians were more ready than their English brethren to accept the Indulgence decreed by the king in both countries in 1687.

It must further be observed that there was not in Scotland the same constitutional ground as in England for rejecting as dangerous gifts bestowed by the arbitrary power of the Crown, because the constitutional powers of the Crown were not limited either by custom or by statute as they were in

England. Yet the fact that the king's real purpose was the advancement of Papists was sufficiently manifest, and caused uneasiness and resentment on all sides. Opposition, however, was much more difficult to organise effectively, while the forces of the Crown were not merely, as in England, a coercive power which the Crown held in reserve, but a normally active instrument for the repression of opposition.


Thus the position in Scotland presented itself to James as perfectly secure, and he had no qualms in summoning Claverhouse, who had now become Viscount Dundee, to lead the bulk of the Scottish troops over the border in the autumn of 1688. But by so doing his government lost the control of Scotland. A stream of malcontents hurried to the South with the obvious intention of adapting their own further action to the course of events in England. The flight of James to France paralysed his supporters, and immediately after the formal acceptance of the crown of England by William and Mary, a Convention Parliament assembled in Scotland.

In that Convention it became at once apparent that the majority were opposed to the return of King James. That disposition was enormously strengthened by a letter from James in which, with his usual blundering impolicy, he adopted a high-handed and threatening tone instead of recognising the necessity for conciliation. Dundee and the Jacobites withdrew from the Convention, which proceeded to appoint a committee on the analogy of the Lords of the Articles, consisting of eight of the nobility, eight burghesses, and eight of the barons or gentry of the shires. This committee directed and formulated the further proceedings of the Convention.

The Convention in England, while it transferred the Crown from James to William, did not in theory effect a revolution of the constitution. Ostensibly it reaffirmed and safeguarded constitutional doctrines which had been set at nought by absolutist innovations. It was not so with the Scottish Convention, which went a long way towards asserting for Scotland these same English constitutional claims which in Scotland had never subsisted either in theory or in practice; and in some respects it went beyond the English formulary. It drew up a Claim of Right corresponding to the English Declaration of Right; but instead of claiming that James had abdicated the throne by his flight it affirmed that James had forfeited the Crown, and, further, it asserted that prelacy, being opposed to the will of the people, ought to be suppressed. Its determination to claim a constitution approximating to the English model was expressed by the denunciation of the system of appointing the Lords of the Articles by any other process than the free election of the members by the Estates, whereas the Stuart system required first the nomination by the peers of eight bishops who were inevitably king's men, the nomination by the eight bishops of eight peers who, in the circumstances, would also obviously be king's men, and the selection of the rest of the Lords of the Articles by this united group of king's men. Thus the Stuart system had in effect given entire control of legislation to the king and the Privy Council; the new system

would practically give it to the Estates. On these terms the crown was offered to and accepted by William, and the Convention was converted into a parliament.

Dundee escaped from the South and raised the Jacobite standard in the Highlands, while William appointed to the command in Scotland General M'Kay, an efficient though not brilliant officer who had served under him in Holland. Five and forty years earlier Montrose had shown what could be done and had learnt what could not be done by an army composed of the clansmen. Among the mountains especially such an army could move with extraordinary speed which regular troops could not hope to match. In the shock of onset the charge of the



The Parliament House, Edinburgh, in the 17th century.

[From an engraving by Gordon of Rothiemay about 1650.]

Highlanders was apt to be irresistible. But the commander of the mixed force was certain to find himself hampered if not paralysed by clan feuds and rivalries which even at the most critical moments it was almost impossible to repress, especially as the clans formed separate contingents, each led by its own chief. But, further, the Highlander conceived of war not as campaigning but as raiding ; after a fight or two he was disposed to consider himself at liberty to return to his glens with his booty. With such forces much damage might be inflicted on an enemy, but with such forces alone an organised campaign of conquest was not practicable. Dundee's hope was that he would be able to keep the Lowlands in a state of perpetual alarm and to demoralise the government troops until he should receive reinforcements from France or from Ireland which would enable him to conduct an effective campaign.

The failure of this hope when the summer was already far advanced made it imperative that Dundee should effect some striking achievement in order to keep his forces from dissolving. Accordingly he enticed M'Kay into the Highlands, drew his force into an ambush at the Pass of Killiecrankie, and put it completely and overwhelmingly to rout. Nevertheless his brilliant victory proved a fatal disaster to the Jacobite cause. Dundee himself fell while leading a triumphant charge. There was no man to take his place. The victorious clansmen attacked Dunkeld; but being there repulsed by the resolute resistance of a regiment of Cameronians, they lost heart and interest and dispersed to their own homes. The civil war was practically at an end.

The war being disposed of, there remained three problems for the government—the settlement of the Highlands, the settlement of the powers of parliament, and the settlement of the ecclesiastical question. All of them were thorny. The parliament demanded that the Committee of the Articles should be entirely elected by the Estates. The Crown, through its ministers and its own representative or commissioner, the Duke of Hamilton, claimed that the ministers should themselves form one of the groups in the committee; and neither party would give way. On the Church question the parliament wanted to restore the independent government of the Church on the Presbyterian system. The Crown, on the other hand, was determined to uphold the supremacy of the State over the Church, and also, not without reason, feared that Presbyterian supremacy would be intolerant and retaliatory. All that was accomplished in 1689 was the passing of an Act abolishing Episcopacy. During the winter, however, some of the leaders of the opposition to the Crown discredited themselves by entering upon intrigues with the Jacobites, and, on the other hand, William resolved to make substantial concessions. Accordingly in the following year the old Committees of the Articles were finally abolished. Future committees were to be appointed by the Estates, but their appointment was not to be a condition precedent on legislation; and while ministers of the Crown had the right of attending such committees, they had no right as ministers to vote. Another Act established the Presbyterian system of Church government with the Kirk Sessions as its base and the General Assembly as the apex. William's concessions secured his position as against Jacobitism, but practically the Scottish parliament and the Scottish Church had won their demands at the expense of what had hitherto been the royal prerogative.

For the settlement of the Highlands the policy adopted combined conciliation with compulsion. The advocates of military control were allowed to establish a government fort and garrison at Fort William; but although for some time many of the Highland chiefs refused to take the oath of allegiance, the disappearance of all chance of help either from Ireland or from France disposed them to come to terms. Some accepted a solatium, and when in August 1691 amnesty was promised to all who should take the oath of allegiance by the first of January ensuing, all of them took

advantage of the promise, although many deferred doing so till the last moment.

Nevertheless in one case the submission came too late. Sir John Dalrymple, the Master of Stair (that is the heir-apparent of the Earl of Stair), one of William's principal advisers with regard to Scottish affairs, found an opportunity for destroying the small clan of the Macdonalds of Glencoe. The chief had presented himself, on the last day allowed by the law for taking the oath, at Fort William, where there was no authority empowered to receive it. Hence he did not actually take the oath before a duly constituted authority till a week too late. The Edinburgh authorities refused to accept the oath thus tendered, and Macdonald's name was returned to London as a recalcitrant. Of these circumstances William and possibly Dalrymple were unaware; and Dalrymple procured from the king an order that "this set of thieves" should be "extirpated." To carry out the order a party of soldiers was sent to Glencoe, whose commander was connected by marriage with the chief's family. Their hostile intentions were carefully concealed; they were received and entertained hospitably by the clan for a fortnight. Then in the night they rose upon their entertainers and massacred them, though some few of the intended victims succeeded in making their escape.

The act deservedly aroused furious resentment; the punishment of the perpetrators was demanded on all hands; and the inadequacy of the penalties inflicted after the whole story of the crime was revealed left a rankling sentiment of bitterness in Scotland against the system which kept the king of Scotland at a distance from the realm and out of touch with the Scottish people. William's ignorance of the facts connected with the tendering of the oath, an ignorance which may or may not have been shared by the Master of Stair, might have been held to excuse him if his subsequent conduct had not endorsed the whole of the proceedings. Stair had to resign his office, but William did not withdraw from him his personal favour. The memory of the massacre of Glencoe remained among the Scottish people as one of the incentives to Jacobitism and to the popular dislike at least of any closer connection with England.

IV

WILLIAM'S WAR

During the four summer months of 1690 when William was in Ireland, signalled by the defeat of Beachy Head and the victory of the Boyne, the queen was left to conduct the administration in England. The period was critical, but Mary passed through the ordeal successfully. The king, on his return, was eager to hasten to Holland to concert plans for the future with his continental allies, for which it was of the utmost importance

that he should be able to rely on the support of England. Parliament, meeting for an autumn session, voted large supplies with a readiness which augured well for the future, and William was able to leave for Holland in January, undeterred by the discovery of a Jacobite plot, the investigation of which was left to his wife. It was not an assassination plot, but aimed at the restoration of James on conditions which would probably have proved acceptable neither to James himself nor to the French king. Lord Preston, an ex-minister of James who gave his name to the conspiracy, was condemned to death, but was ultimately pardoned. Only one of the plotters was actually executed, and some were never brought to trial. For this leniency William himself was responsible, as he reappeared in England for three weeks.

The campaigning in the Netherlands with which he was largely occupied during the ensuing period was of a dreary and unprofitable description, neither the French nor the allies gaining any material advantages. But the fact of primary importance to England, so far as the war was concerned, was that France was wholly absorbed in the military operations, and was thereby prevented from adopting the energetic naval policy which might have been anticipated after Beachy Head. England, on the other hand, concentrated her efforts mainly on naval reorganisation. Nevertheless Louis and James devised a scheme of invading England in 1692.

So many of the leading men in England, including Admiral Russell who was now at the head of the English Navy, were in correspondence with the Jacobites, that James suffered from an illusory conviction that the majority of Englishmen were in favour of his restoration. He issued a proclamation granting a general pardon, from which certain prominent persons were specially excluded, which only made it the more imperative that the men whose names were not excluded should emphatically demonstrate their loyalty to William. This document was so obviously useful to the government that instead of endeavouring to suppress it they published it broadcast. Nothing could have served better to bring the whole nation into line, and, above all, the fleet was put on its mettle.

A large army of invasion was collected in Normandy, and Tourville, the victor of Beachy Head, took the seas to clear the Channel, with positive orders to fight the English fleet on the first opportunity. In obedience to those orders he fought the battle of La Hogue. His fleet was scattered after hard fighting, and a dozen men-of-war which ran themselves aground under the guns of La Hogue itself were cut out by boats under the command of Sir George Rooke, and were burnt down to the water under the eyes of James himself, who was an impotent witness of the catastrophe. This great victory virtually annihilated the French sea-power, which two years before had threatened the ascendancy of England. From that hour England remained decisively the mistress of the seas; for her only rivals were the Dutch, and with them she was in constant alliance until the

smaller country had fallen gradually but completely behind her in the maritime race.

The triumph of La Hogue was somewhat obscured by the failure to follow it up with effective blows and also by the defeat of William at Steinkirk. William was one of those commanders who rarely won a victory in the field, yet possessed a marvellous skill in preventing the enemy from turning a defeat to account. The French General Luxemburg gained little by Steinkirk, but English public opinion was irritated because the English troops which had borne the brunt of the fight were badly cut up, and for this some of William's Dutch officers were held to blame.

So when William returned to England for the winter he found a parliament ill content and murmuring of grievances. Nevertheless the necessity for continuing the war was paramount; the attacks on the government were defeated, and William obtained the required supplies. The two exceedingly important measures by which this end was achieved will be discussed in the ensuing chapter. Here it will suffice to explain that the first was a new assessment of the Land-tax, which became the principal source of revenue, and the second was the creation of the National Debt, a system of borrowing for national purposes, and (in the first instance) spreading the repayment over a term of years in the form of annuities to the lenders.

Again, in 1693, the war went unsatisfactorily. William was again defeated at Neerwinden or Landen, though again the French victory was barely won and was of little immediate service. England, however, suffered a serious blow. A great merchant fleet, English and Dutch, known as the Smyrna Fleet, assembled to sail for Smyrna and the Levant. In spite of the great naval preponderance won at La Hogue, an insufficient escort was provided. Off the Spanish coast the Smyrna fleet was assailed by the French Navy, which had concentrated in the Mediterranean. The odds were so overwhelming that the escort had no choice but to take refuge in flight, and the entire merchant fleet of four hundred vessels was either captured or wrecked.

This disaster had a somewhat curious consequence. Hitherto William had held fast to his principle of employing ministers from both parties, being extremely anxious not to identify himself either with Whigs or with Tories, although in many respects the Whig interests were more closely allied with his own. He had been particularly anxious not to part with Nottingham, a Tory in whose honesty he had great confidence. Antagonism between Nottingham and Russell had made it impossible to retain both in the ministry, and Russell had been removed from the Admiralty. The failure of the Admiralty produced an insistent demand for Russell's reinstatement, which necessitated the retirement of Nottingham; and William at last made up his mind to form a Whig ministry and thus to initiate the system of party government. This device is attributed to the counsels of Sunderland, who, although he had been excluded from the Act

of Grace, had been allowed to return to England and had been received to some extent into William's favour, although not admitted to office. The division of parliament into two great parties was, as we saw, a product of the latter years of Charles II., but it caused no immediate change in the old system by which the king chose his ministers as he thought fit, without reference to the Legislature. To no one was it obvious that if the administration and the parliament were to be in agreement the ministers themselves must be in harmony with the majority in the House of Commons, and must therefore be members of the party which held the majority in that Chamber. For it was still the theory that policy was directed by the king and that the ministers were the men chosen by him to carry out not their ideas but his. They were counsellors no doubt by whose advice his ideas might be modified, but it was their business to do what the king wished them to do. If they disagreed they were none the less supposed not to resign but to obey; if they failed they were dismissed. There was no collective responsibility; each man was directly responsible to the king for his own doings. It was only in the reign of Charles II. that it had been claimed that the minister was responsible not only to the king but to parliament. The fact that a Whig majority in one parliament gave way to a Tory majority in the next was no reason, on these principles, why the king should change his ministers, though he might find it necessary to modify his policy in order to avoid a deadlock.

Now at this early stage the rule of selecting ministers from one party presented itself merely as a matter of practical convenience, the outcome of the division of parliament on party lines which itself was hardly twenty years old. In course of time it came to mean that the policy of the Crown must be the policy advocated by ministers as a body, and that must be a policy supported by the party as a whole from which the ministerial body was selected; ministers became the medium for imposing upon the Crown the policy approved by the majority in parliament. But at the outset ministers appeared to be the medium through which the majority in parliament was to be induced to support the policy of the Crown. So much was this felt to be the case that for a long time to come there was a strong sentiment in favour of excluding office-holders under the Crown from the House of Commons in order that the Crown might not exercise undue influence on that body. To this now antiquated sentiment is due the rule that a member of parliament being appointed to office under the Crown must seek re-election.

The plain fact was that at the end of 1693, William, though he very much disliked the idea of placing himself in the hands of the chiefs of one party, still saw the necessity for having on his Council a body of men who would work in harmony together, and of having the solid support of one great party in the face of the great war on the continent. Later, when the war was over, he sought to revert to the principle of taking ministers from both sides. But now he had to choose one party or the other, and the



The Fleet Prison in the 17th century.

[From a print of 1691.]

balance was definitely in favour of the Whigs. Both Whigs and Tories, as he knew, were intriguing with the Court of St. Germain; but while many of the Tories were Jacobites at heart, the Whigs intrigued mainly as an insurance against accidents; they did not want to see James back, but they wanted to secure a *locus standi* in case he should chance to come back. The Whigs were more definitely in favour of the war; and this was what William had most of all at heart. The Admiral in whom the country had most confidence was a Whig. If Marlborough, who was reckoned as a Tory, had been trusted by the king, he might have counterbalanced Russell; but William knew too well that the brilliant soldier was not to be trusted. The result was that in the ministry of 1693 the only Tories retained in office were Danby and Godolphin. The changes had a beneficial effect on the temper of the House of Commons, which granted adequate supplies, and the financial reforms of the reign were crowned by the creation of the Bank of England.

The campaigning in the Netherlands in this year was uneventful. With the combatants so equally matched as they were, it was becoming more and more obvious that the victory in the long run would fall to the side whose treasury held out longest; and the strain was already becoming too severe for Louis. A joint naval and military expedition against Brest met with disaster, attributed almost with certainty to the treachery of Marlborough, though information of the design had reached the French from other sources as well. The military command was given to Talmash, the only English soldier with a reputation which at that time rivalled Marlborough's; and jealousy of Talmash is generally supposed to have been the motive of Marlborough's treachery. Talmash was killed before Brest, but Russell was despatched with a fleet to the Mediterranean where the French fleet took shelter at Toulon. In spite of his own protests, the English admiral was ordered to winter in the Mediterranean, with the result that naval action on the part of the French was completely paralysed, and the control of the inland sea became a permanent feature of English naval policy.

Altogether, when William met parliament at the end of the year, the progress of the war was more satisfactory than at any of the earlier stages except immediately after La Hogue. King and parliament found themselves harmoniously disposed, and William was at last persuaded to accede to the favourite demand of the Whigs, a Triennial Act, which required not only that parliament should meet at least once in three years, but that the life of a parliament should not extend beyond three years. The Whigs gained too by the retirement of Danby, now Duke of Leeds, consequent upon charges of corruption in connection with the East India Company. The charges could not be actually proved, but, on the other hand, Danby was not able to clear himself; too much suspicion attached to him to allow of his continuing to take an active part in politics.

Before Danby's fall William had suffered a very serious blow both politically and personally by the death of Mary. Tories who had been able

to reconcile themselves to the joint rule of King James's eldest daughter and her husband found it less easy to reconcile their consciences to the solitary rule of William. She, moreover, had been personally popular. William might inspire admiration and respect, but he had no hold on the affections of the English people. Moreover, he had always been able to trust the control of affairs to the queen during his own absence on the continent; there was now no one in whom he could repose a like confidence.

Again, however, it was fortunate that the campaigns of the following summer told heavily in William's favour. The value of the English control of the Mediterranean was manifested, since practically the whole of the French fleet was shut up at Toulon; and William himself, as well as the English troops with him, won a new prestige by the recapture of the important town of Namur, which the French had taken in the first year of the war.

As a natural consequence the dissolution of parliament and a general election brought a considerable accession of strength to William and the Whigs. But though the king's hands were strengthened for the purposes of the war, the Whigs themselves became more insistent upon party demands which were not to the king's liking. William was obliged to cancel large grants which he had made to his most intimate friend and adviser, the Dutchman Bentinck, now Duke of Portland, who, like all William's Dutch companions and servants, was the object of English jealousy. Somewhat reluctantly also he had to accept a Treasons Bill, which required not only that there should be two witnesses to some kind of treason, but two witnesses to any specific charge; while in other respects it secured to the accused rights which we should now regard as elementary, but which had hitherto been denied; so that there could be no repetition of the old scandals in connection with the Rye House Plot.

A reaction in William's favour, however, was caused by the discovery of Barclay's plot for the assassination of the king, which had been tacked on to a plot for a French invasion. William was never vindictive, and indeed carefully avoided too close enquiry and too much knowledge of the persons concerned in plots against his person; on this occasion he displayed his usual half-contemptuous leniency, but parliament and the public were stirred to an unwonted loyalty. As in the reign of Elizabeth plots had recoiled upon the head of Mary Stuart, so now plots recoiled upon the head of James II.; and again, as in Elizabeth's reign, a National Association was formed for the defence of the king. The war however suffered, for the panic created by the alarm of invasion led to the recall of the Mediterranean fleet and the recovery of French ascendancy in those waters. Savoy withdrew from the coalition, and France was relieved from any further fighting in Italy.

Two other consequences of the plot are to be noted in England. One of the prisoners, Sir John Fenwick, revealed intrigues with the Jacobites, already known to and ignored by William, on the part of Shrewsbury,

Marlborough, and Godolphin. Marlborough had already been removed from public employment, although his intriguing ceased with the death of Mary, which ensured the succession of Anne, whom he could count upon controlling through his wife. Shrewsbury and Godolphin both resigned, Godolphin being the only member of the Tory party who had continued till this time to retain high office. A purely Whig ministry was thus brought to completion. The second consequence was that the Whigs themselves resorted to an Act of Attainder to prevent the escape of Fenwick himself, since one of the two witnesses required by the law which they themselves had passed to bring about his condemnation had been bribed to leave the country. Although the Whigs were as loyal as ever in providing supplies for the war, it dragged on ineffectively through 1696. Both sides in fact were exhausted and anxious for peace. Negotiations through the winter and the following spring bore fruit in the Treaty of Ryswick. For William the chief gain was his definite recognition as King of England by Louis XIV., who pledged himself to give no active support to the Jacobite cause, though he refused to deny his hospitality to the exiles. The treaty altogether was a demonstration that France could do no more than hold her own against a coalition which included England; whereas, before the Revolution, when she could practically count upon the neutrality if not the support of England, every treaty had brought her a fresh accession of territory and strength.

But the war had served as a binding force in English politics, and disintegration followed upon the peace.

V

THE GRAND ALLIANCE

William himself had no illusions on the subject of the peace. He regarded it as nothing more than a truce, certain to be followed before long by a renewal of the struggle with Louis. In spite of the treaty, therefore, he urged upon the parliament the necessity not only for a large naval expenditure, but also for the maintenance of a standing army of not less than thirty thousand men.

There was no difficulty about the fleet; the nation was thoroughly alive to the importance of maintaining naval supremacy. But Tories and Whigs alike regarded the standing army as being at the best a necessary evil in time of war, intolerable in time of peace. William, being his own Foreign Minister and relying for the conduct of foreign business on Portland and his Dutch associates rather than upon English statesmen, had failed to educate Englishmen up to his own views of continental affairs; and the Whigs regarded the peace as a satisfactory opportunity for cutting down the army to a standard far below that which was needed to satisfy William.

They were, moreover, irritated by the fact that the king had at last openly admitted Sunderland to his counsels, and obviously gave more confidence to him than to the Whig leaders themselves. Even the retirement of Sunderland only induced them so far to modify the proposals for disbandment as to allow the retention of a force of ten thousand men apart from the troops in Scotland and Ireland.

But the Triennial Act now demanded a dissolution, while William's own continental plans called for his presence at The Hague. The king's constant absences from the country were inevitably unpopular, and his departure at this time had an unfavourable effect on the elections. The result was that ministers found themselves faced by what was practically a Tory majority in the House of Commons. To William's intense disgust parliament resolved to reduce the army to seven thousand men, all of them English-born troops, which at once involved the withdrawal of the Dutch troops on whom William himself relied, and the exclusion of his favourite officers from military posts. So sore was the king that he was on the verge of resigning the crown of England. But he could not afford to sever the ties between England and Holland, though the only modification he could obtain was the admission to the army of naturalised English subjects as well as those who were English born.


The Tories pushed their victory further by demanding and obtaining an enquiry into the distribution of the forfeited lands in Ireland. The Whig ministers no longer found themselves leading the House, and William began to replace some of them by Tories. The Irish Lands Bill is notable as the first instance of a device of the Commons for evading opposition on the part of the Lords, which came to be known as "tacking." The bill was made part of the bill granting the Land Tax. This being treated as a money bill, the Lords could not amend, though they might reject it; and they could not afford to reject it, because to do so in effect meant the refusal of supplies.

The attitude of the parliament remained continuously adverse. In the winter of 1699-1700 there were direct attacks upon Whig ministers; and the general principles of toleration, to which William and the Whigs were committed, were assaulted by new measures directed against Roman Catholics, to which reference has been made in an earlier section. In effect the penal code against Catholics was applied in its main features in England as well as in Ireland. Its iniquity was only less apparent, because in England the papists were only a small minority, whereas in Ireland they formed four-fifths of the population. The enquiry into the Irish lands gave the Tories another handle against the king, since the distribution of the forfeited estates had been made in clear violation of the king's promises and in the interest of personal favourites. Again the method of tacking was employed to force through the House of Lords a bill for the resumption of the lands granted since the king's accession. The Lords attempted amendments, but the Commons took their stand on a resolution of the

Commons in 1678, which declared that the Lords had no power to amend a money bill. The Lords were now obliged to give way. A still more vigorous attack upon the Lord Chancellor Somers and the king's foreign advisers was stopped only by the prorogation of parliament. At the end of the year instead of being reassembled it was dissolved; for a crisis had arrived in foreign affairs which made William prefer the chances of a new parliament to another meeting with the assembly which had proved so hostile.

England in general cared little and knew less about the European problem which absorbed the king of England. In a vague fashion the people were antagonistic to France; also in a vague fashion they suspected their Dutch monarch of caring more for Dutch than for English interests, whereby there was bred in them a sort of reaction against the anti-French

THE SPANISH SUCCESSION



sentiment, which had become active during the peace following the Treaty of Ryswick. Until that treaty William had consistently pursued the single policy of antagonism to France, but since that date he had rather taken the line of seeking an accommodation with Louis. The European problem was in truth one with which England had less direct concern than any other Power; but it was on the point of plunging the world into a tremendous struggle, in which, as it happened, England played a very leading part. England as a matter of fact ultimately flung herself into the war with zeal, not because the country was passionately moved by any abstract political theories or any obvious interests at stake, but because Louis deliberately stirred it to a frenzy of wrath against himself. Nevertheless it is necessary to seek to understand the complication of dynastic and other interests which brought the war upon Europe at large.

The central question, then, was that of the inheritance of the Spanish dominion. The senior branch of the house of Hapsburg ruled over that dominion, while the junior branch was identified with Austria and the

headship of the German Empire. Spain and the Empire had ceased to be united under one crown when Charles V. abdicated in 1556. Now, for the past century, the Spanish crown had descended in direct male line, but outside that actual line the claim to succession passed through the daughters of the kings of Spain. For generations the Austrian Hapsburgs had taken the eldest of the Spanish infantas as their brides. As there was no "Salic law" in Spain, this course would obviously secure the Spanish succession to an Austrian Hapsburg whenever a king of Spain should fail to leave a male heir of his body. But twice the rule had been broken. Both Louis XIII. and Louis XIV. had in their day married the eldest infanta, while the second infanta had been the bride of the Hapsburg. But in both cases, again, the Bourbon marriage, but not the Hapsburg marriage, had been accompanied by a renunciation of the Spanish succession on the bride's part. Hence Leopold of Austria, emperor at the end of the seventeenth century, son of one infanta and husband of another, seemed entitled to claim the Spanish succession whether for himself or for the offspring of his marriage if the king of Spain, Charles II., should die without issue.

But the complication did not end here. Louis, on the one hand, was able to put in a strong plea that his own wife's renunciation (though not his mother's) was legally invalid. Again, the offspring of Leopold's marriage had been a daughter, who married the Elector of Bavaria. But Leopold wanted the Spanish succession to pass to his own second son by a later marriage, and therefore his daughter renounced her own claim on condition that the Netherlands should be handed over to her husband and their offspring. This, again, was a renunciation which had no legal validity at all; but it will be seen that there were thus three possible claimants to the succession, since there was no possibility whatever that the king of Spain, Charles II., would leave an heir of his body. These were Leopold's grandson, the Electoral Prince of Bavaria—a child born in 1792; Leopold himself or the son whom he had nominated in his own place, the Archduke Charles; and a grandson of Louis XIV. Nor could the question be settled among them by merely legal arguments, technicalities as to the more or less questionable validity of particular renunciations. The Spanish dominion included not only Spain itself and the American Empire, but also the Netherlands, the kingdom of Naples, and certain Italian duchies. Europe could not allow this great dominion to become a mere appendage either of France or of Austria, although Spain itself would certainly be fiercely opposed to any disruption of the Spanish Empire.

It appeared then that here was a matter for settlement by treaty. The European balance would be best served by the accession of the Electoral Prince of Bavaria to the Spanish dominion, and this had the advantage also that his title seemed on the whole the strongest. But the other claimants would not withdraw without receiving a substantial solatium. On this basis, William and Louis on their own account made the first Partition

Treaty. Austria and France were to get their solatium in Italy, and otherwise the Spanish Empire was to go to the Electoral Prince. The English ministers were not consulted, nor was the matter brought before parliament. Ministers simply gave an unqualified assent to William's bargain.

But then the bargain itself was nullified by the death of the Electoral Prince. William did not want to see the Spanish Empire handed over to Leopold of Austria, but still less did he wish to see it handed over to Louis XIV. Louis, however, was again ready to make his bargain with the maritime Powers, since he did not wish to fight for his maximum claims against a European coalition. He was moderate enough, and was prepared practically to content himself with the Italian territories, leaving the rest to the Archduke Charles. On these terms William and Louis came to an agreement known as the Second Partition Treaty; but when it was submitted to Leopold he refused to accede to it.

This was the situation at the beginning of 1700; but it was once more turned upside down by the action of Spain. The Spaniards were furious at any scheme of partition. The dying King Charles made his choice between the Hapsburg and the Bourbon in favour of the Bourbon. He named as legitimate heir to the whole of his dominion Philip, the second son of the French Dauphin, since it was recognised in Spain as well as elsewhere that the actual crowns of Spain and France were not to be united. If Philip's elder brother should die without heirs then the crown of Spain was to be transferred to his younger brother, and only if he succeeded to the French throne should it pass to the Archduke Charles, the Hapsburg claimant. Having made his will in these terms Charles died.

Now William took for granted that this will would merely be used to force Leopold into acceptance of the Partition Treaty. To his intense indignation Louis immediately tore up the treaty and took his stand upon the will, claiming the entire Spanish inheritance for his grandson. In William's eyes this meant that for all practical purposes the policy of the Spanish Empire would be directed by Louis; and that was a consummation which must be averted at all costs. He could have carried the Whigs with him, but now the Tories were dominant; therefore he dissolved parliament. But he apparently gained nothing by the dissolution, for in the new parliament the Tories retained their preponderance. It was absolutely necessary to conciliate the Tories, and to educate them over to his point of view. Godolphin returned to the ministry, which was also joined by Rochester.

The first business of the new parliament was to secure the course of the succession; Anne would of course follow William on the throne, but the last of her numerous children had just died, and the succession after her had been left indefinite. Parliament proceeded to pass the Act of Settlement, which nominated as Anne's heir the Electress Sophia of Hanover and her offspring. But the new Act of Succession or Act of Settlement included also a series of clauses dealing with constitutional matters which

had been left over by the Bill of Rights. The king's dangerous control of the courts and judges was finally abolished by the enactment which made judges irremovable except on an address from both Houses. In view of the prospect that the throne of England would be occupied by German princes, it was enacted that the sovereign must be not only a Protestant but a member of the Church of England; that he must not leave the country without consent of parliament; that England was not to be involved in war for the defence of foreign territories; and, finally, that only English-born subjects could be admitted to parliament, to public offices, civil or military, or to the Privy Council. The king's acceptance of the Act of Settlement had an extremely mollifying influence, which was shown by the resolutions of the Commons promising their support in his foreign policy.

But in the meanwhile Louis had been helping William to convert the country by the openly aggressive character of his proceedings; and the popular conversion was hastened by the captious conduct of the Tories in parliament, who seemed more intent upon impeaching the Whig leaders than on considering national interests. From the county of Kent there came a petition which was practically a censure of the Tory majority and an expression of confidence in the king. The indignant House treated this as a breach of privilege, and sent the gentlemen who had presented the petition into custody; but this, to the country, appeared only to be an interference with the right of petitioning, and a series of addresses after the Kentish model poured in.

With his hands thus strengthened, and with Marlborough, who had at last been restored to his confidence, as his principal lieutenant both for diplomatic and for military purposes, William's negotiations for a new Grand Alliance progressed not unfavourably. But once again it was Louis who deliberately gave William the one thing that he most wanted. In September James II. died at St. Germain. By his deathbed Louis pledged himself to recognise young James Edward Stuart as king of England. James II. was no sooner dead than Louis XIV. publicly acknowledged King James III. Through that act the current of public opinion, already setting steadily in William's favour, became a rushing tide. William seized his moment and again dissolved the parliament.

It was true that when the new assembly met there was a single-figure majority of nominal Tories in the Commons, but half the Tories themselves were already converts as far as the war was concerned. The new House not only pronounced it treason to hold commerce with the prince who now called himself James III., while outside the Jacobite circles he was known as the "Pretender" (a term properly applicable to any person claiming a title held *de facto* by somebody else); it also voted forty thousand men for the Army and the same number for the Navy. A clause was inserted in the terms of the Grand Alliance by which the allies undertook to make no treaty with France until she gave England satisfaction on this head.

William's patience had won. A great coalition had been formed against Louis, in which England had at last become not merely an auxiliary but a principal. But it was left to another to carry on his work. William's health had always been feeble, and had constantly threatened to break down under the tremendous strain of toil and responsibility. The shock of a fall from his horse and a broken collar-bone proved too much for his wrecked constitution. On March 9, 1702, Anne, the last of the Stuart sovereigns, became Queen of England.

CHAPTER XXI

THE CENTURY

I

COLONIAL EXPANSION

WHEN James VI. of Scotland became also James I. of England his actual dominion did not include a single acre of soil outside the British Isles. Ninety-nine years later, when William III. died, the whole of the North American seaboard between the French Acadia on the North and the Spanish Florida on the South was occupied by British colonists. Still farther north, beyond the French Canada, England claimed possession of the Hudson Bay territory or Prince Rupert's Land. Also she was in possession of sundry islands, and the East India Company had established a footing on the Indian Peninsula. Her colonial system was in full play, and her Indian Empire was in the germ.

The conception of an Imperial England overseas had been born in the brains of Humphrey Gilbert and Walter Raleigh while the Virgin Queen still sat on the throne of England and the world still counted Spain, which had annexed the Portuguese Empire, mistress of the seas. But Raleigh's attempts to found the colony which he called Virginia had failed woefully. The Elizabethans were still too eager in the pursuit of short cuts to wealth. Those who were venturesome preferred preying upon Spanish galleons to settling down to a toilsome battle with nature in new lands which produced no gold nor silver nor precious stones. But, as in ancient days, the Dane, baulked of his robbing propensities, sought to satisfy his greed of gain by commerce, the Englishman, when he could no longer spoil the Spaniard, bethought himself of turning the New World to commercial account.

In 1606 a commercial company was formed, which procured a charter for the colonisation of Virginia; for, after a vague fashion, England had asserted a claim to the territories which lay north of the Spanish possessions. The company was granted what were practically sovereign rights over a vast and undefined region (subject to the English crown). The company's settlement at Jamestown formed the nucleus of the colony of Virginia. Here there was no native empire to be subdued, such as the Spaniards had found in Mexico and Peru, or such as that which dominated India. The native tribes were elevated only a degree above barbarism;

they knew no cities, were still half nomadic, and had no political organisation higher than that of the tribe. But such an experiment as this of the English had no precedent in the world's history. The Greeks had planted city states on the Mediterranean shores among peoples for the most part akin to themselves or already possessing an elaborate civilisation. The Romans had not colonised but had planted garrisons. The Spaniard treated his conquests in America as estates of the Crown occupied by garri-

sons who exploited the mineral wealth of the land for the benefit of the Crown. But the Englishman went out to make for himself a new home in a new land, to acquire competence or wealth by the methods with which he was familiar in the old home; and he carried with him his traditional ideas of liberty and self-government.

The first settlers narrowly escaped the fate of Raleigh's colonists. But for the vigour and abilities of one of their leaders, Captain John Smith, they would have been wiped out in their collisions with the native Red Indians, so named because it was still believed that the New World was a portion of the Indies. Experience was needed to teach the practical principle that the colony would best serve the



John Smith at 37.

[From his "General History of Virginia," 1624.]

commercial objects of its founders if the colonists were left in the main to manage their own affairs with the minimum of interference from home. In 1623 the colonists were granted a constitution which vested the government in the hands of a nominated Governor and Council and an elected Assembly of "burgesses." The business of the colony was not merely to be self-supporting, but to develop the products of the country suitable for export, notably tobacco, in exchange mainly for manufactured goods. A large proportion of the settlers were younger sons of the English gentry, of the landowning class, Church of England men, of the type which was presently to recruit the ranks of the Cavaliers. The climatic conditions and the character of the work to be done favoured the employment of slave labour and the importation of negro slaves began in 1620, to be

supplemented afterwards by criminals or quasi-criminals, who were transported to the plantations as slaves for a term of years.

The enterprise of the Virginia Company was followed by one of an altogether different type, when a group of Nonconformists sailed in the *Mayflower* from Plymouth in 1620 and founded the first of the New England Colonies. The motive of the Pilgrim Fathers was to find new soil where they might follow religion after their own fashion, and they were followed by others like-minded with themselves, although these Northern Colonies were divided, like the Puritans at home, between those which were rigidly Presbyterian and those which favoured Independency and toleration. Here the conditions approximated more nearly to those of the English agricultural districts and towns. They drew to them Puritan gentry, burghers, and yeomen. There was no demand for slave labour, nor did the soil grow products for export as in the South; while, on the other hand, the settlers were very much less dependent on manufactured goods from the Old World.

Romanists as well as Puritans were allowed to seek free exercise of their religion in the New World; and the primarily Romanist colony of Maryland was also of necessity tolerationist. This group, however, was much more nearly akin to the landowning classes of the South in origin than to the Puritans of the North, and planted itself in the neighbourhood of Virginia as the second plantation colony, not in the neighbourhood of the New England group. As a natural consequence the New Englanders were entirely in sympathy with the Roundheads when the Civil War broke out, while Cavalier sentiment prevailed in the plantation colonies which gave some trouble to the Commonwealth government. Meanwhile the English flag had already been set up in the Bermudas and the Bahamas, and in Cromwell's time the almost accidental seizure of Jamaica established England beside Spain in the West Indies.

The habitual procedure on the creation of colonies was for a company or an individual to procure from the Crown a charter conveying the possession of certain territories upon conditions. Privileges were conceded, but rights were reserved to the Crown. There was no theory that the colony was a free state; it was a community to which permission was given to settle itself and to go its own way, provided that its specific interests were always recognised as subordinate to those of the mother country. The powers of self-government varied according to circumstances; that is, the powers of the elected Assembly, as compared with those of the Governor and Council, differed, mainly according to the nature of the body to whom the original charter was granted.

On the North beyond the St. Lawrence the French made their province of Canada. The regions between the St. Lawrence and New England were appropriated under James I., and named Nova Scotia in order to provide colonising ground for the Scots. But the ground was inadequately occupied, and was claimed and colonised by the French under the name of

Acadia. More than once, during the Anglo-French wars, the theoretical sovereignty changed hands ; but it was not till 1713 that the country was finally ceded to Great Britain. We have already observed that the Dutch at one time thrust in a wedge between the northern and the southern colonies of the English, and the continuity of the British seaboard from North to South was only completed with the cession of the Dutch colony at the Treaty of Breda.

Pennsylvania was a colony created in the reign of Charles II. at the instance of the Quaker William Penn. This, too, was intended to provide a home for the persecuted members of the Society of Friends, though under conditions which required a general toleration. The Carolinas were an earlier product of the Restoration ; both Clarendon and Ashley were in the small group of the original "Proprietors."

As a general rule the English government itself intervened very little in the affairs of the colonies. Under the Commonwealth Navigation Act no difference was made between them and England itself. English, Scottish, Irish, and Colonial shipping were all on precisely the same footing. The Commonwealth was Imperialist in refusing to differentiate between different portions of the Empire, just as it sought for unification by uniting the parliaments of England, Scotland, and Ireland at Westminster. But with the Restoration the Particularists prevailed. The united parliament was dissolved, and the English parliament became exceedingly English ; that is, it sought the interests of England, however detrimental they might be to other portions of the Empire. The effects were felt by the colonies ; for the Navigation Act at the Restoration imposed restrictions upon colonial commerce for the benefit of English merchants. Colonial ships, it is true, counted as English ships ; they could participate in the carrying trade. But no goods could be imported to the colonies except from an English port, nor might colonial goods be exported except in the first instance to an English port. This did not of course interfere with the trade between England herself and her colonies ; but it required colonial commerce with all other countries, including Scotland and Ireland, to take England *en route*. Protectionist principles were presently carried still further, and the colonists were forbidden to export or even to manufacture goods which could compete in the market with English products.

II

THE TRADING COMPANIES

The reign of Elizabeth saw the close of the long period of agricultural depression brought about largely by the conversion of tillage into pasture. That process ceased when the stage had been reached at which the profits of growing wool and of growing corn had become equalised. Something

was contributed to this end by the introduction of convertible husbandry, which increased the profits of tillage. Otherwise, however, there were no great improvements in the methods of farming; enterprise on the part of the greater landholders was checked by the civil broils. But two features of the period had a specially favourable effect on the rural population. The Elizabethan Poor Law to a very great extent served the purpose with which it had been enacted, of providing relief for honest destitution and at the same time discouraging wilful idleness and vagabondage. But besides this the substitution of the system of industrial regulation under the Statute of Apprentices for the old gild system made itself felt. It provided those whose substantive employment was agricultural labour with supplementary means of livelihood, because it allowed spinning to become a general cottage industry, while in many cases the farmer added weaving to his other employments. The Civil War was inevitably destructive, but its effects were hardly so injurious in England as those of the partisan struggles in France, and were in no way comparable to the disastrous results produced in Germany by the Thirty Years' War. The general prosperity, in short, compared favourably with that of other nations; and a further impulse was given to industrial development when the persecuting policy of Louis XIV. drove the highly skilled industrial population out of France and to a very great extent into England. The employments in which the expelled Huguenots excelled were not such as in the main brought them into direct competition with the English trades; a colony of silk-weavers was established at Spitalfields without arousing native hostility. Coming immediately before the Revolution, at a moment when Englishmen were particularly ready to sympathise with persecuted Protestants, and when ideas of toleration were gaining ground, the French king's victims were sympathetically welcomed, and new industries were planted which soon became thoroughly acclimatised.

The great development of the period, however, was commercial rather than industrial, and the main agencies by means of which the commercial extension was effected were the chartered companies of merchants which began to multiply in the later years of Queen Elizabeth.

The general principle applied to these companies was one which had long been familiar in the cases of the Merchants of the Staple and the Merchant Adventurers. A charter was given to an association of merchants conveying to them exclusive rights of trading in particular fields, with jurisdiction over their own members and large powers of independent action. During the sixteenth century the members of such companies traded on their own account as individuals, but were bound to obey the company's regulations. In the seventeenth century there came a new development which was in effect initiated by the East India Company, which had first received its charter on December 31st, 1600. At a quite early stage of its career this association converted itself into a joint-stock

company; that is to say, the members ceased to trade as individuals; the company traded as a unit, distributing the profits of the trade among its members. The actual trading was done by the agents or servants of the company. Thus in what were called the *Regulated Companies* the associates were actually individual traders, trading under the guarantees of the whole body and bound by its regulations. In the *Joint-Stock Companies* the associates became simply shareholders, participating in the profits of the trade carried on by the company as a whole, while they themselves only controlled that trade in so far as they could control the election of the Board of Directors.

Practically the whole of the trading with remote, barbarous, or semi-barbarous countries was appropriated to the companies, regulated or joint-stock; for, as we have seen, the permanent communities or colonies overseas were also planted in the first instance by chartered companies. The principle was obvious. In remote regions the Home Government could not undertake police business; the trader must be left to protect himself not only against avowed pirates but against foreign rivals. He could not efficiently protect himself if his own countrymen were behaving in a lawless fashion. He could not make terms for himself and his countrymen with native potentates if others of his countrymen were not legally bound by those terms. Hence it was necessary to give to the company exclusive rights of trading and an indisputable authority over traders.

In the importance ultimately achieved by their operations none of the great associations can be compared with the East India Company. For a century after the company received its first charter the great Mogul Empire in India was at the height of its splendour and power. The Moguls ruled unchallenged over all Northern India, though they had not brought the great kingdoms of the South into actual subjection. No one dreamed of a conquest of India like the Spanish conquests of Mexico and Peru. But, broadly speaking, the effect of the maritime rivalry now developing between Dutch and English—for the old Portuguese supremacy in the Eastern waters had already perished—was to make the Spice Islands on the South-East the Dutch sphere, while the English devoted themselves rather to the Indian Peninsula itself. The first footing was gained in 1612 when the British company was permitted to set up a trading establishment (called a "factory") at Surat on the western coast. A second factory was conceded on the south-east coast at Madras, where the English quarter was known as Fort St. George. This was in 1639. The third, at Hugli on the Ganges delta, was granted in 1650; and this was afterwards shifted to Calcutta. The marriage of Charles II. to Catherine of Braganza brought, as a portion of the dower, the Portuguese possession of Bombay, which was transferred by the Crown to the East India Company, and took the position formerly occupied by Surat. The three factories at Bombay, Madras, and Hugli were the centres from which the three British Presidencies ultimately expanded; but the company were merely tenants, not owners, except in the one case of Bombay.

During the last third of the seventeenth century the French entered the field as rivals of the English and Dutch. This was the era in which, under the influence of Colbert, France developed her greatest maritime energy, and the French East India Company was started in 1664. Hence in the ensuing century the French, not the Dutch, were the rivals who attempted to monopolise the Indian trade and dreamed of a European ascendancy in India; it was the French whose defeat gave to the British the ascendancy which was gradually to expand into Empire.



The old East India House.

[Drawn from an old print by Herbert Railton.]

But even in the seventeenth century there were Englishmen in India who were conscious of the instability of the Mogul Empire; and a French observer expressed his own belief that a Turenne with twelve thousand men could conquer India. As a matter of fact that was very nearly what had been done by Babar, the founder of the Mogul Empire, when Henry VIII. was reigning in England. English governors, prematurely contemptuous of an empire which was as yet only on the verge of utter disintegration, ventured to levy war in support of their demand for the redress of grievances. The English factories would have been wiped off the face of India if the Emperor Aurangzib had not feared that English ships would cut off his faithful Mohammedan subjects from the pilgrimages to Mecca by which

he and they set great store. This, not fear of English arms, induced the Mogul to deal magnanimously with the English, and to reinstate them at Calcutta after the Hugli factory had been destroyed.

But the East India Company had other vicissitudes to pass through besides Dutch and French rivalry and quarrels with the native powers. Their monopoly was a grievance. Enterprising English merchants objected altogether to the principle of the joint-stock company; they wanted to trade for themselves, and to secure for themselves the profits of their own enterprise and energy. They wanted Free Trade for the individual, and they struggled hard to break down the company's monopoly. The Commonwealth government inclined to favour the view of the "interlopers," as they were called, and to treat their independent trading as legitimate. Cromwell, however, resisted the temptation to allow a rival company to set itself up. The view prevailed not that monopoly was in itself a thing desirable, but that under existing conditions it was a necessity. Only a monopolist company would be able to exercise the sovereign functions which were required in dealing with native powers and foreign rivals.

The theory found justification in the reign of William III., when a rival company was actually established under Whig auspices, the old company being associated with the Tories. This was in 1698. The Exchequer was in need of money. The company offered nearly three-quarters of a million to have its charter confirmed by parliament. The interlopers were ready to provide two millions if the subscribers were given the exclusive trade for thirteen years. The second offer was accepted, while the old company was allowed three years' grace to wind up its affairs. Before the three years were up a Tory parliament confirmed the old company's charter. The battle between the companies was so obviously and immediately disastrous to both that in a very short time they were negotiating for a union; and in the last days of 1701 they were incorporated as a single company whose monopoly remained unchallenged for a century.

The accepted commercial doctrine of the day was what is called the Mercantile Theory. It was the business of the State to direct commerce and industry into the channels which were regarded as best for the national welfare; the theory of free competition was unheard of. The East India Company itself had much ado to preserve its existence, apart from the difficulties already referred to, because there was a very general belief that the East India trade was bad for the country, although highly profitable to the traders. The argument was that India did not buy English goods, while England bought Indian goods. Therefore what took place was an exchange of English gold for Indian goods, whereby England was drained of bullion. It was the universally accepted theory that a trade which took money out of the country was bad for the country. It was left for a later age to demonstrate that in the whole field of trade the balance adjusted itself automatically. The advocates for the company won its case with the public by the argument that although gold went out of the country to

India a large proportion of the goods for which it was exchanged were re-exported and exchanged again for gold at greatly enhanced prices, so that the net outcome of the Indian trade was an actual addition to the amount of gold in the country.

On another side Protectionism and Retaliation both followed in practice upon the mercantile theory. It was good to foster each English industry, good to damage the industry of any neighbour who might become hostile, and good to damage any specific foreign industry which might compete with an English one. The influence of the mercantile community in parliament caused those principles to be applied not only to the countries of Europe but to Scotland, Ireland, and the colonies. Scotland could be dealt with only by tariffs, but Ireland and the colonies were subject to direct legislation from Westminster. The colonies probably did not suffer very greatly, for the simple reason that, if there had been no legislation at all, there would still only have been a very small market for such of their goods as came in competition with those of England. It was not so with Ireland, where the growing of wool was deliberately suppressed. Virtually the only industry permitted in that country, apart from agriculture, was the linen manufacture (vigorously encouraged by Strafford), which never became acclimatised in England; and this was not the least of the reasons which kept Ireland in a miserable state of economic depression.

Scotland, on the other hand, though it had gained economically by the commercial and political union under the Commonwealth, had not yet come to regard such commercial advantages as an equivalent for the loss of political independence. With the Restoration she reverted to the position of a foreign state. Her competing goods were shut out from the English market, and she was excluded from the benefits which English shippers derived from the Navigation Act. Although she was too poor to challenge the great English monopolies successfully on her own account, she attempted to do so, most conspicuously in the disastrous Darien Scheme. The Darien Company was formed to establish on the Isthmus of Darien a trading centre which was to rival the East India Company. The scheme failed to find financial support outside of Scotland itself, where it was taken up with unreasoning passion. The inevitable failure was attributed to the machinations of the English mercantile community and the political pressure brought to bear upon foreign communities by William acting under their influence. The collapse of the Darien Scheme and the widespread ruin it involved were turned to account, like the Massacre of Glencoe, to intensify anti-English sentiment, though there were level-headed Scots who saw in it rather a strong argument for a Legislative Union with England which should make the two countries commercially equal.

III

NATIONAL FINANCE

The system of national finance occupies a prominent position in the history of the seventeenth century, since for some three-fourths of the period it is a primary factor in the relations between the Crown and the parliament. It is at the very root of the constitutional struggle; not because the people were afraid of being tyrannically taxed beyond endurance, not because they grudged money for public purposes, but because they recognised that the control of the purse ultimately entails the control of policy. But since this constitutional struggle is itself the leading feature of the period to a much greater extent than at any other time in our history, national finance in its connection with that struggle has already been dealt with and requires little further elucidation. In effect the outcome of the long fight was that the Restoration separated the personal income of the king from the public revenue of the kingdom which had hitherto been identified with it. The regular revenue was appropriated to particular objects, while for all other objects additional revenue had to be voted by parliament; and in the course of the reign of Charles II. the principle was finally laid down of appropriating the expenditure to the specific object for which the supplies had been granted.

Except in one particular the sources of supply remained the same as in the past. The parliamentary votes were concerned mainly with the "subsidies," to which each locality was called upon to contribute in proportions fixed by an exceedingly antiquated assessment. Variations in the duties at the ports were controlled not by the desire to increase revenue from that source, but to encourage or discourage particular trades. The one new source of revenue was the invention of the Long Parliament, or, more accurately, was borrowed by them from the Dutch. This was the excise, a tax primarily imposed upon the home production of alcoholic liquors. Unpopular as this novel tax was, it was too productive to be given up, although there was no further extension of its principles.


But revenue had hitherto been provided on what may be called ready-money principles, on the hypothesis that the year's expenditure was to be met out of the year's revenue. Kings in the past had occasionally run heavily into debt, sometimes with disastrous results for the lenders, as in the case of Edward III. and Henry VIII., who met their difficulties by repudiating their obligations. But in general the Treasury borrowed only to meet the immediate expenditure which could not await the collection of the revenue; when the revenue was collected the debts thus incurred were paid. In the days of the early Plantagenets the principal lenders had been the Jews; when the Jews were expelled from England the kings borrowed

chiefly from the Lombards, at a later stage from the Germans, and then, with the great development of English wealth, from the London merchants and especially the goldsmiths. But the risks which still attended this method were demonstrated by the Stop of the Exchequer in 1672, when the Government suspended repayment to the goldsmiths.

The Crown in the past had supplemented its revenues, much to the disgust of the general public, by the sale of monopolies. Private monopolies were abolished before the Civil War, but the monopolies of the great companies were increasingly valuable sources of revenue. Thus we have seen the Government in 1698 obtaining a couple of millions as the price for bestowing a monopoly on the new East India Company. Here, we may remark in passing, lies a striking difference between the English enterprises of this kind and those of France. The English company bought its privileges from the government by substantial subsidies; the French company was a creation of the government, not of private enterprise, and was run by the government generally at a loss.

But, in fact, England had entered upon a period of foreign wars, whose expenses the normal sources of revenue were not capable of meeting. The vigorous and impressive foreign policy of the Commonwealth had almost reduced it to bankruptcy. After the Restoration, the Dutch war, coupled with the gross misuse of the public funds, had so emptied the Treasury in 1667 that half the English fleet had to be laid up, and the Dutch sailed up the Medway. The determination to embark on another Dutch war brought about the Stop of the Exchequer in 1672. And when the Revolution sucked England into the vortex of the European complications, it became increasingly impossible to meet the heavy demands for military and naval purposes out of an annual revenue derived from the established sources.

The first remedy that presented itself was a revision of the old assessment of the land and property tax, which had become translated into the subsidy of £70,000. As matters stood the relative taxable capacity of the different areas had changed enormously since the old assessment. Poor areas had become wealthy and wealthy areas had become poor. A formerly rich area which had become poor still paid its old proportion, and therefore reached the limit of endurance much sooner than a stationary area, while a



A first-rate man of war of 1680.

[From a print.]

poor district which had become rich was still only lightly burdened. The limit of taxing was set by the paying capacity of the most heavily burdened of these three groups. A redistribution of the burden under a new assessment would obviously enable a much larger revenue to be collected without hardship. So in 1692 a new assessment was made, under which it was estimated that a tax of one shilling in the pound would produce approximately half a million. As a matter of fact the burden fell almost entirely upon the land, owing to the extreme difficulty of arriving at any tolerable



The old Mercer's Hall, where the Bank of England was first established.

assessment of the value of other kinds of property. From this time forward the land tax became the main source of revenue.

But even when the land tax was as high as four shillings in the pound, when it produced a couple of millions, war expenditure outran the annual revenue. The land tax of four shillings in 1692 provided a million less than was required. The solution of the problem was found by Charles Montague, afterwards Lord Halifax, in the creation of the National Debt. A loan of a million was invited, but the lenders, instead of being paid off at an early date, were to receive life annuities. Thus the annuity would be an annual charge on the Exchequer, steadily diminishing as the annuitants died off. Two years later the principle of borrowing was further extended by the creation of the Bank of England. The Government called for a

loan of a million and a quarter. Interest was guaranteed on the amount, and was secured on an increase in the Customs. From the subscriber's point of view the subscription was simply an investment. He was certain of his interest, and if he wanted to recover his principal, he would have no difficulty in finding some one else willing to take his place. The subscribers were incorporated as the Bank of England, a company whose business was not commercial but exclusively financial. It is to be observed that the creation of the National Debt provided a powerful guarantee against the development of Jacobitism. The commercial classes, from whom most of the money was borrowed, inevitably felt that a Jacobite restoration might mean a repudiation of the National Debt. That fear kept the solid mass of vested interests on the side of the Protestant succession, and tended to keep it on the side of the Whigs, because the Whigs were more decisively bound to the Protestant succession than were the Tories, although the bulk of the Tories were by no means Jacobites.

The real ease with which the country was able to bear an enormous financial strain without suffering was further demonstrated by the reform of the currency in 1696. The coinage had been deliberately and shamelessly debased in the twenty years preceding the reign of Elizabeth. Its restoration had been one of that queen's first measures; and since that time the standard of the coins issued from the Mint had been maintained. But the coin in circulation had been clipped and defaced till most of it was very much below the face value. According to the recognised law, it was the debased coins that remained in regular circulation. The effect on foreign exchange was disastrous, and trade was hampered. Yet with the war actually in progress the Government faced the problem of calling in the defective coin and replacing it with a currency of full value and not liable of clipping. The whole cost was borne by the State. In spite of the great quantity of coin called in and the long time required for replacing it with the new coins, trade was not seriously disturbed. The moment was seized by the numerous enemies of the Bank of England to make an attempt to ruin that body. The goldsmiths bought up the Bank paper and presented it for payment in specie when the Bank cellars were drained. The Bank, however, treated the demand as a conspiracy, which it actually was, and refused payment, though it met all *bona fide* claims as fast as the Mint could provide it with money. The conspiracy defeated itself, and the Bank emerged from the crisis stronger than before.

IV

THE SPIRIT OF THE AGE

The splendid virility of the Elizabethan era had displayed itself in an astonishing individual versatility typified in Walter Raleigh, who was equally fit to play the part of soldier, sailor, courtier, statesman, and man

of letters. It was an age in which one man could conceive and depict Falstaff and Lear, Nick Bottom and Hamlet, Rosalind and Cleopatra. Not so were the elements mixed in the age which followed. The abounding delight in the exuberance of life and the appreciation of life's seriousness, Paganism and Puritanism, parted company. Paganism captured the court and Puritanism dominated the country. Puritanism as a force in literature gave to the world of its best in Milton and Bunyan. Paganism achieved nothing higher than the dainty lyrics of Herrick and the brilliant depravity

of the Restoration comedy. Even in the seventeenth century it is true that the world could not be divided into Puritans and Pagans ; but at no other period had the two principles been so openly at war ; and because they were so openly at war Puritanism assumed an extravagance of austerity, and Paganism an extravagance of wantonness, incompatible with consummate artistic achievement. Only the supreme genius of Milton and Bunyan made them exceptions. Paganism produced no Aristophanes to set against them.

It must be remembered, however, that the border-



A bedroom party of 1631.

land between the Elizabethan and the early Stuart literature lies not at the beginning but at the end of the reign of James I. ; that half of the "Elizabethan" drama was produced after the Union of the Crowns. And even when the generation of Elizabethans had died out, the hostility between Puritanism and Paganism was not by any means fully developed. The immediate severance was rather that between the intellectual and the emotional, which must unite in the production of the greatest literary work, especially poetry. The pursuit of verbal ingenuities and intellectual subtleties, which had in fact been heralded by the Euphuists, dominated the cultivated taste of the time and produced what a later age chose to call the "metaphysical" poets, at whose head was John Donne. The deeper feelings of men were concentrating upon religion and the passion for liberty, but they had not yet hardened into fanaticism. *Comus* is the consummate expression of the Puritanism which was at once spiritual and intellectual, neither Roundhead nor Cavalier but characteristic of much that was best

among the adherents of both sides when the Civil War broke out. It was the Civil War itself which taught Milton to identify the Royalists with the Philistines, and to allegorise the struggle of Puritanism in the *Samson Agonistes*; while the essential unconquerable spirit at the heart of English Puritanism, independent of all the turmoil of war and faction, still found its sublime expression in the *Paradise Lost*.

In Milton alone the most intense Puritanism was wedded to the highest intellectuality. Consciously his appeal was to a "fit audience though few." John Bunyan represents the Puritanism which took captive the humble and unlearned through its own essential humility and simplicity.

A man of the people, low born, with no social advantages, uneducated save for an intimate knowledge of the Scriptures and a considerable acquaintance with the controversial literature of Puritanism, John Bunyan followed the old advice of Sir Philip Sidney, "looked in his heart and wrote." The immortal allegory of the *Pilgrim's Progress* displays the root quality of Puritanism, not turned arrogant by battling with the Devil, nor harsh by battling with the flesh, nor sour by the world's contempt and persecution. Incidentally it gives a delightfully

vivid impression of eternal human types under the conditions of the England of the Restoration. But in the history of literature it stands out peculiarly as the precursor of the English novel which was about to be created by Daniel Defoe.

The reign of King Charles I., the Civil War, and the rule of the Commonwealth were not favourable to literary production, except of a controversial character either political or religious. Pamphleteering flourished, but the lighter forms of writing could only be practised by those who were able to stand aloof altogether from the arena. Yet such peaceful spirits were to be found. There is nothing militant in the devotional prose of Jeremy Taylor or the devotional verse of George Herbert, the latter of whom lived to witness only the danger-signals of the storm, not the storm itself. There are few writers dearer to the true book-lover than Sir Thomas Browne, though not every one takes a genuine delight in the *Religio Medici*. Battles raged and kingdoms fell, but that did not prevent Isaac Walton from practising the most peaceful of recreations and writing the




John Milton.

fisherman's supreme classic, while Milton was deserting his diviner muse to produce the *Areopagitica*, a masterpiece in political prose literature.

With the exception of *Comus* the great masterpieces of Puritan literature were actually produced after the Restoration. But the voices which prevailed were not those of Puritans. Milton was the survivor of an age of idealists, when men fought for causes with a splendid devotion, however antagonistic the causes themselves might be; when they were ready to die for "Church and King" or for "the Houses and the Word." The old ideals had shattered themselves. The new age which had dawned was

materialist and cynical. The past age had been too much in earnest to be clever and witty; the new age was supremely clever and witty, being no longer in earnest. Therefore its tragedy was insincere, stilted, and unconvincing. Its comedy was brilliant, but it was not merely non-moral and irresponsible; it assumed in its reaction against Puritanism that virtue is redeemed from being contemptible only when circumstances render it comic. And the note of the Restoration prevailed through the Revolution; the claims of decency remained in abeyance, so far as polite society was concerned, until the seventeenth century had passed. Milton, as we have said, belongs to the earlier age. Besides Bunyan's, the one other great literary name of the era is that of John Dryden, whose work practically covers the period from the Restoration to the end of the century. As befits the times in which he



John Dryden.

[From the engraving by Houbraken.]


lived, Dryden's supreme achievement was in the field of satire. His political pieces *Absalom and Achitophel* and the *Hind and the Panther* are unsurpassed in their kind. But satire is essentially intellectual, appealing to the intelligent critical judgment, the taste of the audience. If the poet's function is to express his own sense of beauty, what the Greeks meant by the phrase which we translate as "the beautiful," and to arouse the perception of it in others, the satirist is not a poet, since he is mainly concerned with denouncing and exposing the antithesis of the beautiful. Satire is the natural product of materialist conditions.

Such conditions, on the other hand, are rather favourable to scientific inquiry, though they are by no means necessary to it. The era of the Restoration and the Revolution was one during which England achieved far more distinction in natural science and in the literature of Rationalism than in the literature of imagination and emotion. But the scientific movement had its birth at a much earlier date, in the reign of James I.,

when Harvey was demonstrating the theory of the circulation of the blood and Bacon was formulating afresh the whole system of scientific thought. Living political problems inspired speculative inquiry into the bases of the political structure and the organisation of society. Advocates of parliamentary control began to assert that kings were nothing more than the chief magistrates of the states over which they ruled. Advocates of Absolutism discovered that they ruled by right divine, which it was profanity to question. Thomas Hobbes, the disciple and sometime secretary of Francis Bacon, recognised in politics a branch of the universal science conceived by his master; and being himself a convinced Absolutist, he endeavoured to discover a basis for Absolutism more satisfying to the reason than the theory of Divine Right. He evolved his own peculiar doctrine of the Social Contract, promulgated in the work which he called *Leviathan*. Mankind being by nature in a condition of war, every man against every other man, the warring units discovered that each of them could profit more, individually, by acting in consort with others for mutual assistance. But the individual had no guarantee that his consorts would not play him false; some coercive power was required. Hence men entered into a contract with each other to recognise and enforce the supreme authority of some one person or body of persons. Here was the nucleus of the state, the whole body of persons who entered into the contract which was *ipso facto* binding upon all persons born under the contract. But it was not a contract between the ruler and the ruled, but between the ruled among themselves; a contract from which they could not free themselves without dissolving society altogether. Society therefore has no rights as against the ruler; the ruler has obligations, but in respect of them he is responsible to himself and the Almighty and to no one else. But the doctrine of Thomas Hobbes, published in the early years of the Commonwealth, was by no means to the taste of the clerical royalism of the day, since it uncompromisingly subjected religion to the authority of the absolute ruler of the state. On the other hand, the theory of the Social Contract was appropriated and modified by the Constitutionals, and was formulated by John Locke in his *Theory of Civil Government*, the text-book of the Revolution Whigs. The king was bound by the contract, being himself a party to it in the primary constitution of society. If he broke his part of the contract, the other parties to it were released from their obligation, not of recognising a supreme authority, but of continuing to regard him personally as the seat of that authority, of which the ultimate sanction was the will of the society as a whole. The names of Hobbes and Locke, widely though they differ, stand at the head of the peculiarly English school of moral and political philosophy.

But the highest distinction was reserved for the leaders of English progress in natural science, one of whom stands second to none, whether in English or in European records. The discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton

in the field of physics revolutionised men's knowledge of the Universe. Not Darwin himself effected so fundamental a change in the imaginative conception of an infinite creation, apart from the vast practical bearings of the new knowledge. Perhaps the most creditable trait in the character of Charles II. was his genuine interest in scientific inquiry. To Charles we owe the foundation of the Royal Society; and beside the supreme name of Isaac Newton stand those of the astronomer Flamsteed, of Boyle the father of modern chemistry, and of Ray the founder of the science of zoology.



Head-piece from the Book of Common Prayer, 1662.

BOOK V

THE BRITISH EMPIRE

CHAPTER XXII

QUEEN ANNE

I

MARLBOROUGH

THE death of William III. left Whigs and Tories very evenly balanced in the House of Commons, while the Whigs had a small majority in the Peers. On the great pressing question of the hour, however, Whigs and Tories were for the time being at one. With few exceptions the Tories as well as the Whigs were a war party. Under these conditions William would have worked with a ministry mainly Whig, since the Whigs would have given him the stronger personal support. The Crown was still so strong that nothing short of a marked predominance in the Opposition would outweigh the king's personal predilections in selecting ministers and directing policy. Although William's successor was very far from possessing a strong character, this dominance of the Crown lasted throughout her reign. The queen chose her own ministers, and she did not select them because they represented the dominant party in the House of Commons. The queen's choice was generally managed by the reigning favourite. The reigning favourite at the moment of her accession was Sarah, as yet only Countess of Marlborough; and for eight years her ascendancy was the governing factor in English politics. Marlborough himself still counted as a Tory, though his party ties were of the slenderest. His closest personal ally was Godolphin, whose son had married one of Marlborough's daughters, while another was the wife of the young Earl of Sunderland, who this year succeeded to the title. Godolphin's Toryism, too, was by no means deeply rooted.

The natural effect of Anne's accession was in the first place to give the Tories the ascendancy in her ministry, but in the ministry itself the real supremacy lay with Marlborough; and since Marlborough was the inheritor of William's foreign policy, which was essentially that of the Whigs

and only accidentally that of the Tories, it followed that Marlborough and his ally Godolphin presently found themselves relying upon the Whigs and parting from the Tories. The curious fact is that Marlborough's own supremacy depended on his wife's ascendancy over the mind of the queen. When Anne freed herself from the yoke of the Duchess Sarah, Marlborough's supremacy collapsed. It was not the Revolution but the Hanoverian Succession which placed the Crown in subjection to parliament. At the moment of Anne's accession, however, everything pointed to the ascendancy of Tory policy. By associating itself with the war, the party

had saved its credit with the country. The queen's personal predilections were Tory, notably on questions connected with Church and Dissent, and a period of Whig depression was generally anticipated.

On the continent William's death appeared to be a ground for infinite congratulation for Louis XIV. For thirty years past William's patient, indomitable, remorseless resistance was the one obstacle which had constantly checked the French King's ambitions, and had more definitely foiled them since he had brought England to join forces with Holland. William was the diplomatist who had combined the powers against France, the general who had neutralised victory after victory



Queen Anne.

[From the painting by Kneller.]

of the French arms. William had been the soul and brain of the resistance to French aggression. And now the great antagonist had disappeared, at a moment when Louis occupied a position more advantageous than ever before. His grandson Philip was *de facto* king of Spain, and was accepted as king by Spain. French troops were in occupation of the Spanish Netherlands. Within the German Empire the Elector of Bavaria, Max Emanuel, had allied himself with Louis out of hostility to the Emperor. His alliance with Savoy gave him the entry of Italy. No one as yet knew that the allies had the two greatest soldiers of the day to lead them, and that one of them was not only a much greater military genius than William had been, but was hardly if at all inferior to him as a diplomatist.

Ostensibly the War of the Spanish Succession was a dynastic struggle

to decide whether the crown of Spain should rest on the head of a Hapsburg or of a Bourbon, a question of the balance of power to prevent the undue preponderance of France in Europe, a question in which England would hardly have been concerned but for the wound inflicted on her *amour propre* by the French king's recognition of a king of England whom England herself had rejected—another dynastic question. But in actual fact matters of vital interest were at stake. If England had stood aside, France and Spain between them would have taken complete possession of Italy and the Netherlands, and there would have been very little left of Holland. France and Spain would have been so closely united that they would have counted practically as a single power, and might have developed a maritime strength which would have become more than a menace to English naval supremacy. The whole of the Bourbon dominion would have been closed for British commerce, while the British colonies in America and the British trade in the East would have been seriously endangered. These possibilities had passed long before the war was actually over; but when the war began they were imminent perils. Neither statesmen nor merchants probably had any very definite idea of a British Empire as the stake for which the nation was fighting; but the mercantile interest, which was chiefly associated with the Whig party, was very much aware that unless the nation fought its commerce would be in jeopardy.

Fighting between France and Austria had already begun in Italy; and the allies whom William had brought together were much relieved to find that William's death would not withdraw England from the alliance. William himself, at the close of his reign, had settled upon Marlborough as the man to carry out his policy. Marlborough, conscious where his own supreme genius lay, was certain to feel that the road of his ambitions lay through European battlefields; and Marlborough's influence at home was ensured by the relations between the Countess Sarah and Queen Anne. War was declared in May, and William's nominee occupied his place as commander-in-chief of the allied army.

The new chief's operations were seriously hampered by the fact that instead of his having a free hand his plans were liable to be vetoed by a body of Dutch commissioners or "field deputies," who were not by any means military experts, while their views of the purposes to be served were strictly confined to the immediate securing of Holland against invasion. Marlborough, prohibited by them from seeking to destroy the French army in the field, had to content himself with manœuvres which forced the enemy back from the line of the Meuse. A series of forts were captured and Marlborough's reputation, which had hitherto been called in question, was established by the campaign, though his accomplishment fell far short of what he would have aimed at achieving if his hands had not been tied. In England his success was rewarded by his elevation to a Dukedom.

Meanwhile, an expedition had been despatched to Cadiz under Sir

George Rooke, which failed there ignominiously ; but his fleet redeemed his credit by breaking the boom of the harbour of Vigo, where it destroyed a powerful French squadron, and sank the most part of a great treasure fleet, after securing booty to the value of about a million sterling.

Again, in 1703, the French confined themselves to a campaign in the Netherlands, and again the Dutch sought to confine Marlborough to a campaign of sieges. His operations were marred by the disobedience to orders of the Dutch generals, and the flat refusal of the Dutch field deputies to sanction his design of falling upon the main French force.



John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough.
[After the painting by Van der Werff.]

The campaign, therefore, was marked with no striking results. Meanwhile France had designed what should have been a paralysing blow to the Grand Alliance. Marshal Villars from the Upper Rhine, the Elector of Bavaria, and Vendôme from Italy, were to effect a junction and strike straight at Vienna. The plan was frustrated by the unforeseen. Villars and the Elector joined hands ; but then the latter proceeded into the Tirol, a province of Austria which had been promised to him with careless generosity by the French king. He meant to secure the Tirol and to join the French as they came up from Italy by the Brenner Pass. But the Tirolese, who were not parties to this arrangement, handled the electoral troops so roughly that Max Emanuel evacuated the country and declared himself unable


to proceed to Vienna. Moreover, no French column came from Italy, because Victor Amadeus of Savoy played his favourite game of changing sides at the critical moment. He fell upon Vendôme's communications, and the French general had to turn back instead of advancing to join hands with Villars.

Now Austria was in no plight to resist a French invasion in force, supported by Bavaria. On the east she was harassed by a Hungarian rebellion ; and her military organisation was in a state of desperate disorder, which Prince Eugene was patiently struggling to remedy. Austria owed the services of that brilliant commander to the fact that when he offered his sword to France some years before, when his talents were still unknown, she had declined. Though the French scheme of invasion had been baulked in 1703, it was to be carried out next year on a less complicated plan of campaign. Vienna was doomed, unless England and Holland came to the rescue, and neither England nor Holland would dream of withdrawing

forces from the Netherlands in order to take care of Austria. It was true that if the power of Austria were shattered France would be able to concentrate the whole of her force on the Netherlands ; but English Tories had a vague conviction that English troops ought not to be fighting on the continent at all, certainly not further off than Holland ; and the Dutch did not look further than the defence of their own frontier.

Marlborough appreciated the situation and formed his own plan, which had to be carried out without being suspected either in England or in Holland, to say nothing of France. He required a confidant in Holland and another in England to hoodwink the two governments while he concerted his scheme with Eugene.

From England he obtained an authority which sufficed for his purpose ; from the Dutch he procured permission to conduct a campaign on the Moselle with a large force. To the Moselle went Marlborough with his army ; the great French force still on the Upper Rhine awaited developments. Suddenly Marlborough vanished ; he was racing through Germany to Bavaria to join Eugene, and was fairly out of



Plan of the Battle of Blenheim.

reach before Dutch or English could make any attempt to stop him. On the way he joined a German force under Lewis of Baden.

Bavaria was commanded by a hostile force holding the heights of Schellenberg, by Donauwerth ; the position was stormed and carried. Meanwhile Tallard, who had taken the place of Villars as commander of the army of invasion on the Rhine, had started on his march to join the Elector of Bavaria and the French forces under Marsin which were already in that region. By August 12th Marlborough had effected his junction with Eugene, and the hostile armies lay facing each other, the river or stream of the Nebel flowing between them into the Danube. The French right was in the village of Blenheim on the bank of the great river. It was the task of Eugene on the right of the allies to keep the French left in play when the great battle was fought on the 13th. It was not till mid-day that the allies opened the attack, which was developed on the two wings. At four in the afternoon every attack had been beaten back, but the French centre had been weakened to strengthen the wings. It was at this point

that Marlborough reconstructed his lines for a furious assault upon the French centre, which was pierced. The French right was rolled up, and nearly the whole of it was cut to pieces, driven into the Danube, or forced to surrender; the left, principally the Bavarian contingent, for the most part made its escape, since the victorious army was unable to follow up the pursuit. But the victory was absolutely decisive and crushing. The French were driven back behind the Rhine, and there was no more thought or talk of a French army threatening Vienna. Marlborough returned to the Netherlands.

Meanwhile Admiral Rooke had been despatched with intent to an attack upon Toulon, the naval control of the Mediterranean being very definitely a part of Marlborough's conception of the war policy as a whole. He did not attack Toulon, because the Duke of Savoy was unable to co-operate as had been intended. Though he had a great fleet it appeared that he would have made no use of it at all if he had not been goaded into trying what could be done with Gibraltar. When the attack was made it was found that the place was practically incapable of offering resistance. It was seized in the name of King Charles III.—that is, the Austrian Archduke Charles, the son to whom the Austrian Emperor had finally made over his own claim to the Spanish throne—and was garrisoned with English troops. Little general importance seems to have been attached to the capture at the time except by Marlborough, who declared that no cost should be spared to make it secure. Thus accidentally the great fortress passed into English control.

The last parliament of William III. was also the first parliament of Queen Anne's reign. It was dissolved in the summer of 1702, and the new House of Commons, which met in the autumn, showed a large Tory preponderance. The small Whig majority in the Lords was due to the presence of the latitudinarian bishops appointed under William—men who were in sympathy with the principles of toleration. The queen and the Tories were antagonistic to the Nonconformists. The bulk of the Tories were opposed to Marlborough, not on the general principle of maintaining the war, but because they wished to restrict it to the sea so far as England was concerned; whereas Marlborough, like William, while he understood better than the Tories themselves the importance of naval supremacy and the way to secure it, was also determined that England should take the lead upon land as well. Thus practically from the outset there was a growing estrangement between Marlborough and Godolphin on the one hand and the Tories on the other, while the duchess exerted herself to ally her husband with the Whigs, and to manage the queen on the same lines. The advanced Tories for their part endeavoured to establish a complete Tory ascendancy, increasingly antagonistic to Marlborough himself. The struggle between Tories and Whigs was to a very considerable extent a contest between the Commons and the Lords. In this contest the Lords were victorious. They were able to defeat the attempt of the



THE BATTLE OF BLENHEIM (OR HOCHSTAEDI), AUGUST 13, 1704

A reference to the map on page 553 will render clear the positions of the opposing armies of Marlborough and Prince Eugene and those of the French and Bavarians. From a print by J. van Huchtenburgh.

Commons to apply the late Act of Succession so as to exclude from the House of Lords the Dutchmen who had received peerages from William. They defeated also an Occasional Conformity Bill, which now became a favourite scheme of the Tories. William's Toleration Act had conceded freedom of worship to the Nonconformists, but retained the tests which required all office-holders to participate in Anglican services. Nonconformists in general, while habitually attending their own places of worship, did not find it against their consciences to make the necessary attendances at the Anglican rites, so that the still valid Corporation and Test Acts did not in effect preclude them from taking office. The object of the High Churchmen was to disqualify these Occasional Conformists by penalising them heavily if they attended the religious services of any body other than that of the Church of England while they held office. This attempt also the Lords were able to frustrate. Popular sentiment was at first on the High Church side, but a strong reaction was produced, in part at least by an ironical pamphlet entitled *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*, which pretended to be an inflammatory appeal to all good Churchmen to insist on the extirpation of the enemies of Church and State. The satire on the Tory programme was convincing, and the Tories only made matters worse for themselves by having the author, Daniel Defoe, set in the pillory. The punishment provided the audacious pamphleteer with a popular ovation.

The Blenheim campaign saved what may be called the Marlborough Administration. The Tories had been studiously minimising the Duke's doings on the continent ; but the attempt to belittle Blenheim itself recoiled on their own heads. The victory was in effect a Whig triumph. A general election in the spring of 1705 gave a small Whig majority in the Commons, where Harley, the leader of the moderate Tories, alone of that party remained firmly attached to the Ministry, since Marlborough and Godolphin must now be reckoned as Whigs. But the administration was also reinforced by Henry St. John, the most brilliant of the younger Tories. The remaining members of the party were soon displaced by pronounced Whigs. The Government thus formed devoted itself to the whole-hearted carrying out of Marlborough's war policy ; but it achieved something still more vital to the future of the British Empire in carrying through the Incorporating Union between England and Scotland.

II

THE UNION

An Incorporating Union between England and Scotland was a project which William III. had been anxious to carry through ; and one of his last public acts was to commend such a scheme to the consideration of the Scottish parliament. The existing arrangement, which united the crowns

only, was fraught with danger ; for Scotland it was intolerable. As matters stood, England was practically able to treat Scotland as a hostile country whose commercial interests were to be ruined for the benefit of England ; while the Union of the Crowns left the weaker and poorer country no means of defending herself except commercial retaliation, which could inflict no great harm in England but must inevitably be ruinous to Scotland herself. With the Union dissolved, Scotland could at least follow the ancient policy of allying herself with the enemies of England abroad ; and separation appealed to the Scottish mind as being a restoration of Scotland's ancient independence. An independent Scotland could not be ignored by England ; a Scotland tied to her as Scotland was now tied could be ignored altogether. The fact had become most patent during William's own reign. Though he himself had been unable to visit his northern kingdom, he had not been unpopular there in spite of Glencoe and the Darien failure. In the one case he was held to have been misled by Dalrymple, and in the other to have been rather the victim of irresistible pressure than a free agent. But it was precisely in that fact that Scottish hostility to the existing arrangement found its strongest argument. If such a king as William found himself compelled to subordinate Scottish to English interests, in spite of his zeal for even-handed justice, it was hardly possible that Scotland should not suffer yet more under another king who wore the English crown. The one condition, therefore, which could make the Union of the Crowns tolerable was commercial equality. Scotland was practically agreed that the alternative to commercial equality was separation ; and the threat of separation was the one means by which commercial equality might be obtained.

There was no possible question of Scotland's right to separate herself from England. The two nations were bound together by nothing whatever except the accident that a King of Scotland had succeeded to the throne of England as the legitimate heir a hundred years before. Since that time each nation had asserted its own right to lay down a rule of succession for itself. The English Commonwealth indeed, for its own preservation, had asserted its right to forbid Scotland by force of arms to set up as a separate kingdom under a Stuart monarch ; but there was no possibility of questioning that, for so doing she had no other authority than that of superior force. At the Restoration England herself had cancelled the absorption of Scotland. Both countries had rejected James II., and both had accepted William ; but the Acts by which England had fixed the course of the succession to the English throne were in no sense binding upon Scotland, which had not committed itself any further than the acceptance of Anne. Though England had selected the Electress Sophia and her heirs, Scotland was perfectly free to settle the Scottish succession on some one else.

Now England had hitherto turned a deaf ear to all Scottish complaints on the score of her commercial policy. The recognised English mercantile doctrine was that foreign products should not be allowed to compete

with home products at all in the home market, or in the foreign market so far as such competition could be prevented. With greater insight the Commonwealth had realised that English commerce would not suffer by freeing the trade with Scotland, Ireland, and the Colonies. But with the Restoration England had reverted to the earlier theory. She believed that something very tangible would be required to compensate her for any concession on the point; and hitherto Scotland had had nothing very tangible to offer. But now came the Scottish threat of separation. The Scottish parliament passed what was called the Act of Security, which asserted the right of the nation to nominate as successor to the throne of Scotland some other person than the Electress Sophia. It claimed also that the great officers should be nominated by the Scottish parliament, whose consent should be necessary to any declaration of war on the part of a king of Scotland who was also king of England. Here then was something tangible. Nothing short of an incorporating union could preclude the possibility that now or at some future time the exiled Stuarts might be restored in Scotland, and England might be hampered as of old by a hostile state in the North, ready to attack her whenever she should find herself embroiled with continental powers, and ready also to support a Jacobite revolt. Immunity from that danger was worth purchasing at the cost of commercial concessions. On the other hand, Scotland could hardly be secure of the permanence of commercial concessions unless they were guaranteed by an incorporating union. The problem was to frame an incorporating union sufficiently attractive to Scotland to counterbalance the Nationalist bias towards separation. For half Scotland was convinced that no union whatever could be devised which would not subordinate Scottish to English interests.

The Convention in Scotland which had called William to the throne, and had by him been continued as a parliament, had never been dissolved; Scotland had no Triennial Act. It was exceedingly doubtful whether this assembly had any validity as a parliament beyond the term of William's own reign. Nevertheless it was this parliament which opened the negotiations for a union with England at the moment when a House of Commons had just been returned with a large Tory majority. The moment therefore was unfavourable, because, whereas the Whigs followed William in favouring the idea of the union, the Tories as a natural consequence were antagonistic. The conference therefore between the Scottish and English commissioners which was held in the winter of 1702-3 was unsatisfactory. The authority of the Scottish commissioners was dubious, and Scottish Nationalists had already repudiated the authority of the parliament. The English commissioners, though ready to make concessions, still fell considerably short of the minimum of the Scottish demands.

The election of a new parliament in Scotland whose legal authority should be beyond question left the real Unionists, headed by Queensberry, decidedly weak; while the Nationalists, or "Country Party," seemed likely

to gain the support of the extreme section who called themselves Cavaliers, with most of those who were as yet indisposed to commit themselves to one side or the other. The head of this coalition was that Duke of Hamilton who figures in Thackeray's *Esmond*. The real chief of the uncompromising Nationalists was Fletcher of Saltoun. It was the parliament thus composed which passed the Act of Security already referred to, in which the crucial clause declared that, after Anne, the same person should be incapable of being king or queen of both England and Scotland unless England had conceded "a free communication of trade, the freedom of navigation, and the liberty of the Plantations," that is to say, of the colonies. The Act did not receive the royal assent this year, but did so in the following year after it had again been passed with the commercial clause omitted.

The Act of Security received the royal assent almost on the day when Marlborough was winning the battle of Blenheim. The event was unknown; disaster was still possible; if the royal assent had been refused, Scotland would have refused the money to pay the army, and if Marlborough had been defeated on the Danube, a very critical situation would have arisen. After Blenheim, the English Government no longer felt that it would be imperilled by anything that Scotland might do. The immediate reply of the Whigs to the Act of Security was contained in measures stiffening the barriers to Scottish trade, ordering the north of England to be put in a state of defence, and treating all Scots as aliens unless and until Scotland should adopt the line of succession laid down for the English Crown. But these measures were accompanied by further proposals for a union; and again in April 1706 commissioners from the two countries were assembled to discuss terms.

The Scots proposed in effect a commercial union under one crown, the two countries retaining their separate legislatures. The English insisted that the union of legislatures and the acceptance of the English rule of succession were a *sine qua non*. The Scots required with equal emphasis that the freedom of trade should be part of the bargain. These conditions having been accepted by both sides, there remained questions of detail as to the treatment of finance, the composition of the united legislature, and the security in Scotland of the national religion and national institutions. In July nearly the whole of the commissioners signed the articles; but the ratification by both parliaments was still necessary. The English commissioners had done a good deal towards disarming opposition by the liberality of their financial concessions and by the reasonableness of their demands as to the relative strength of the representation of the two nations in the parliament of Great Britain. Before the Scottish Estates met in the autumn to discuss the acceptance of the treaty, the English parliament had withdrawn the hostile measures with which they had responded to the Act of Security. Marlborough's later successes in the Netherlands had confirmed the results of Blenheim,

and neither Nationalists nor Jacobites in Scotland could use the fear of France as a lever for gaining their own ends.

Nevertheless, it was still far from certain that the treaty would be accepted. On one side there were the zealots of the Covenant, who feared for the independence of the Scottish Kirk, on the other the Jacobitism which was wide-spread in the Highlands, though comparatively inactive in the Lowlands. Everywhere, even among men who were rationally convinced of the substantial benefits that would arise from the union, there was a sentimental antipathy to anything which savoured of diminishing national independence. It was possible with perfect honesty, and easy by means of deliberate exaggeration and misrepresentation, to excite a passion of emotional hostility, insomuch that hardly any one believed that the union would be carried without bloodshed. But the opposition was overcome, not without the employment of influence which a strict political morality would have rejected as corrupt. The leaders of the opposition were divided. But when the crucial clause deciding the question of the legislative union came up for final decision, Hamilton abstained from voting, and the clause was carried by a substantial majority.

The Scottish Act of Union received the royal assent in January 1707; that of the English parliament received it in March. The Acts came in force on the 1st May, and from that time England and Scotland, while their separate nationalities remained intact, were merged in the single Power of Great Britain.

From a strictly constitutional point of view, the government of England was modified at the Union by nothing more than the addition of forty-five Scottish members to the House of Commons and of sixteen Scottish peers to the House of Lords. So far as the sovereignty of the country lay with the parliament there was no change. It was not so with Scotland, where it was only during the reign of William III. that parliament had claimed powers approximating to those of the English Estates. The Union in fact applied the English system to Scotland. On the other hand, it prepared the way for Scotland to exercise a very effective influence in the policy and the concerns of Great Britain. Scottish Nationalism was respected, the Presbyterian Scottish establishment was secured, the Scottish system of law and Scottish institutions generally were preserved. Although the Treaty of Union could not in effect debar the sovereign parliament of Great Britain from occasionally modifying the original terms, the fact still remained that it would be exceedingly dangerous to the public welfare and the public peace for the parliament of Great Britain to introduce modifications which were not acceptable to the Scottish people.

When there was no longer any differentiation between English and Scottish trade and shipping, the way was cleared for an immense development of Scottish energy and Scottish wealth, although half a century was to pass before the effects were thoroughly realised. At the moment and for years to come the Union was not popular in Scotland; it had been

carried because the Unionists proved themselves more skilful party managers than the Nationalist stalwarts. The opposition to Jacobitism was much weakened in the northern country by the expectation that national independence would be restored with the Restoration of the Stuarts. It was not till the Jacobites had played their last card and lost the game for good and all at Culloden that Scotland became sufficiently reconciled to the Union to turn it to full account.

III

THE WHIG ASCENDENCY

The year which followed Blenheim was a trying one for Marlborough. His design for an effective invasion of France was frustrated by the failure of the imperialist troops to co-operate. He succeeded during the summer in piercing the French lines with his English and Dutch forces; but when he would have followed up the success, he was paralysed by the obstinacy of the Dutch field deputies and the misconduct of some of the Dutch commanders. There was the usual tendency of the English and Dutch, each to suspect the others of playing for their own interests. Through the winter Marlborough was engaged in diplomatic efforts to bring the new Emperor Joseph and the German States which had joined the alliance effectively into line. Yet, although his hand was strengthened in Holland by a reaction in his favour, brought about by the discovery of the misconduct of some of the Dutch generals, Holland refused in 1706 to sanction his design of carrying an allied force into Italy and sweeping the French out of that country as he had previously swept them behind the Rhine. The Northern German States were equally averse from sharing in such remote expeditions.

Nevertheless he found his opportunity for dealing another destructive blow to the French in the Netherlands. The Dutch for once abstained from tying his hands, and at the battle of Ramillies in May he inflicted a tremendous defeat upon the French marshal Villeroi. The result of the victory was a general evacuation by the French of Flanders and Brabant. From Ostend to Brussels and Louvain the whole region before the end of the year passed into the possession of the allies. Moreover, the battle itself produced such an effect on the German princes that they yielded to Marlborough's exhortations, and sent their troops to Italy, where the campaign, conducted by Prince Eugene, cleared the French out of the country.

During these two years also the allies were possessed with illusory ideas on the subject of the Spanish Peninsula itself. The plain fact was that the entire peninsula, with the exception of the kingdom of Portugal and the province of Catalonia, was on the side of Philip. The Catalonians,

who had been robbed of cherished political rights by the supremacy of Castile, flung themselves into the cause of the Archduke Charles ; Portugal had confirmed the alliance with England which had originated at the time of the Restoration in England. Portugal and Catalonia gave the great maritime Power an entry to Spain both on the west and on the east. Imperial and British troops were sent to Spain, the latter under the command of the brilliant but exceedingly erratic Lord Peterborough. Successes of a remarkable character were achieved in a most unorthodox manner ; but it was no more possible for the English and Imperialists to carry out an effective conquest of Spain against the will of the Spanish people than for France to achieve the same object a hundred years later. Although in 1706 it seemed for a time that the Bourbon cause was lost, its ascendancy was recovered in the following year at the battle of Almanza. The French on this occasion were commanded by the Duke of Berwick, an illegitimate son of James II., whose mother was Marlborough's sister.

Again in that year, 1707, Marlborough's great naval designs were frustrated. None of the allies could be easily persuaded to take part wholeheartedly in any share of a general scheme in which their own individual interests did not obviously occupy the first place. The clearance of Italy in 1706 opened the way for the invasion of France from the south-east. Marlborough designed such an invasion, with which the British fleet (as it must be called from this date) was to co-operate. The objective was to be Toulon, and the capture of Toulon would turn the Mediterranean into a British lake. But since this presented itself as a merely British interest to the Austrians, no energy was applied to the project. All that Austria and Savoy really cared about was to secure the Italian land frontier against French invasion.

During 1707 Marlborough himself was again engaged in diplomacy, not on campaigning. Charles XII. of Sweden had started on his astonishing and meteoric career. He had grievances against the Emperor, and there was serious danger that his sword would be thrown into the scale, in effect against the Grand Alliance. In part at least it was due to Marlborough that the danger passed, and Charles plunged into Russia,



The Allied Forces going into action at Ramillies.

[From a medal struck to commemorate the victory.]

a country which was just beginning to assume European importance under Peter the Great.

The situation at the end of 1706 looked so ill for France that Louis was prepared to seek peace with the allies on the terms of giving up the Bourbon claim to Spain and the Netherlands. The terms, however, were rejected by the allies, and the events of 1707 on the whole gave some encouragement to France. Hence a vigorous defensive campaign was planned in the Netherlands for the next year. Marlborough was hampered as usual by the difficulty of obtaining the co-operation of the German forces, whose Northern army had now been placed under the command of

the Elector of Hanover, the future George I. of England. Eugene, however, released from Italy, was now bringing up a third army to the North; and with him Marlborough could always count upon cordial agreement.



A medal celebrating the French defeat at Oudenarde.

But before a junction could be effected some of the recently occupied Netherland towns revolted against the Dutch ascendancy, and the French were threatening Oudenarde. Marlborough could not afford to wait for the whole of Eugene's army, though he was joined by Eugene in person. By rapid and skilful movements he was able to fling himself upon the French forces near Oudenarde and to inflict upon them a decisive defeat, though too late in the afternoon to effect the complete destruction of the French army. The victory enabled Marlborough to prevent the French from recovering Ostend, after another brilliant action had been fought by General Webb at Wynendael. Before the end of the year the important fortress of Lille surrendered. Another valuable capture bears further witness to Marlborough's understanding of the meaning of naval supremacy. It was owing to his urgency that a force was despatched to Minorca, Port Mahon seized, and the island occupied, a winter naval station in the Mediterranean being thereby provided for the British fleets. The design was carried out by Lord Stanhope; the island remained a British possession till its loss in 1756.

Ever since Blenheim the power of the Whigs at home had been steadily increasing. The party was controlled by a group known as the Junto, consisting of Lord Somers, Charles Montague, who had become Lord Halifax, and must not be confused with the "Trimmer" Halifax of the Revolution, Sunderland, Wharton, and Lord Orford—that Admiral Russell

who had won the battle of La Hogue. It was the completeness of their agreement with Marlborough and Godolphin with regard to the war which bound these two chiefs to the Whig party, of which they were not professedly members. The Tories, Harley and St. John, endeavoured to undermine the Whig influence through Abigail Hill (Mrs. Masham), a kinswoman both of Harley and of the Duchess of Marlborough. The intrigue was detected at the beginning of 1708, Harley was removed, and the ministry became exclusively Whig, though Mrs. Masham still retained the ear of the queen in spite of the Duchess. A general election in the summer confirmed the Whig ascendancy, all the more because the majority of the Scots in both Houses for practical purposes increased the majority of the Whigs. Their victory in Parliament was capped by the successful campaigns of the year and the apparent prostration of France.

So complete was this prostration that Louis was ready to accept almost any terms for peace. He was willing to withdraw even from active support of his grandson's claim to the Spanish throne, and to surrender to the Dutch sundry fortresses in the Netherlands which would serve as a barrier against French aggression. But the Emperor was not satisfied with the terms; and neither the Whigs nor Marlborough wanted peace, Marlborough for obvious reasons, and the Whigs because they were afraid that peace would be followed by a Tory reaction. The war party were afraid that Holland might be tempted by the offers of Louis to make a separate treaty on her own account; against this they secured themselves by the Barrier Treaty with Holland engaging to secure her still more favourable terms. The demands finally formulated for the acceptance of the French king were in plain terms intolerable; for he was required not only to withdraw his support from Philip but to employ French troops in ejecting him from Spain, on which Louis very pertinently observed that if he must fight some one he would fight not his friends but his enemies.

A wave of fiery enthusiasm ensued. A new army was drawn together, ill-fed and ill-clad but burning with patriotic ardour. Under the command of Villars, the best of the French marshals, it met Marlborough and Eugene at Malplaquet. The formal victory fell to the allies, but at the cost of terrific carnage, and losses heavier than those of the French, who were able to beat an orderly and secure retreat. It was a Pyrrhic victory; though it enabled the victors to capture some more fortresses in the course of the next twelve months, they had been punished too severely to strike any decisive blow. And when the



Queen Anne clipping the wings of the Gallic cock.

[A contemporary caricature of the French position in 1708.]

twelve months were past, the war party was no longer in the ascendant in England.

Again, in Spain renewed campaigning went on the whole favourably to the allies through the first half of 1710, but the Spaniards remained obstinately loyal to Philip. In the autumn they received more reinforcements from France, and at the end of the year the small British contingent under Stanhope forming the rearguard of the allied army was surprised and compelled to surrender at Brihuega. The other successes of the allies had little effect beyond hardening their hearts to the persistent rejection of peace proposals.

In the meanwhile matters had been going ill with the ministry in




The campaigns of Marlborough.

England. In 1709 the Duchess of Marlborough's influence with the queen was waning, and all Anne's personal sympathies were with the Tories. Moreover, there was serious friction between the Junto on one hand and Godolphin and Marlborough on the other. In the winter both Marlborough and the Junto committed serious blunders. Marlborough, anxious to secure his own position above party, applied to the queen to be made Captain-General for life. The fact sufficed by itself to destroy his popularity and to arouse ominous suspicions that he was scheming for a military dictatorship. The Whigs found their own pitfall in an outbreak of High Church fanaticism. An egregious divine, Dr. Henry Sacheverell, had long made himself notorious by his attacks upon dissenters and upon the latitudinarian bishops. On November 5th he preached in St. Paul's an egregious sermon denouncing toleration and comprehension, directed against prominent politicians and more particularly against Godolphin, to whom he

referred by the popular nickname of Volpone, taken from Ben Jonson's play.

The thing itself was of no serious consequence, but it was typical of the attitude of the High Clerical Tories who represented Whig ascendancy as a danger to the Church. The Whig leaders, urged on by the vindictiveness of Godolphin, resolved to silence the political extravagances of the pulpit instead of leaving them alone. Sacheverell was impeached, and was forthwith prematurely glorified as a martyr; his trial caused as much excitement as that of the seven bishops. The real object of the Whigs in the prosecution, apart from Godolphin's personal feeling of vindictiveness, was to procure the condemnation of the prevalent Tory doctrines as subversive of the principles of the Revolution and as being in fact veiled Jacobitism. There was not much difficulty, however, in representing their action as mere persecution of a political opponent. The Doctor was a



A High Church caricature on the Sacheverell prosecution, 1710.

fashionable preacher, and the fashionable audience who attended his trial were moved to sympathetic tears by his eloquent defence. The Peers, by a small majority, found him guilty of the charges, but they had taken alarm at the popular excitement; the queen was known to be favourable to the culprit; and the sentence merely suspended him from preaching for three years, and ordered the obnoxious sermon to be publicly burnt. The Whigs had only succeeded in making themselves look foolish.

Through the early months of 1710 Harley was secretly intriguing to sow dissensions among the Whig chiefs and to foster the queen's increasing determination to escape from the yoke of Duchess Sarah. He brought into play the erratic Shrewsbury, who had secluded himself from politics for many years past. Before midsummer the queen had broken finally with her ancient but too domineering confidante. The disappearance of the Duchess of Marlborough from her intimate society was followed by the dismissal first of Sunderland and then of Godolphin. Harley reappeared in the ministry. His own object was in all probability to form

a ministry made up of the moderates of both parties. But there was no real coalescence. By September all Harley's colleagues were Tories, while the House of Commons was the same which had been returned as triumphantly Whig some two years before. A general election was inevitable, and resulted in the return of a strong Tory majority.

IV

THE TORY ASCENDENCY

The Barrier Treaty had done the war party no good, since it had encouraged the popular cry that England was pouring out blood and treasure merely to benefit the Dutch; moreover, the extravagant conditions of peace offered to and rejected by Louis could not be reconciled with that desire to bring the war to an honourable close by which every one was professedly actuated. The events of 1710 demonstrated with some clearness that the war was not likely to come to an end at all if Britain insisted on the Whig formula which absolutely refused to recognise the Bourbon king of Spain. The Tory ministers were entirely warranted in conveying to France their readiness to enter upon negotiations with a view to terminating the war. The peace party received a great accession of strength by the death of the Emperor Joseph and the consequent succession of his brother the Archduke Charles to the Austrian dominion and the Imperial Crown. England had not gone into the war in order to revive for Charles VI. the enormous empire of Charles V. A Hapsburg on the Spanish throne had certainly appeared preferable to a Bourbon so long as it was clearly understood that the different Hapsburg crowns were not to be worn by one person; but if the Austrian Emperor, Charles VI., was established also as the head of the Spanish Empire as the result of a great European war ostensibly directed to maintaining the balance of power, the paradox would be somewhat glaring.

Throughout 1711 secret negotiations with France were in progress. There was, in fact, only one way to bring the war to an end—that one of the great Powers should come to terms with France and then insist upon the other Powers accepting those terms. Only by pressure of this kind could they be induced individually to surrender extravagant claims. The war itself was languishing; Marlborough was conscious of the precarious character of his own position in England, since his wife had not only ceased to be the queen's intimate confidante, but had been definitely dismissed. The political managers in England were Harley, the nominal chief of the Tories, and the brilliant St. John, men whose characters and aims were too incompatible for the alliance to last, though they might be considered as each other's complements until they became antagonists. Harley was an opportunist with a dislike for extremes and a preference for

back-stairs methods. St. John was an ambitious adventurer, entirely unscrupulous, and of boundless audacity, who held Harley's cautious and non-committal attitude in contempt, though he was quite ready to assume the same attitude merely as a mask. For him the matter of first-rate importance was to gain a complete ascendancy over the fox-hunting Tory squires whom he despised from the bottom of his soul.

But for both Harley and St. John the first thing was to procure peace and to get rid of Marlborough. The two objects were secured by a *coup d'état* at the end of the year. The way was blocked by the hostile majority in the House of Peers, small but sufficient. The majority was converted into a minority by the innovation of adding twelve Tories to the Peerage, and the transformation of the House of Lords was accompanied by the dismissal of Marlborough and the appointment of Ormonde to the chief military command. The ministers could conduct with a free hand the negotiations which now opened at Utrecht for a general peace, as to the terms of which they had already come to their agreement with France.

The Peace of Utrecht, which was signed in the spring of 1713, was the great achievement of the Tory ministry. In its broad lines it was such a treaty as would have been approved by William III., although the terms obtained by France were infinitely better than those which Louis would have accepted in 1707, 1709, or 1710. It was of little importance that the Emperor chose to prolong the war with France on his own account for some little while before he would surrender his claims. Philip was to retain Spain and the Indies, but he and his house were to be barred from the French succession; the Spanish Netherlands became the Austrian Netherlands, while Holland held the barrier fortresses. Naples and Milan went to Austria; Sicily was handed over as a kingdom to the Duke of Savoy. The gains of Great Britain from the treaty were substantial. She retained Minorca and Gibraltar, bases for the naval command of the Mediterranean. In America she received Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and the Hudson Bay Territory, all of them hitherto subjects of periodical dispute with France. In the West Indies she acquired the island of St. Christopher. To her was transferred what was called the *Asiento*, restricted rights of trading with the Spanish colonies which had recently been enjoyed by France. This included a monopoly of the supply of negro slaves and the right of sending one trading vessel annually to trade in the South Seas. Further, France undertook to dismantle Dunkirk, formally repudiated the claim of the exiled Stuarts to the Crown of Great Britain, and acknowledged the Hanoverian Succession.

The war, which was originally commenced for sound enough reasons, had been carried on successfully by the Whigs, and the Tories brought it to an end by a peace which came as near to achieving the original aims of the war as could have been hoped for. Great Britain herself had very substantial gains in the American territories and the two new naval bases in the Mediterranean. But while the peace itself might be claimed as satisfactory, two at


least of the attendant circumstances were extremely discreditable to the ministry. Great Britain induced the allies to come to terms by practically deserting them in the field. Ormonde's forces were neutralised by orders from home, while he was still supposed to be acting in concert with the allies. This might perhaps have been excused as being no very great breach of international political morality; but no excuse whatever could be found for the desertion of the Catalonians. The British had directly encouraged Catalonia to rise in arms against the Bourbon monarchy; they were bound in honour to protect the Catalonians against any vindictive treatment. They did nothing of the kind; they made no terms for their Spanish allies, and the rebellious province was left to the tender mercies of the Spanish monarchy.

Probably the Tories did themselves more harm by proposing a commercial treaty with France to accompany the Treaty of Utrecht. In 1704 the Methuen Treaty with Portugal had secured a market for English wool by granting a preference to Portuguese wines, which gave port wine its enormous vogue throughout the eighteenth century. The Methuen Treaty was universally applauded, because the value of the exports to Portugal was much greater than that of the imports; what was called the "balance of trade" was heavily in favour of England, because the difference in values was made up in bullion. A commercial treaty with France, on the other hand, would on the same principles have been in favour of France, where there was no great market for English goods, whereas a lowered tariff would have induced a great demand for French wines and other goods in Britain. Bullion would have gone out of Great Britain into France; so that, according to the theory of the time, a country generally hostile to us would have gained at our expense. The proposal was received with so much indignation that it had to be dropped.

This affair is to be noted as a striking example of the fact that the Whigs were much more determined advocates of the mercantile theory of economics than the Tories. The strength of Toryism lay with the landed interest, and the landed interest had not become protectionist for the simple reason that the country had no difficulty in producing all the corn it wanted for itself. The strength of the Whigs lay among the mercantile classes, and the mercantile classes still believed that their own interests were safeguarded by protection. In the nineteenth century the points of view were reversed; it was the landowners who demanded Protection and the mercantile classes who carried Free Trade.

The Whigs had believed that they could best maintain themselves in power by prolonging the war; the Tories had displaced them by advocating peace on the ground that the war was being continued for the benefit not of Great Britain but of the allies. Hitherto both parties had posed alike as supporters of the Hanoverian Succession. But while the Tory leaders were endeavouring to maintain themselves in power by securing the favour of Queen Anne, the Whig leaders were busy in im-

pressing upon the court of Hanover the conviction that they were the friends of Hanover, and that the Hanoverian Succession was endangered by the Tory ascendancy. The Tories did not grasp the position until it was too late. Before the end of 1713 it was already a moral certainty that, as soon as the Elector of Hanover ascended the British throne, he would place himself in the hands of the Whigs. And the Tories had only just awakened to the fact that the succession question was imminent. Harley, now known as the Earl of Oxford, was not the man to guide the party in an emergency, but he was the man in possession. St. John, who was now Viscount Bolingbroke, found that the time had arrived when he must grasp the leadership. When that was secured, he would have to stake everything on a Stuart Restoration, though until he held complete control such a policy could not be avowed. The general election which followed the peace had preserved the predominance of his party in Parliament. The matter of vital importance



A hackney coach about 1710.

[From a broadside.]

for him was to get rid of Oxford, and himself to obtain such a dominant influence with the party as would enable him to carry it with him when the moment arrived for throwing off the mask and declaring for King James.

If the game was to be won it would not be by any futile effort to conciliate adverse interests and win over the moderates. The thing could only be effected by an appeal made to popular passion at the right moment, and the Sacheverell incident pointed to a wave of High Church fanaticism as the most promising means to attaining the end in view. To secure the High Churchmen the Schism Act was introduced and carried, which entirely barred dissenters from educational work. It was an obvious first step towards the revival of the Clarendon Code, overthrown by William's Toleration Act, but still dear to the hearts of the High Church Tories. It served its purpose in rallying the whole of that section to the enthusiastic acceptance of Bolingbroke's leadership. Meanwhile he had not only been intriguing with James, but had been steadily employing Mrs. Masham to destroy Oxford's influence with the queen.

On July 27th the intrigues were so far successful that Anne dismissed Oxford, and Bolingbroke had a clear field in forming a new administration. Ready and swift as he was, death was swifter. In three days all the controlling executive offices had been conferred upon Jacobites, secret or avowed; yet a few days more were needed to make the control effective and enable Bolingbroke openly to throw off the mask. The few days were not given. On the third day after the fall of Oxford the queen had an apoplectic stroke. The Council met, among them the incalculable Shrewsbury. To

them entered two of the great Whig Peers, Somerset and Argyle, to offer their aid in this melancholy emergency. Custom restricted attendance at the Council meetings to the acting ministers of state, but theoretically all members of the Privy Council could claim the right to be present. The arrival of Argyle and Somerset was sufficient proof that the Whigs had concerted their measures for the emergency. Bolingbroke dared not take the tremendous risk of there and then throwing off the mask and declaring against the Hanoverian Succession. Some one, perhaps he himself, proposed that Shrewsbury, who was obviously in collusion with the Whigs, should be made Lord Treasurer ; Bolingbroke at any rate did not venture to resist the proposal. When the physicians reported that the queen had recovered consciousness a deputation was sent to the dying woman's chamber to request her to confer the Treasurer's staff upon Shrewsbury. She acquiesced, handing it to him with the pathetic words, "Use it for the good of my people." A general meeting was immediately called of all the available members of the Privy Council—a very different thing from the selected gathering of Bolingbroke's instruments which had been interrupted by the Whig Peers. The Council acted as a united Government, whose first business was to secure the Hanoverian Succession, and to take measures against any possibility of insurrection or invasion. On the fifth day after Oxford's fall Queen Anne died, and George I. was proclaimed king of England, while no man ventured to raise a dissentient voice.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE WHIGS, AND WALPOLE'S ASCENDENCY

I

THE HANOVERIAN SUCCESSION

THE Hanoverian Succession confirmed and extended the principles of the Revolution ; it was absolutely irreconcilable not merely with the doctrine of divine right but with any very elevated conception of monarchy. The Revolution itself had been brought about by the determination to put an end to government by a king who had made himself intolerable, and to provide security against a like misgovernment on the part of his successors. A legal justification was required to satisfy the English conscience ; it was found in the doctrine of the Social Contract as expounded by Locke, in the elective character of the early English monarchy, and in the parliamentary title of Henry IV. and Henry VII. But the Revolution had been carried out successfully because Mary and Anne were conspicuously English princesses, and Mary's husband, though a Dutchman and a Calvinist, was still grandson of King Charles the Martyr, and a man indubitably fit to play the part of a king. He was, in fact, the man of whom England stood in need at the moment. But now every living descendant of King Charles was a Romanist, barred from the succession by religion. What Great Britain wanted was not a king but some one to sit on the throne and prevent it from being occupied by a Roman Catholic. The nearest representative of the blood royal who would answer the purpose happened to be a rather elderly German prince whose grandmother had been a daughter of James I.

Now William had been made king upon conditions, but the conditions



George I.

[From the painting by Kneller in the National Portrait Gallery.]

did not make him into a dummy. He was a king in fact as well as in name, because England needed him quite as much as he needed England. Now, however, England needed not George in particular, but merely some colourable imitation of a king to occupy the place of James Stuart. George and his son would have gained nothing by threatening to go back to Hanover. They were kings on condition of good behaviour. Neither their talents nor their characters procured them the respect or affection of their British subjects; if the country was loyal to anything it was not to the person of its kings but to the principles of the Revolution. The Hanoverians had no choice but to place themselves practically without reserve in the hands of the dominant party in Great Britain. Bolingbroke had destroyed the Tory party by identifying it with Jacobitism, and consequently the Whigs held complete control of the situation and retained it for more than fifty years. The comparatively small influence which under such conditions the Crown was able to exercise finally established the supremacy of parliament and the system of party government which was only coming into being during the reigns of William and Mary.

The Whigs had very carefully taught the Elector, and his mother before him, that they could win and hold the Crown of England only by grace of the Whigs and by recognising their dependence on the Whigs. In accordance with the arrangements made for dealing with the situation when Queen Anne should die, the government was vested in the hands of a group of "Lords Justices" nominated by the new king, until he himself should arrive in the country. This was in accordance with the precedents of William's reign, when the king himself had been absent in the Netherlands. The Lords Justices nominated were all Whigs; when George himself came to England in September he appointed all his ministers from that party. They soon showed themselves bent on the entire destruction of the Tories. The dissolution of parliament and a general election returned a strong Whig majority. A commission was appointed to inquire into the proceedings in connection with the Treaty of Utrecht, and on the strength of its report Bolingbroke, Oxford, and Ormonde were all impeached. Bolingbroke had already taken refuge in flight and had joined James Stuart. Ormonde, frightened by the impeachment, promptly followed him. Oxford declined to run away, and was justified by the event. It was too obviously impossible to condemn as treasonable proceedings which had been ratified by the votes of two parliaments as well as by the approval of the monarch who was reigning at the time.

France was pledged by the Treaty of Utrecht to recognise the Hanoverian Succession; but at the deathbed of James II. Louis ignored a similar pledge which he had given at the Peace of Ryswick. France might again repudiate her pledges, and if she supported the claim of James Stuart it was conceivable that a well-organised Jacobite rising might be successful. Common-sense and material interests were on the side of the Hanoverian

Succession ; sentiment was entirely on the other side. But the whole machinery of government was in the hands of men to whom a Stuart restoration would mean political ruin. There were three things absolutely necessary to a successful insurrection—organisation, enthusiasm, and the certainty of extraneous, that is to say French, support. The Jacobites attempted to upset the new dynasty without any one of the three requisites. Unfortunately for them Bolingbroke was the only intelligent person who attempted to direct their counsels, and the unintelligent people carried out their own plans behind his back. Bolingbroke had bent himself to winning over King Louis, but, as in 1714, fate fought against him. Louis was dying; on September 1st, 1715, he died. His sickly great-grandchild Louis XV. became king of France, and the interests of the Orleans regency were entirely opposed to a Stuart restoration.

Nevertheless a few days later the Earl of Mar raised King James's standard in the north of Scotland, where he had collected together a group of Highland chiefs on the pretext of a great hunting. The Government were somewhat unaccountably unprepared. Jacobite sentiment and hatred of the Union were real forces in Scotland capable of effective combination. Prompt and vigorous action on Mar's part might have given him at the outset such an advantage as would have made the insurrection exceedingly formidable. But "Bobbing John," as he was nicknamed, was incapable of promptitude or vigour. While he sat still and did nothing the Duke of Argyle, a soldier and statesman of considerable distinction, was despatched to Scotland to suppress the insurrection. On November 13th the armies of Argyle and Mar met and fought at Sheriffmuir. The battle was characteristic in its futility—

"There's some say that we wan,
 And some say that they wan,
 And some say that none wan at a', man!
 But ae thing I'm sure,
 That at Sheriffmuir
 A battle there was that I saw, man:
 And we ran and they ran,
 And they ran and we ran,
 And we ran and they ran awa', man."

Both the left wings broke and ran ; some ran without any reason, and on the whole the Jacobites ran most effectively. To have called the fight a victory for either party would have been absurd ; some five or six hundred appear to have fallen on either side ; but the practical result was that when the running was over Mar retreated and Argyle did not. The advance of the insurgents was stopped, and all the heart that there ever had been in the rebellion was taken out of it.

When Mar raised the standard of James in the North the English Jacobites ought to have risen simultaneously. But insurrection in the Scottish Highlands was a much simpler matter than in England, where

there were no solid Jacobite districts, and the government troops could be moved with comparative ease and rapidity. The news of the Scottish rising was immediately followed by the arrest of half-a-dozen leading English Jacobites ; and if any hopes of French help had survived the death of Louis XIV. they were quenched by prompt demonstration that the fleet was ready for action. In the north of England, however, a number of Jacobite squires collected together under the leadership of the Earl of Derwentwater and Sir Thomas Forster, who was nominated General. Over the border Lord Kenmure, with Lords Nithsdale, Carnwath, and Wintoun, declared for King James, and were joined by Brigadier M'Intosh with a few Highlanders from Mar's force. These two companies united at Kelso. But the Englishmen would not march North to help Mar against Argyle, and the Highlanders would not march South to strike at the small government force commanded by General Carpenter. While they tried to make up their minds to do something government troops were mustering. At last the insurgents determined to invade Lancashire, whereupon the Highlanders returned home. The rest, some fifteen hundred strong, marched through Cumberland southwards, collecting miscellaneous recruits by the way till they got to Preston. Here they were attacked by Carpenter and Wills. Led with any intelligence they should have been able to rout the government troops ; but after having repulsed on attack their commanders were inveigled or bluffed into surrendering. Sheriffmuir was being fought on the same day.

Thus ignominiously collapsed the rising in England. In Scotland it dragged on a little longer. James himself arrived on the scene with the idea that his presence would give heart to his followers. But the unfortunate prince suffered from an inveterate melancholy which would have damped the most eager enthusiasm. Argyle was in no hurry to strike home ; but the Jacobites had lost the power of striking at all. Their forces diminished day by day, James in despair withdrew from the country, and the once threatening Jacobite conflagration guttered dolefully out.

Most of the leaders escaped to France ; some were attainted. Of the prisoners taken at Preston some who had been army officers were shot. The peers were condemned to be beheaded, and several of the leading commoners to be hanged. But some succeeded in breaking prison, others were respited, and only Kenmure, Derwentwater, and twenty-six commoners were actually put to death. The plain truth was that it was unsafe to proceed to extremities, because too many people would have been inconveniently compromised. Everybody on both sides had friends in the opposite camp, and no one felt quite sure that though it was Hanover's turn to-day it might not be the Stuart's turn to-morrow, and it would be highly impolitic to make the Jacobites vindictive. In not a few families one or two sons had been allowed to join the rising to demonstrate the family's loyalty to the Stuarts, while the head of the house had remained at home to demonstrate its loyalty to the Hanoverian Succession. And

the nation at large sat still, in scarcely disturbed apathy, while the supreme question of the day was settled by two or three thousand regular troops, a rabble of fox-hunters, a few broken adventurers, and some Highland clansmen, most of whom cared more about clan feuds than the real issues that were at stake. A few forfeitures, the construction of some military roads in the Highlands, and an ineffective measure of disarmament, were the principal outcome of the Fifteen.

It produced however one measure of constitutional importance. Under the Triennial Act a general election was due in 1717, and as matters stood it was clearly possible that there might then be a Jacobite majority in parliament. So the Whig House of Commons resolved to prolong its own life, and passed the Septennial Act, which extended the period of parliament from three years to seven—an Act which remained in force until the passing of the Parliament Act in 1911. The Whigs were impervious to the Tory outcry that such a proceeding was unconstitutional. For precedent there was the case of the Long Parliament, which had made its own life legally interminable, except with its own consent. For the rest, the measure was necessary to secure the stability of government.

II

THE FRENCH ALLIANCE


The death of Louis XIV. in September 1715 produced what was practically a revolution in international relations. Only one sickly child, Louis XV., stood between Philip V. of Spain and the Crown of France. Philip had abjured all pretensions to that Crown, and if that abjuration held good, the heir of the young Louis was Philip, Duke of Orleans, the son of the second son of Louis XIII. Orleans was declared regent; but there was no escaping the possibility that if Louis died Philip might act upon the legal doctrine that no abjuration of the French Crown could be valid. Hence the regent Orleans, so long as he should be heir-presumptive to the French throne, had the very strongest interest in upholding the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht. The House of Orleans and the House of Hanover were thus mutually bound to support each other; and there followed a period of close alliance between the French and British Governments. Further, this possible succession question created an antagonism between the Spanish Bourbon and the Government of France; for the time being there was no danger to Europe from that menace of Bourbon aggression, which had been conjured up by the old king's acceptance of the Spanish Crown for his grandson.

These conditions had a double effect on naval policy. On the one hand, France was satisfied to rely upon the alliance with Great Britain for security against maritime attack, Holland during the late war had already

dropped behind, and the British naval supremacy thus secured was increased by the new combination. On the other hand, the Spanish minister Alberoni was inspired with a passion for reviving the Spanish capacity for maritime rivalry; since, while the British dominated the seas, Spain was cut off from adventures for recovering power in the Italian Peninsula, now mainly absorbed by Austria.

Though the Whigs were in power, the great Whig names of Anne's reign very soon disappeared. Marlborough, at first recalled to a position of confidence, broke down completely at a very early stage; Somers was worn out; Shrewsbury vanished after his appearance as the Whig *deus ex machinâ*. Stanhope and Townshend became the leading counsellors of the

THE FRENCH SUCCESSION



Crown; and with Townshend was presently associated Sir Robert Walpole, whose abilities had already won for him a marked ascendancy in the House of Commons. Of the Junto, Sunderland alone held a leading position. At the beginning of 1717 there was a split between the Whigs, which caused Townshend and Walpole to retire and form a Whig Opposition, which vigorously criticised, and sometimes successfully challenged, the measures of the Government conducted by Stanhope and Sunderland. The Whig split was almost simultaneous with the development of the understanding between the French and British Governments into the Triple Alliance, in which Holland was included.

Alberoni had at first probably hoped to procure the advancement of Spain by closer relations with England, to be purchased by commercial concessions. Such hopes could not survive the Franco-British Alliance, and he was using his immense capacities for intrigue to work up combinations of the Baltic Powers, which, by threatening Hanover itself and the Hanoverian Succession in England, should prevent the Maritime Power from active intervention in his other designs. Then in 1717 he opened a premature attack upon Sardinia, which had fallen to Austria in the settlement after Utrecht. The discovery and exposure of the intrigues with the Northern Powers spoilt whatever existed in the nature of a plot; France and Great Britain intervened in favour of Austria, and forced the acceptance of an agreement which satisfied neither Austria nor Spain, but which gave Sicily to Austria, and Sardinia in place of it to Savoy. Thus the rulers of Savoy became the kings of Sardinia, the progenitors of the present royal house of Italy.

The check only incited Alberoni to fresh energy. He renewed his secret intrigues, which were intended to bring about an anti-Hanoverian combination between Charles XII. of Sweden and his sometime great enemy the Tsar Peter, the creator of the power of Russia. He strove

The check only incited Alberoni to fresh energy. He renewed his secret intrigues, which were intended to bring about an anti-Hanoverian combination between Charles XII. of Sweden and his sometime great enemy the Tsar Peter, the creator of the power of Russia. He strove

harder than ever to build up a mighty Spanish fleet. In France he intrigued with the faction which opposed the Orleans régime. In the summer of 1718 he struck again, launched an expedition against Sicily, and laid siege to Messina. But the British, fully alive to the great preparations which had been in progress, were ready with a strong fleet under command of Admiral Byng in the Mediterranean. Although Spain and Great Britain were not at war, the British fleet went in search of the Spanish fleet. They met off Cape Passaro. The result was entirely decisive. Only ten of the Spaniards escaped annihilation, while only one British ship was seriously damaged. The work was completed by Captain Walton. There is an established fiction, commonly endorsed by historians, that Walton's despatch describing his operations was the briefest on record and ran, "Sir, we have taken and destroyed all the Spanish ships which were on this coast, the number as in the margin." Unfortunately the real despatch is extant, and is ten times as long as the laconic epistle with which the captain has been credited. But though Walton gained an undeserved renown, the fact remained that the battle of Passaro destroyed all prospect of the resuscitation of a Spanish fleet on a scale which could threaten the British supremacy. Nevertheless it was not followed by a declaration of war. Byng's purpose was sufficiently accomplished. Spain could not fight Austria in Sicily and Italy unless she held command of the seas.

Every one of Alberoni's schemes miscarried. The anti-Orleanist plot in France was detected and crushed. Charles XII. of Sweden was killed by a stray shot before Fredricshalle in Norway, and a revolution brought into power in Sweden a government from which Hanover had nothing to fear. A British squadron on the Baltic was an argument which Peter the Great found conclusive. Austria was added to the Triple Alliance, and at the beginning of 1719 the United Powers declared war against Spain. Alberoni made a last desperate attempt to despatch an armada, which went to pieces in the Bay of Biscay before a blow had been struck. A French army entered Spain, and a British squadron wrought havoc at Vigo. Philip realised that the struggle was hopeless, Alberoni was dismissed and banished, and the Spaniards evacuated Sicily. The arrangements proposed in 1717 were generally confirmed. The real root cause of the recent trouble had been the ambitions of Philip's queen, Elizabeth Farnese. The heir to the Spanish throne was Ferdinand, Philip's son by a previous wife, and Elizabeth wanted a separate dominion in Italy for her own offspring. She had now to be content with the recognition of her son Charles as heir to the duchies of Tuscany, Parma, and Piacenza, which were to be definitely separated from the Spanish Crown.

In England the Stanhope administration carried out the traditional Whig policy by repealing the Schism Act and the Occasional Conformity Act which the Tories had at length passed during their period of power in the last years of Queen Anne's reign. Walpole, in Opposition, did not


scruple to criticise the repeal, although no man had more energetically denounced those measures when they were introduced. In other respects, however, the divisions of the party were destined to have beneficial results, and in fact to confirm the Whig domination instead of wrecking it, as at one time they seemed in danger of doing.

The revolution Whigs were not in the slightest degree democrats. They represented in the main two principles, parliamentary supremacy and religious toleration; but the supremacy of parliament did not for them mean popular government. The steady strength of the Whig party lay in the House of Lords; all the more since the addition to their numbers of the Scottish peers and of former Tories who had repudiated all connection with their party to escape the Jacobite taint. A bill was brought in by Sunderland which would have transformed the House of Peers into a permanent oligarchy. The whole number of peers was to be limited to six more than there were at that time. Peerages which lapsed on the failure of male heirs might be replaced. The Crown was to nominate twenty-five Scottish peers, instead of the sixteen whom the body of Scottish peers now elected from their own number. This increase was by way of compensation for the arrangement under the Act of Union by which Scottish peers might be made peers of Great Britain, when they would not longer be included among the sixteen, but would sit in the House each in his own right. The avowed object of the bill was to prevent a repetition of the party move by which the Tories had procured the creation of twelve peers in order to obtain a majority for the passing of a particular measure. But the power to create peers was the only means of preventing a standing majority in the Upper House from exercising a practical sovereignty. A House so constituted could not indeed directly force its own measures through the House of Commons, but its veto would be permanent. It would be a close hereditary body into which no new blood could be introduced except on the actual lapse of a peerage. The commoner could no longer look forward to a peerage as the prize of public service. The Scottish peers could no longer acquire the status of peers of the realm. From Scotland arose a clamour that the bill was a breach of the Treaty of Union, and that if it were carried the Union itself would be challenged. Walpole appealed to the ambitions of the members of the House of Commons, excluded for ever from the prospect of being enrolled among the aristocracy. Sutherland's Peerage Bill was defeated, and the House of Lords remained an open body. In modern times such a defeat would involve the resignation of ministers; but the modern theory was then unknown. Both Walpole and Townshend accepted office under the very ministers whom they had just opposed with all their might, and defeated. The fall of the Stanhope ministry was due to another cause.

The Whigs under King William had created the great financial corporation of the Bank of England. Of the commercial corporations the greatest was the East India Company, which, originally associated

rather with the Tories, had also become preponderantly Whig since its union with the Second East India Company. The Bank and the East India Company were both extremely useful to the Whigs, while a Tory Government could not with equal confidence rely upon their help. Hence when the Tories came into power in 1710 they created another commercial association in the hope that it would serve them as the other corporations served the Whigs. This was the South Sea Company, with a commercial programme based upon the rights and privileges which were to be the reward of the peace which Harley and St. John at once set about negotiating. It was anticipated that the monopoly of the South Sea trade which was formally opened to England by the Treaty of Utrecht would soon bring immense wealth to the South Sea Company. The company, in return for the monopoly, took over the government debt of ten millions, the government appropriating to it for the payment of interest the proceeds of particular duties.

There was in fact a substantial trade, and the position of the company as originally constituted was reasonably sound. But shortly afterwards Europe was visited by an epidemic of speculative mania. The thing was not confined to England; France went crazy over the fabric of crazy finance erected by Law of Lauriston. Until 1719 the South Sea



A caricature of the day on the South Sea Company, 1720.

Company so far prospered that its shares stood at a premium. Now at the close of the War of the Spanish Succession the National Debt amounted to more than fifty millions, and the annual charges thereon were more than three and a quarter millions. These figures seemed alarming, and there was a very strong desire to reduce the debt as rapidly as possible. But very little had been done in this direction by Walpole's institution of a sinking fund, made just before the Whig split. The South Sea Company now came forward with a proposal to take over another thirty millions of the National Debt, which would be converted into South Sea stock, and to pay seven and a half millions to the government, in return for which their existing privileges in the South Sea trade were to be expanded into an entire monopoly, and the expenses of management entailed by the scheme were to be provided for by the Treasury. Government adopted the scheme in spite

of the open warnings of Walpole; there were members of the ministry who did not go into the matter with clean hands, though others were perfectly honest in their belief in the soundness of the scheme. If it had merely attracted a sufficient supply of additional capital for extended operations the business might have escaped disaster or even have achieved a moderate success. But the public imagination was inflamed by wild rumours of incredible concessions made by Spain, and the huge profits to be anticipated. High and low, rich and poor, were gripped by the gambler's fever, and began to spend every available shilling on South Sea stock. The prices rushed up. On January 31, 1720, while the South Sea Act was under consideration, the market price of £100 of South Sea stock was about £130. A week after the Act was passed two and a quarter millions were subscribed at the price of £300 for a nominal £100 of stock. At the end of May the price had almost reached £1000, and at Midsummer it reached £1060. But in the meanwhile innumerable fraudulent companies had been taking advantage of the gambling frenzy to rob the credulous public, and in the light of the prosecutions which were instituted, the public began to wake up to the fact that it was being robbed. Stockholders of all kinds began to be as eager to sell as they had been to buy, and three months after reaching its highest point the South Sea stock had dropped again to what was after all the highly respectable figure of £150. But the drop meant ruin to the vast numbers who had bought at the inflated prices. Their ruin entailed the ruin also of their creditors, and the creditor's creditors, and so in ever-widening circles the ruin spread. It was easy for the public to attribute the whole hideous disaster to the criminality of directors and the wicked ways of the Government, which had tricked them into believing that the concern was sound. It was easy to forget that the action neither of Government nor of directors had warranted the mad inflation of prices, though there were individual ministers and directors who had used their opportunities to feather their own nests. If Jacobites expressed an unholy glee over a catastrophe which seemed to portend the immediate downfall of the Whigs, they could hardly be blamed; for every one who could be in the most remote degree suspected of having had a share in causing the disaster became the object of frantic popular execration.

But such critics were woefully out in their reckoning. The people turned for their saviour not to the Tories but to the ranks of the Whig Opposition. Townshend, Walpole, those who had joined with them in attacking the men and the measures of the Stanhope-Sunderland administration, were palpably free of all blame. Walpole himself had raised the voice of warning; Walpole was a master of finance. If any man could minimise the disaster it would be Walpole.

Walpole succeeded in his task. He was strong enough to refuse to yield to merely vindictive clamour, and adopt measures which would have appeased the popular rage for the moment at the expense of justice and

without restoring public credit. The company itself was preserved with its nominal shares of £100, once worth £1000, reduced to £33. The private property of directors was confiscated, and provided some two millions for the immediate relief of the sufferers from the catastrophe. The Government's claim on the company for the promised seven millions was cancelled. The South Sea Company remained a going concern. As for the ministry, Ayslabie, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, was expelled from the House in disgrace. Sunderland was deservedly acquitted, but the bitterness of popular feeling forced him into retirement. Stanhope, conspicuously honest and blameless, might have held his own, but was killed by the shock of the whole affair. Townshend and Walpole became the first ministers of the Crown.


III

WALPOLE AND THE SYSTEM

Townshend and Walpole were connected by marriage. They had held together through the political vicissitudes of the last ten years, and for ten years more they remained colleagues. Their government was at first a partnership; but neither was content to be second or merely equal to the other; and the partnership developed into a rivalry which was only brought to an end when Townshend made up his mind in 1730 to leave the field to Walpole, since they could not longer work in harness together. But from the outset Walpole rather than Townshend filled the public eye; for practical purposes Walpole controlled British policy from the end of 1720 until 1739, and he remained nominally at the head of affairs for three years more. This long ministry of Walpole inaugurates the era during which the question of primary importance has been not who was king or queen, but who was Prime Minister? Since the days of Charles I. and Buckingham it had hardly been possible at any time to name any one person as the minister of the Crown who directed the policy of the state. Before the seventeenth century ministers had been still more palpably the servants of the Crown, holding office at the pleasure of the Crown, and dismissed or disgraced or sent to the block if the Crown so pleased. But from Walpole's time onwards the sovereign has been virtually deprived of choice. He has hardly been able to refuse a minister pressed upon him by the leaders of the party dominant in parliament, still less to dismiss one who enjoys parliament's support or to appoint one whom parliament finds obnoxious. And almost at all times one particular minister has been decisively the chief of the administration, though not always the nominal figurehead for whom the title of Prime Minister has come to be reserved.

The change however was gradual and unconscious. William III. chose his own ministers, merely modifying his selection in order to avoid excessive friction in the machinery of government. It was a practical

outcome of the struggle between Crown and parliament that parliament made its voice heard on questions of policy and of administration very much more energetically at the close of the seventeenth century than in the days of Plantagenets or Tudors; the more or less tacit acquiescence



Sir Robert Walpole.

[From the painting by J. B. Vanloo in the National Portrait Gallery.]

of parliament was less easily obtained than in earlier times. Hence to avoid friction it had become necessary to secure correspondingly a greater concord between ministerial action and parliamentary opinion. Theoretically it was not necessary for ministers to be in agreement even with each other, but practically it was becoming very inconvenient that it should not be so. If at any time during the reign of William or Anne all the ministers were taken from one political party, it was merely because such a selection seemed necessary at that particular time to prevent a deadlock.

The Crown did not as yet recognise, popular opinion did not yet declare, that the power of the Crown to select ministers was restricted, except by the obligation not to choose men who were conspicuously obnoxious. Moreover, the power of the Crown was only slightly restricted even in practice. It is notable that changes of ministry did not usually follow upon general elections. When the Crown and the ministry were in harmony the electors gave a general support to the ministry. When the Duchess of Marlborough thoroughly dominated the queen, Whigs dominated the ministry, and an appeal to the electorate returned a Whig



THE HOUSE OF COMMONS UNDER SIR ROBERT WALPOLE'S ADMINISTRATION

From an engraving of the painting by Hogarth and Thornhill. Walpole stands to the left of Mr. Speaker Onslow.

majority. When the queen shook herself free of the Duchess, Whigs were turned out of office, Tories took their places, and when there was a general election the electors returned a Tory majority. Politicians devoted themselves more zealously to capturing the favour of the sovereign than to cultivating the goodwill of the electorate.


Both the theory and the practice survived the Hanoverian Succession. But the change of dynasty produced new conditions. One of the two great parties was shattered. The interests of the whole body of Whigs were bound up with the security of the new dynasty. The interests of the new dynasty were bound up with the predominance of the Whigs; and the Hanoverian Tories, without hopes of themselves forming a dominant party, were rapidly absorbed into the Whig ranks, more especially after the ignominious collapse of the "Fifteen." The Crown had not the will, and would not have had the power, to choose ministers except from among the Whigs. After the passing of the Septennial Act, Whig government was never really in danger; even the South Sea Bubble confirmed a Whig combination instead of shaking it. Instead of a rivalry of parties, there was only a rivalry of Whig factions; and the long ascendancy of the Whigs under these conditions made it for ever impossible that a working ministry should be formed independent of party lines. Within the party the king apparently retained the power of selection; but the prestige of the Crown was very much reduced by the fact that it was worn by unattractive and unpopular German princes, while the sentiment of loyalty, wherever it survived at all, was necessarily attracted to the legitimate king "over the water."

Thus if the king was free to choose any Whig ministers he liked, it still remained necessary that he should choose men who would work together; and the personal influence of the king proved to be no longer sufficient to induce ministers to work in political harmony when they were personally antagonistic to each other. Politicians continued to intrigue in order to obtain royal favour; but the royal favour was wasted on any statesman who could not manage his colleagues or who could not manage parliament. This managing capacity was possessed by Walpole, and after Walpole by Henry Pelham. It was not possessed by their rivals, and therefore between 1720 and 1754 Walpole was for twenty years the inevitable minister and Pelham for ten years. And after Pelham's death government fell into hopeless confusion until there was a coalition between Newcastle and William Pitt. The position of a minister was unstable unless he could secure the royal favour, though the royal favour was not sufficient to keep in power even a brilliant politician who lacked the art of managing his colleagues and parliament.

Walpole, then, ruled the country for nearly nineteen years, and continued nominally at the head of affairs for nearly three years after he had lost the real control. With the exception of Lord Burleigh before him, and the younger Pitt after him, no other minister has held the chief power in the

state for so long a time continuously or almost continuously. He retained the support of the Crown throughout that time, in spite of the fact that George I. and his heir were in constant antagonism, and it was generally expected that the accession of George II. would be followed by a complete

THE HANOVERIANS



change of ministers. Walpole maintained his position because he was shrewd enough to know that the person who exercised the strongest influence over the mind of George II. was his very able queen, Caroline of Anspach. Walpole's rivals made the blunder of seeking alliance with the king through other ladies who enjoyed the royal regard.

But the latitude of George's morals did not disturb his wife's ascendancy; Walpole allied himself with Queen Caroline, and that alliance secured him with the king. His power was notably diminished when Queen Caroline died in 1737.

Walpole managed his colleagues by overriding them. If they set themselves up as rivals or attempted to defy his authority, they ceased to be his colleagues. At the end of his tenure of power every man of dangerous abilities or overweening ambition had joined the Opposition, an Opposition united only in its antagonism to the minister. Walpole wanted not colleagues but subordinates, and he was strong enough to conduct the government through the mediocre subordinates who obeyed orders.

The management of parliament was more complicated; the method was corruption. Corruption could be applied in one form or another to individual members of parliament, to the magnates who controlled the elections in certain constituencies, and to the electorate itself in other constituencies. County members were returned by the independent votes of landowners, and here direct corruption was hardly available, except so far as it might procure the favourable influence of great county families. Of the boroughs a great number had already become in effect the property of some great magnate whom the voters could not venture to offend. Both Tudors and Stuarts had added to the number of boroughs small



Queen Caroline, Consort of George II.

towns especially in Cornwall, which practically acted under orders from the Crown. In other boroughs of magnitude the parliamentary elections were virtually controlled by the corporation, and corporations were corruptible, even to the extent of openly selling the seat to the highest bidder. Individual members of parliament were corruptible. "All these men have their price," said Walpole as he surveyed the benches of the House of Commons, a remark which has been popularly translated into the saying, "Every man has his price." The price of course was not necessarily cash; but Walpole acted without scruple on the general principle that votes in the House were to be bought, that the support of magnates was to be bought, and that the support of corporations was to be bought. Official places big and small were distributed for the satisfaction of influential persons. Hard cash passed when hard cash was required. Walpole did not create the system; Danby has a better title to the honour of having originated it; as compared with his successors, Walpole was a mere dabbler; still it was he who educated the public conscience into regarding corruption as a matter of course. No man ever bribed Walpole himself; in that sense his hands were conspicuously clean; but he was entirely without shame in his corruption of others. And thus he managed parliament.

But there still remained a latent force which no ministry could withstand if it were roused to activity, the force of public opinion. Ministers have often achieved and not so often retained power by awakening popular enthusiasm. Walpole and his school dreaded popular enthusiasm as a disturbing and unsettling factor. His great object was to prevent ebullitions of sentiment, to preserve an acquiescent apathy in the public, to "let sleeping dogs lie." For more than eighteen years he carried out that policy successfully, though sometimes at the cost of surrendering measures which he regarded as being in themselves for the public good. After eighteen years it was a rush of popular feeling which swept him away, although he would not resign the helm which he could no longer control. During those years his policy had consistently preserved the country at peace, while the storms of war swept over the continent. British commerce expanded under his enlightened financial administration. The nation piled up wealth which was to stand it in good stead. But the pursuit of material wealth as the *summum bonum*, the cultivation of moral indifferentism, the total divorce of politics from all idealism, threatened to debase the national character, until nobler leaders than Walpole reawakened a nobler spirit.

IV

THE RULE OF WALPOLE

Lord Hervey, writing memoirs of the earlier years of George II.'s reign, apologises for their lack of incident. There was no lack of incident in affairs on the continent, but Walpole, in spite of occasional strong pressure, managed to prevent Great Britain from being embroiled. It was in fact his very particular business to avoid incidents. The country was to enjoy the happy lot of having no history. Nothing was to be disturbed which could be left undisturbed. The French alliance, inaugurated under the Stanhope régime, was the best possible guarantee of peace. Under Stanhope also the domestic question of religion had been relieved of its acuteness by the repeal of the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts. In the abstract it was quite unreasonable no doubt that dissent should carry with it any legal disabilities; but the grievance was more theoretical than practical, since the great majority of Nonconformists had no conscientious objection to passing the very futile tests which the law imposed; and even if they did break the law, they could practically count upon the passing of an annual Act of Indemnity which relieved them from any penalty. Walpole, therefore, discountenanced any attempts at re-opening a question which might arouse a slumbering fanaticism into a dangerous activity.

For a moment the equilibrium was in danger of being disturbed when old king George I. died in 1727, for it was known that the new king's favourite among the statesman of the day was Carteret, who, at first a colleague of Walpole and Townshend, had been driven from office as a too clever rival. The ice cracked but it did not break; Walpole, having won the support of Queen Caroline, was soon more firmly established than ever.

The main features of Walpole's policy were negative; he would not provide a handle for any one who sought to create discontent and disturbance; he would not be seduced into a policy of intervention in Europe. The one direction in which he adopted a positive policy of reform was in that of commerce; because he looked to commercial prosperity as the surest guarantee of political quietude. And here he could venture to be a reformer, though an exceedingly cautious one, because his already high financial reputation was convincingly confirmed by his management of the South Sea disaster. The country was wedded to the mercantile system, the doctrine of controlling trade so that British goods should be exchanged for foreign money rather than British money for foreign goods. Broadly speaking, imports were discouraged except from countries which took more than their value in exports, and they were discouraged also as competing

with British products. On the other hand, British exports were taxed in order to keep down their prices in the home market for the benefit of the consumer, although in other cases the consumer was forgotten and the export was encouraged by bounties for the benefit of the producer.

Walpole saw that the greatest economic gain would come from the maximum development of the volume of trade; he wished to make London the great World Emporium. But he was true to his principles, disturbing no interests which were satisfied with the existing order, but might be dangerously excited by change. He reduced or removed taxes on exports, taxes on imports which did not compete with home products, and taxes on raw materials which the home manufacturer wanted to buy at the lowest possible price. Experience had shown the risk and disadvantages which arose from the dependence of the country on the Baltic trade for naval materials, since hostility on the part of the Baltic Powers tended to paralyse that trade; so the production of naval materials at home and in the "Plantations" or colonies was fostered by bounties. No commercial interests suffered, nor did the revenue itself suffer from the reduction of tariffs, because while the rate was lowered, the corresponding reduction in price brought an increased demand and an increase in the quantity of the goods on which the duties were levied.

Yet the moment of greatest danger to Walpole's administration came with the financial proposal known as the Excise Bill. If it had not been called an excise bill no danger would have arisen at all. Excise is internal taxation; as distinct from customs duties, the taxation at the ports of goods on their embarkation or disembarkation. It had been introduced by the Commonwealth government, but applied only to the production and sale of spirituous liquors, and was exceedingly unpopular, though it was too useful a source of revenue to be dropped. Now, in accordance with the principle of endeavouring to attract commerce and shipping to English ports, Walpole tried a very successful experiment with tea, coffee, and chocolate. Such goods were brought to English ports, in part, not for sale in England but for re-export. They paid a duty on being disembarked, and when they were re-embarked a corresponding rebate was allowed. In the case of tea, coffee, and chocolate under Walpole's experiment the goods were disembarked and stored at the ports without paying a duty, and of course were re-embarked without any rebate; the duty, in short, became charge-



George II.

[From the portrait by R. E. Pine.]

able only when they were withdrawn from the port for home consumption. It was found that this change was productive of a substantial increase in the revenue. In 1733 Walpole proposed to extend the system to other goods, notably tobacco. But he called the measure an Excise Bill. The purpose of the bill was generally to develop commerce and specifically to obtain an increase of revenue whereby he would be enabled to diminish the land tax, and so to conciliate the interests which bore the main burdens of the nation under the system of finance introduced by the Whigs. But the name of excise spelt ruin to the measure. The Opposition conjured up an appalling picture of a universal system of excise, under which a vast army of government officials would penetrate into private establishments and

would subject the citizen's private affairs to investigation. Even the landowners took fright, preferring the burden of the land tax to the dreaded invasion which was to deprive every Englishman of his most cherished liberties. It was of no use to point out that the new army of officials



Costumes in the early part of the 18th century.
[From Nickoll's "View of Hampden Court."]

would number not much more than a hundred, and that their duties would be practically confined to the ports. The country lost its head almost as completely as in the days of the Popish Plot. Walpole had absolutely no doubt of the value of his proposal; he could have carried it in parliament, but it was evident that it could not be put in execution without much rioting and bloodshed. On such an issue a modern ministry in like circumstances would resign office. Walpole withdrew the measure, but did not resign. Common ministerial responsibility is taken for granted in modern times; but this was still so far from being the case in Walpole's day that some of Walpole's own colleagues took part in the agitation against the bill. Walpole held his own grip of power, and turned those colleagues, Pulteney and Chesterfield, out of office. They joined the ranks of the Opposition which gathered round the inefficient person of Frederick, Prince of Wales, who was on the worst possible terms with his father, as his father had been with George I. The whole episode affords the clearest possible demonstration of the difference between modern conceptions of ministerial responsibility and those which prevailed in the first half of the eighteenth century.

Not domestic but foreign affairs finally led to the destruction of Walpole's influence. We have seen that the outstanding feature of the Whig foreign policy after the death of Louis XIV. was alliance with France, because the peculiar circumstances made the French court under the Regent Orleans antagonistic to the new Bourbon dynasty in Spain, instead

of drawing the two Bourbon powers together. The death of Orleans in 1723 and the domination of the Duke of Bourbon which followed it did not in effect change the situation. For Bourbon wanted to get the young king married and to provide another heir to the throne, in order to exclude the new Duke of Orleans from the succession. But the Spanish princess to whom, with another object in view, the Regent Orleans had betrothed the youthful Louis, was only six years old—Orleans had hoped that the sickly king would die before an heir could be born to him. Precisely in order to prevent this, Bourbon broke the Spanish engagement, and married him to Mary, a daughter of Stanislaus, ex-king of Poland, so that the hostility of Spain to France was intensified by the slight. But then there came a change. Louis in 1726 declared himself of age, dismissed Bourbon, and entrusted the government to the already aged Cardinal Fleury. Fleury, like Walpole, was an advocate of European peace; he believed in achieving his ends by diplomacy in preference to war, and so Fleury and Walpole remained in close alliance. But, on the other hand, Fleury had no reason whatever for antagonism to Spain. Since the king's marriage and the growing improvement in his health, the possibility that Philip of Spain would ever have a chance of asserting a claim to the Crown of France became remote. The unostentatious reconciliation with Spain bore fruit in 1733 in the secret "Family Compact" between the Bourbon powers; and the policy to which that compact pointed was the estrangement of Great Britain from Austria and the European ascendancy of the Bourbons, to be attained by the humiliation first of an isolated Austria and then of an isolated Britain. The scheme so far as France was concerned required the maintenance of friendly relations with Great Britain until Austria had been dealt with; but the friendliness to Great Britain was merely assumed for ulterior purposes. The public knew nothing of these things, but the Family Compact was known to Walpole, and the great defect of Walpole's management of foreign affairs lay in his neglect to take measures either to counteract or to paralyse the Bourbon conspiracy. It was a matter of supreme good fortune for Great Britain that Fleury also neglected to provide the means for carrying out the scheme. Neither Spain nor France developed a navy fit to cope with the naval ascendancy of the island Power, whose supremacy had been so thoroughly established in the last great war and confirmed in the subsequent years.

Fleury's objects were advanced by the War of the Polish Succession which began in 1733 and was ended in 1737. The kingdom of Poland was elective, and all the European Powers ranged themselves on the side of one or other of two opposing candidates for the throne. Great Britain alone kept clear, though King George, as Elector of Hanover, was extremely anxious to plunge into the war in support of the Imperial candidate. The result was that Europe was deluged with blood, and all the treasuries were exhausted, while Britain remained at peace and accumulated wealth. Otherwise, the points in the redistribution of territory to be noted are that the

king of Spain's second son was established as king of the Two Sicilies ; and that Francis, Duke of Lorraine, who was about to marry Maria Theresa, the daughter and heiress of the Emperor, received the dukedom of Tuscany, and in effect surrendered Lorraine itself to France. To the Emperor Charles the main satisfaction was found in the guaranteeing by the Powers of the Pragmatic Sanction, an instrument which, in defiance of precedent, recognised his daughter Maria Theresa as the heiress of the Austrian dominion.

Six years after the Family Compact the whole fabric of Walpole's peace



A satire on Walpole and his Administration about 1738.

[This print, called "In Place," covers the whole political situation of the day.]

policy had melted into thin air. Britain and Spain plunged into war, and in a very short time all Europe was once more in conflagration. But neither the Family Compact nor the intervening War of the Polish Succession was directly responsible for the Anglo-Spanish quarrel or the War of the Austrian Succession. British and Spaniards flew at each other's throats over a quarrel which had been standing for nearly two centuries ; neither people knew anything about Family Compacts. The War of the Austrian Succession arose because the Emperor Charles VI. had neither a son nor a brother, nor even a nephew, and the king of Prussia discovered in the fact an opportunity for rounding off his dominions. Looking back on the circum-

stances in the light of later history, it is easy to observe that the two wars between 1739 and 1763 settled a question of vital importance in the world's history by giving to the British race a decisive supremacy over all European rivals in North America and in India ; but obviously, when the fighting began, the combatants did not realise the nature of the stake. They were not fighting for that stake. The French government *ought* to have been directed by the consciousness that there was not room either in North America or in India for both French and English ; the Bourbon conspiracy *ought* to have been one primarily for the suppression of Great Britain, the appropriation of the Western Hemisphere by the Bourbons, and the establishment of a French Empire in India. The political instinct of the British race *ought* to have led the nation to force the hand of a too timid minister and compel him to strike at Spain before the conspiracy was ripe. But, as a matter of fact, the conspiracy was aimed primarily against Austria, and only in the second place against British maritime supremacy, not consciously against British colonial expansion. The proof lies in the fact that the conspirators made no sort of preparations to challenge the British maritime supremacy in the one conceivably effective manner, namely, by the creation of rival fleets. Neither the French nor the British governments had given a second thought to the idea of dominion in India. And the British nation forced the hand of the British minister, not influenced by an instinctive perception of great imperial necessity, but because it lost its temper. The Englishman who knew of the Family Compact, who was convinced that France would make common cause with Spain, who believed that his country would not be able to stand up against the united Bourbons, was the minister whose hand was forced, the minister who hated and dreaded the war, Robert Walpole.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE FALL OF WALPOLE, AND THE PELHAM ADMINISTRATION

I

THE WAR IN EUROPE

EVER since the days of Elizabeth English seamen had persisted in a belief that they had a right to trade with the Spanish settlements in Central and South America and in the West Indies, whether the Spanish authorities sanctioned the custom or not. The Spanish authorities did not sanction the custom and punished offenders with a high hand, as they had an obvious right to do. The Treaty of Utrecht had at last made some limited concessions; the British had the right of supplying negro slaves, and of sending one trading ship to the South Seas. But this provided no remedy for the still extensive illicit traffic. On the other hand, the Spaniards were charged with exercising the right of search not only within the proper area of Spanish waters but on the high seas. Both sides broke the law freely. A British captain named Jenkins declared that his ship had been boarded on the high seas and his own ear torn off by the Spanish revenue authorities. When further stories of outrage were multiplied, and, in spite of the conciliatory attitude of British ministers, no redress was forthcoming, the story of Jenkins's ear was resuscitated, a storm of popular indignation swept over the country, and Walpole found himself obliged to choose between declaring war and resigning. He would not resign, and in October 1739 war was declared.


Walpole's inefficiency as an organiser of war was no less conspicuous than his ability as a peace minister. Knowing what he knew, it was his business to have been ready to strike and to strike hard the moment that war was forced upon Britain. The Spanish fleet might and should have been in effect swept off the seas at once. Instead Anson was despatched on the celebrated expedition in the course of which he circumnavigated the globe. Vernon was sent to the West Indies and the Spanish Main, Portobello was severely handled, but both at Cartagena and at St. Iago the British were badly repulsed owing to the discords between the naval and the military authorities. No great result could be looked for from such operations. But before any one else was drawn into taking part in the duel—for France was quite unprepared for a great naval struggle—all

the leading states in Europe found themselves fighting over the Austrian succession.

The Emperor Charles VI. died. According to the Pragmatic Sanction, which every one had guaranteed more or less solemnly, Maria Theresa was to succeed to the whole of the Austrian dominion. Her husband, Francis, formerly of Lorraine, was a candidate for the Imperial Crown. But the Elector of Bavaria claimed the succession to large portions of the dominion, and was also a candidate for the Empire. France and Spain saw their advantage in the dismemberment, Great Britain and Hanover in the integrity, of the Austrian dominion. The electorate of Brandenburg, for some time ranking among the more powerful of the German principalities, had been erected into the kingdom of Prussia at the beginning of the century. Its second king, Frederick

William I., had organised his army on the hypothesis that the state was a military machine. The country had not hitherto played the part of a first-rate Power; Frederick II., who had just succeeded his father on the throne, was now to prove the efficacy of that military machine, and set Prussia definitely in the front rank of the European Powers. But to give Prussia that position, it was a strategic necessity for her to absorb the Austrian province of Silesia. While other Powers were arguing and arming, Frederick acted. His troops entered Silesia, for the possession of which he was able to concoct a claim sufficiently plausible for his purposes, and announced that if Maria Theresa confirmed him in possession he would defend the integrity of Austria. If not he would naturally support the claims of Bavaria.

THE AUSTRIAN SUCCESSION



The permutations and combinations, and the withdrawals and reappearances of the various states who participated in the war as principals or as auxiliaries were complicated and confusing. The direct issue was between Maria Theresa and Charles of Bavaria, who was successful in the imperial election and became Charles VII. Charles claimed the main succession in right of his wife, the daughter of the Emperor Joseph, the elder brother and predecessor of Charles VI. Since the male succession failed there was a good enough case for arguing that the daughter of the younger brother had no right of precedence over the daughter of the elder brother. Spain intervened in spite of her war with Great Britain, because the opportunity offered of making good her claims to dominions in Italy; Frederick intervened because he wanted to make good his claim in Silesia. Both these were claims against Maria Theresa as the heiress of the Archduke Charles; that is, they were in respect of possessions which had gone to her father as the old Emperor Leopold's second son, not as the senior representative of the Hapsburgs; consequently, from the point of view of


Charles VII. there was no objection. There was in short to be a dismemberment of the dominion of Charles VI. in the interests of Bavaria, Prussia, and Spain.

France tore up her guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction and intervened in the curious character of an auxiliary, because the disintegration of Austria was to the interest of the Bourbons. When the war was fairly opened in Silesia in the spring of 1741, Great Britain, under Walpole's guidance, would not intervene on the continent, and Hanover itself was forced into neutrality by the threat of a French invasion of the Electorate. Saxony joined the Bavarian combination; and if both France and Prussia had acted energetically against Austria Maria Theresa might have been forced into submission. But Frederick held off, after early successes, hoping to make a separate compact of his own with Austria; and France held off because it did not suit her that Charles should have matters all his own way.

At the beginning of 1742 Walpole gave up the hopeless attempt to keep the control of British policy in his own hands. He resigned; in the new ministry foreign affairs were managed by Carteret, whose views coincided with the king's. An energetic foreign policy was adopted; if it had not been so the Opposition would have thundered against the pusillanimity of the government. As it was, they thundered instead against a policy which was controlled by the interests of Hanover. It is to be observed, however, that George always wanted Maria Theresa to purchase the support of Frederick by conceding his demands in Silesia; and Frederick in fact was bought off, after another victory in May, by the Treaty of Breslau, which gave him the better part of the coveted province. But it was not till 1743 that the British and Hanoverian troops played a conspicuous part—at the battle of Dettingen. King George, who commanded in person, blundered into a trap from which the army rescued itself more by sheer valour than by skill. George himself displayed conspicuous courage. This is noted as the last occasion on which a British monarch was himself present on the field of battle.

At this stage some concessions on the part of Maria Theresa would have made possible a general peace, of which George would have had some right to regard himself as the real author. But comparative success made the Austrian queen disinclined for peace; England was irritated against France, which was threatening to take up the cause of the Pretender, and it was easy to proclaim that the peace proposals were dictated in the interests of Hanover. The negotiations fell through, a fresh league was formed for carrying on the war, and in the next year, 1744, Frederick again intervened, having made a compact with France, which now dropped the fiction that her troops were merely acting as auxiliaries and definitely declared war. For hitherto, in spite of all the fighting, Great Britain and France had not nominally been at war with each other.

The character of the contest was modified by the death of Charles VII. in January 1745. The new Elector of Bavaria came to terms with Austria,



The House of Commons in 1742.
[From a drawing by Gravelot engraved by W. J. White.]

and the Austrian queen's husband, Francis of Lorraine, became Emperor. But France was now palpably playing for her own hand, and once more the Netherlands became the theatre of conflict between the French armies under Maurice of Saxony, commonly called Marshal Saxe, an illegitimate son of the Saxon Elector, and the British Hanoverian and Dutch troops under the command of the Duke of Cumberland, the second son of King George. From the British point of view, the most notable event was the defeat of Cumberland at Fontenoy, a battle where the mismanagement of the commander was almost neutralised through the amazing courage and discipline displayed by the British troops, which were, however, little more admirable than those shown by their foes.




The despairing Frenchman at Louisbourg.
[From a French caricature.]

Again, however, the war was modified by the practical withdrawal from it on the continent of one of the combatants on each side. The great Jacobite insurrection called British troops back to England; and Frederick again retired in disgust because France was obviously fighting entirely in her own interest to the complete neglect of his. The French could and did overrun the Netherlands; but then Austria was relieved of another enemy by the accession in Spain of the pacific King Ferdinand, who was much more interested in giving Spain itself a chance of peace and recuperation than in extending the dominions of his half-brothers ambitions of the Family Compact with France.

In fact, from the time when the Jacobite insurrection was over, and France and Austria had become practically the only active belligerents on the continent, the interest of the struggle for Great Britain is to be found in other regions. She had begun in 1739 with an ill-conducted maritime war against Spain, in which her greatly superior power was frittered away with very little result. In the next stage she had reasserted her maritime ascendancy in the Mediterranean, paralysing the French and Spanish fleets, and thereby at least reducing Spanish activity in Italy. In the closing years of the war naval ascendancy was more vigorously asserted; some blows were struck at the French fleet by Anson and Hawke; and a foretaste was given of the coming struggle with France in North America by the capture of Louisbourg on the St. Lawrence. The fleet would again have turned the scale in favour of the British in the conflict which had opened in India had the general war continued for another year. But by 1748 Britain, Spain, France and Prussia all wanted to stop the

war from which Bavaria had long retired; and a peace on the general basis of a restoration of conquests was forced upon Austria, though Frederick of Prussia retained his acquisitions. Apart from Silesia, Maria Theresa held what she had fought for. England restored Louisbourg to France in exchange for Madras, which the French had captured in India. Frederick of Prussia alone had gained positively by the war, by the actual acquisition of territory and the achievement of a great military reputation; and this had been done at the cost of procuring the undying animosity of Austria. As for Spain and Great Britain, the cause of the quarrel which had started the original duel between them was not even alluded

The Wheel-Barrow Crys of Europe, in 1748-9



European Sovereigns at Market, 1748.

[From a print satirising the re-arrangements, bargainings, and restorations of European diplomacy at the end of the war of the Austrian Succession, in 1748.]

to in the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748), which brought the war to a close.

II

THE FORTY-FIVE

The war which lasted from 1739 to 1748 was, from a British point of view, singularly futile and unproductive. But out of it arose, while it was still in progress, two episodes of signal importance. One was the last great effort of Jacobitism, the failure of which finally freed the country from the constantly lurking spectre of civil war. The other was the attempt made by the servants of the French East India Company to eject their British rivals, an attempt which presently recoiled upon their own heads.

The ignominious collapse of the rising of 1715 damped the somewhat lukewarm ardour of English Jacobites. In Scotland the enthusiasm of

loyalty to the Stuarts remained alive among some of the Highland clans, and thrilled the romantic hearts of many ladies. The hope that a Stuart restoration would put an end to the Union with England was cherished north of the Tweed by many who cared nothing for the rights of dynasties. But the real fervour, the real sanguine belief that "James III. and VIII." would yet come by his own, was to be found chiefly among the exiles or the sons of the exiles who had departed from Limerick, or had taken flight after the "Fifteen." The king whose honest bigotry, combined with an obstinate stupidity, lost him the crown of England, was succeeded by the unfortunate prince who lives in the pages of Thackeray as a voluptuary who threw away a crown to gratify an amour. The real James was a meritorious person who habitually endeavoured to do what he believed to be his duty. He would not sacrifice loyalty to his faith for the sake of a crown, though half England would have turned Jacobite if he had turned Protestant. He conceived it to be his duty to regain the crown of his fathers, but, not without plenty of excuse, he was a melancholy pessimist, painfully conscious that he was fighting a losing battle. He was free from the conspicuous faults of his father, of his uncle Charles II., and of his son Charles Edward; unhappily his personality was not inspiring but chilling. For that reason he was singularly ill-fitted to undertake the rôle which fate had thrust upon him.

Jacobite plots and intrigues continued with varying activity during the thirty years which followed the "Fifteen." Half the English Tories would perhaps have liked to see a restoration; many Tories and not a few Whigs, while regarding a restoration as a disturbing possibility, were anxious to stand well at the Stuart court if that possibility should materialise. Sanguine exiles were easily persuaded to believe that the Stuart cause was really popular in England, as it in fact was to a large extent in Scotland. Ireland was too powerless to count. But Jacobites in England and Scotland held to a firm conviction that no rising was possible without active military support from beyond the Channel. The long period of the French alliance made any such hopes futile, at least after Alberoni was dismissed from Spain. Hope revived when Britain was again involved in the War of the Austrian Succession. It was encouraged by France, since the British Government was thereby kept in fear of a Jacobite rising. In 1744, when France and Great Britain openly declared war, an invasion for the avowed purpose of effecting a Jacobite restoration was projected. Saxe himself was to have been in command, but at the chosen hour the transports were wrecked; the moment passed, and the French decided not to divert their arms from the conquest of the Netherlands.

But the fiery enthusiasm and the magnetic personality in which James was wanting were present in his son, Charles Edward, who was five-and-twenty years of age when he played for the great stake and lost. Handsome, athletic, generous, endowed in full measure with that personal charm for which so many members of the Stuart family were conspicuous,

we may, after the event, still trace in him warning signs of those weaknesses which, after the great failure, hurried him to moral ruin ; yet it may be that they would never have developed if his venture had been crowned with success.

The chance of French help was gone ; the prince resolved that at all costs he would strike his blow for the crown. Every trustworthy adherent

of his cause warned him that the attempt would be madness, that the English Jacobites would not rise, that the Highland chiefs themselves would not deliberately thrust their necks into a halter. In defiance of all advice the prince sailed from France with seven companions, slipped up the west coast, and landed in Moidart, the south-western corner of Inverness-shire, a remote point, beyond the ken of government officials. Thither he summoned the chiefs in whom he trusted. Some were wise and would not come ; they wished the cause well, but objected to a venture for which they saw no remotest prospect of success. Others came, each one bent on dissuading the prince and declaring that he himself would not be beguiled into an act of sheer madness. They might have held out if Donald Cameron of Lochiel had been able to resist the prince's appeal. But Lochiel gave way. If the prince was bent on ruin Lochiel would stand and fall beside him. Lochiel's action turned the scale ; chief after chief came in. The news filtered through at last to Sir John Cope, the commander of the government forces. Cope marched into the Highlands, intending to throw himself between Charles and the doubtful clans of the North ; Charles slipped past him and marched upon Edinburgh *via* Perth, while the baffled Cope moved to Inverness to bring his forces back to Dunbar by sea. A party of dragoons was sent out from Edinburgh to meet the advancing Highlanders, but fled in a panic without striking a blow—an exhibition



The Jacobite march from the landing at Moidart to the battle of Culloden.

had been able to resist the prince's appeal. But Lochiel gave way. If the prince was bent on ruin Lochiel would stand and fall beside him. Lochiel's action turned the scale ; chief after chief came in. The news filtered through at last to Sir John Cope, the commander of the government forces. Cope marched into the Highlands, intending to throw himself between Charles and the doubtful clans of the North ; Charles slipped past him and marched upon Edinburgh *via* Perth, while the baffled Cope moved to Inverness to bring his forces back to Dunbar by sea. A party of dragoons was sent out from Edinburgh to meet the advancing Highlanders, but fled in a panic without striking a blow—an exhibition

known as the Canter of Colt Brigg. The city of Edinburgh offered no resistance, and in fact welcomed the prince, though the Castle defied him. While Charles held his court at Holyrood, Cope returned from the North and approached Leith. Guided across an intervening marsh on a night march, the Highlanders fell upon the government troops as the morning mists were breaking and scattered them in a discreditable rout at Prestonpans. Scotland was apparently in the hands of the Jacobites.

For five weeks Charles delayed, beguiled by hopes of Jacobite risings and of a possible diversion from France. But while he delayed, the government in London was recalling troops from the Netherlands. The one chance lay in a dash to the South, in demoralising opposition by sheer audacity. Charles flung himself across the border at the head of his six thousand Highlanders, evaded first Wade and then Cumberland by sending each of them off on a false scent, and advanced as far as Derby. London was in a state of complete panic, and it was half believed that the approach of Charles would be the signal for the troops which still barred his advance either to join his standard or to run away. Charles would have dashed on, but less reckless counsels prevailed with the Highland chiefs. No Jacobites had joined them on the march, none had shown signs of rising, no Frenchmen had landed. They were far from their homes; if they advanced the slightest check would involve irretrievable disaster. In bitterness of spirit Charles yielded, and the army turned its face northward. Perhaps there was one chance in a thousand of success if he had advanced. There was no chance at all when once he had begun to retrace his steps. Eight weeks after the Highland army had started from Edinburgh it was back again at Glasgow (December 26). The shrewd management of Duncan Forbes had kept the rest of the clans quiet.

In the rearguard skirmishes which took place during the retreat the government troops had come off badly; Charles now laid siege to Stirling, and at Falkirk a complete defeat was inflicted upon General Hawley, who was in command of the pursuing force, Cumberland having been detained in the South. But this was the last success. Disagreements and jealousies divided the prince's council, the siege of Stirling was abandoned, and the insurgents retired into the Highlands. Thither they were pursued as the spring came on by Cumberland, who maintained his communications with the coast, where a supporting fleet attended his movements. No fresh clans joined the Stuart standard. On April 15th the two forces were in close proximity, the government troops well fed and in good condition, while the Highlanders were on very short rations. Cumberland's army was drawn up on Culloden Moor. Charles attempted to effect a surprise by a night march, but the design was spoilt by delays. Nevertheless the cause was staked on a pitched battle. Under Montrose, under Dundee, under Charles himself, the Highlanders had repeatedly routed larger bodies of regular troops by the fury of their onset. For this Cumberland was prepared, his superior numbers enabling him to draw up his troops in

three lines. The rush of the Highlanders broke the first, but their advance was stopped and turned into a rout by the deadly volleys from the second line. Recovery was hopeless. "The clans of Culloden were scattered in flight," and Cumberland earned his nickname of the Butcher by the savage brutality displayed on the field and in the consequent penal operations. For after Culloden armed resistance was no longer possible, and the prince himself became a fugitive. The Duke merely scoffed at the pacificatory



A contemporary plan of the Battle of Culloden.

wisdom of Forbes. What followed was not war, but a hunt for fugitives. Hairbreadth escapes, splendid deeds of loyalty and devotion, and the glow of romance, give a unique fascination to the story of the Forty-five. As a matter of rational calculation the great adventure was doomed to failure from the very outset, yet chivalry, loyalty, and sheer audacity had actually brought some six thousand clansmen from the wild Highlands of Scotland within measurable distance of winning back the British crown for the house of Stuart.

III

DUPLEIX

In 1740 the ambitious Frenchman who in India was at the head of the affairs of the French East India Company was eagerly awaiting the opportunity of a war between Great Britain and France to wipe out the rivalry of the British East India Company. Twenty years later the British East India Company had become no longer a mere body of traders but a territorial power, and French influence had received its *coup de grâce*. The first stage of the conflict corresponds to the period of open war between Great Britain and France, which was brought to a close by the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle.

It is not very easy to disabuse our minds of the idea fixed therein by Macaulay that Clive with a handful of Englishmen overthrew the Mogul Empire and set up in its place a British dominion over India. What Clive did perform in actual fact was one of the most astonishing feats recorded in history, but it was an intelligible feat, not a miracle.

In the middle of the eighteenth century the Mogul Empire in India was very distinctly more wanting in the characteristics of a state than the Holy Roman Empire in Europe. During the reign of Henry VIII. the great Babar, a prince of mixed Mongol or Mughal and Turkish race, had burst into India from Afghanistan and founded the Mogul dominion over Hindustan; that is, roughly speaking, the half of India which lies to the north of the river Nerbudda and the mouth of the Ganges. The empire was lost by his son Humayun and again almost recovered; the re-conquest was completed by Humayun's son Akbar, whose glorious rule very nearly synchronises with that of Queen Elizabeth. The rule of Akbar's three successors covers the next hundred years; that is, in effect, the seventeenth century. Under the third, Aurangzib, the great kingdoms of the South which had not been subject to the Moguls were overthrown, and the whole Peninsula from the Himalayas to the sea owned the sovereignty of the "Padishah," who parcelled it out into great vice-royalties or satrapies. But when Aurangzib died in 1707 the control of the empire by the Moguls became merely nominal. The satraps professed allegiance, but acted practically as independent sovereigns. The seat of the Padishah, the Great Mogul, was at Delhi, the traditional capital of the successive Mohammedan dynasties which for centuries had dominated the mainly Hindu populations of Hindustan; but their phantom dominion was made yet more shadowy by the devastating invasion of the Persian conqueror, Nadir Shah, in 1739.

Now we may take India as falling into five divisions—the basin of the Indus and its tributaries forming the Punjab and Sindh; the basin of

the Ganges forming the Delhi province, then Oudh, and then Behar and Bengal; Rajputana extending between the Delhi province and Sindh; Central India with the corresponding portion of the west coast; and the great southern division called the Deccan.¹ The whole of the Deccan was under the sway of the viceroy called the Nizam, with his headquarters at Haidarabad. Subordinate to the Nizam was his lieutenant-governor, the Nawab of the Carnatic, the great province which stretches along the Eastern Sea and inland to the mountains of Mysore. Presently we shall find a Mohammedan adventurer setting up for himself an independent kingdom of Mysore; but not yet. The great central district was dominated by the Hindu confederacy of the Marathas, having five centres, at Puna, Baroda, Indur, Gwalior, and Nagpur. Here and in Rajputana the ruling powers were Hindu; in the Deccan and in the Ganges basin the viceregal dynasties were Mohammedan; the Indus basin was as yet a debatable land where organised government hardly existed. All over India the Mohammedan was to the Hindu an alien conqueror, Turk or Afghan, who had laid his yoke upon the rightful lords of the Indian soil; and the Hindu was to the Mohammedan an infidel and an idolater. In race, in language, and in religion the peoples of India were less homogeneous than the peoples of Europe, although the hybrid Hindostani tongue had grown up in the camps as a common language of general intercourse.

Now, except in Rajputana, there was no single dynasty occupying a throne of importance which had been established for more than about half a century. There were minor Hindu rajahs, whose title may be translated prince or king, who traced their descent to a legendary past; but the Marathas had only sprung into prominence during the rule of Aurangzib, and the nawabs and wazirs, the proconsuls, the governors or lieutenant-governors of great provinces, were the sons or grandsons of Aurangzib's great officers; the aged Nizam had served Aurangzib himself. The Mogul empire was a great congeries of undefined states which had no sense either of a common or of an individual nationality, and no loyalty to a royal house with a traditional title to honour and obedience. Each ruler was watching for a chance of self-aggrandisement, though the will of the Mogul was technically law and every viceroy was technically the Mogul's officer.

On the skirts of this vast country, approximately the size of Europe without Russia and Turkey, were seated a few small communities of European traders. At no great distance from the two British posts, Forts William and St. George, better known afterwards as Calcutta and Madras, were the two main French naval stations of Chandernagur and Pondichery, each with some fortifications, and with a garrison of some scores of white troops; small communities, but each in a sort representative of the might of a great European nation; rivals and competitors in trade, each eager to

¹ See the Map of India on p. 677.

procure for itself from the native powers privileges to be withheld from the other. To the Frenchman, Dupleix, who became governor of Pondichery in 1741, the idea presented itself of acquiring a controlling influence at the courts of the great native potentates, with the corollary that the British rivalry was to be suppressed altogether. The two aims went hand in hand. Neither could be accomplished without the other, each was a means to the other.

The British in India were not indisposed for a duel; but the controlling authorities of the two trading companies at home saw only a loss of trade in any possible hostilities; and neither Dupleix nor his rivals could look for much outside support. Dupleix secured the favour of Anwar-ud-Din, the Nawab of the Carnatic, from whom both the companies held their "factories" as tenants. Anwar-ud-Din (Macaulay's Anaverdy Khan) forbade the British to attack the French when a British squadron appeared in Indian waters. The British squadron went away, but Dupleix concerted his plans with La Bourdonnais, the commandant at the French naval station of Mauritius. In 1746 La Bourdonnais appeared with a squadron and compelled Madras to surrender on terms. Anwar-ud-Din was deaf to the British appeal for protection, because he expected the town when captured to be placed in his own hands. But Dupleix now declared that there was no authority for the terms which La Bourdonnais had granted. He took possession on his own account; though La Bourdonnais retired in anger, feeling that his honour was compromised by the repudiation of his promise.

Then came the critical moment for Dupleix. He refused to resign to Anwar-ud-Din. The Nawab, in wrath, despatched an army of ten thousand men to give the insolent Frenchman a lesson. But Dupleix had mastered the vital truth that a handful of disciplined white troops were a match for ten times their number of half disciplined oriental levies; and further that natives, when drilled, disciplined, and led by European officers, and stiffened by a core of European soldiers, were not much less efficient than European troops in a contest with native armies. Anwar-ud-Din's great force was put to ignominious rout by a small band of Dupleix's sepoy with a few Frenchmen. This startling success at once gave the French a new and tremendous prestige. Anwar-ud-Din, without condescending to be afraid of the French, thought he might make them useful, and came to terms, agreeing to the retention of Madras by Dupleix.

A hundred miles to the south of Madras, beyond Pondichery, the British occupied the fortified post of Fort St. David. The French were in possession of Madras and of numerous British prisoners of war, taken when that town surrendered. The capture of Fort St. David would clear the Carnatic; but the garrison repelled every attack in 1747. In the following summer the attacks were renewed, and were again repulsed by Major Stringer Lawrence, the very capable soldier who had been placed in command. By this time the British naval authorities had awakened to

the benefits that might accrue from a more vigorous employment of naval supremacy. Admiral Boscawen appeared with a squadron in August, and now Pondichery was besieged instead of Fort St. David. After seven weeks, however, during which the defence was brilliantly conducted, and the siege operations were not, Boscawen had to withdraw his fleet because the season of the gales called the monsoon was at hand. During that season the squadron could neither keep the seas nor find adequate harbourage on the coast of the Carnatic. Pondichery escaped. It can hardly be doubted that its fate would have been sealed in the following year by the presence of Boscawen's squadron; but before hostilities were renewed came the news of the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle and the order that Madras should be restored to the British.

So closed the first phase of the contest. All the honours had fallen to Dupleix. The only success achieved by the British had been their stubborn defence of Fort St. David. The French, supported by a squadron, had captured Madras. The British, supported by a squadron, had failed to capture Pondichery. Dupleix's small forces had routed the great army of the Nawab of the Carnatic. Madras was restored to the British; but only in consequence of orders from home, not from any military necessity apparent on the spot.

IV

CLIVE

Peace was signed between Great Britain and France, and direct hostilities between the two companies in India were precluded. But Dupleix was bent on carrying out his own programme. The immense prestige which he had already achieved promised him an overwhelming influence in the native courts of the Deccan; but the British still stood in the way, and were not yet prepared to own themselves beaten. The contest was renewed on different lines, which avoided a formal breach of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle. Dynastic struggles broke out in the Deccan; French and British took the field as auxiliaries on opposite sides, and the British turned the tables on the French.

Anwar-ud-Din, an old and able soldier, had been appointed Nawab of the Carnatic by the Nizam in 1740. During the thirty years preceding the Nawabship had been held by the able and popular administrator Sadutulla, then by his nephew Dost Ali, and then by Dost Ali's son. The assassination of this last was the cause of the appointment of Anwar-ud-Din. The family of Sadutulla was now represented by an admirable and popular prince named Chanda Sahib. For some years Chanda Sahib had been a captive in the hands of the Marathas. He had been on particularly good terms with the French. Dupleix now ransomed Chanda Sahib from

the Marathas, with the intention of asserting his claims to the Nawabship, to which he, not Anwar-ud-Din, would have been appointed in 1740 had he at that time been at liberty. The powerful old Nizam at Haidarabad would have had to be reckoned with ; but at this opportune moment he died. The succession was seized by his son Nadir Jang, but was claimed by a grandson Muzaffar Jang, on the pretext that he had been appointed to it by the Lord Paramount of all India, the Mogul at Delhi. The two claimants to the Nizamship and the Nawabship, Muzaffar Jang and Chanda Sahib, made common cause against the Nizam and the Nawab in actual possession, Nadir Jang and Anwar-ud-Din.


Dupleix gave the pretenders his active support, on the plea of loyalty to the Mogul. The combined forces marched against Anwar-ud-Din, who was defeated and slain, whereupon his title was taken up by his son Mohammed Ali. The victory had been largely due to the services of a French force under the command of the able General Bussy. Mohammed Ali threw himself into Trichinopoli and appealed to the British for support ; but the latter could do no more than send him some two hundred men. On the other hand, they sent a contingent under Major Lawrence to join Nadir Jang, the *de facto* Nizam, who was now invading the Carnatic in force. But intrigue and conspiracy came to the aid of Dupleix. Nadir Jang was assassinated. Muzaffar Jang was proclaimed Nizam, and when he was killed in a skirmish his place was taken by the French nominee Salabat Jang, who fell completely under the control of Bussy. The new Nizam, accompanied by Bussy, retired to Haidarabad to establish his position, and it appeared that Dupleix had only to crush Mohammed Ali and Trichinopoli to be completely master of the situation, with a decisively controlling influence over both the Nizam of the Deccan and the Nawab of the Carnatic.

Hitherto there had been a singular absence of vigour and audacity on the part of the Madras authorities. But now there was a new governor, Saunders, and Saunders was able to appreciate the need of activity. He despatched reinforcements to Trichinopoli ; but, what was of still more importance, he listened to young Robert Clive. The story of Clive's youth is as familiar as that of Alfred and the cakes. The naughty boy, with whom his parents could do nothing at home, was sent out to India as a junior clerk or "writer" in the service of the East India Company. When the fighting began the young clerk at once volunteered. He had found his true vocation, and was allowed to exchange his writership for a commission in the company's service.

Trichinopoli was now in imminent danger of falling when Clive proposed to Saunders to create a diversion by attacking Arcot, the capital of the Carnatic. Saunders was bold enough almost to denude Madras of its garrison, by despatching Clive with eight officers, of whom only two had been in action, a couple of hundred British soldiers, and three hundred sepoys, to make the attempt upon Arcot. The blow was secret, sudden as

a thunderbolt. When Clive arrived before Arcot the amazed garrison was seized with panic and fled. Clive took instant possession and prepared to stand a siege. The desired effect was produced. Four thousand men marched from Trichinopoli, gathering reinforcements as they went, till a force of ten thousand men sat down before Arcot with its little garrison of five hundred. For seven weeks Clive held out, defying the efforts of the besiegers, inspiring his own men with the magnificent devotion which led the sepoys to make the spontaneous suggestion that the rice on which they were almost reduced to living should be reserved for the British; the natives could live on the water in which it was boiled.

The fame of the defence spread far and wide; the prestige of the British suddenly rose higher than that of the French. Rajah Sahib, the commander of the besieging force, Chanda Sahib's son, feared that if Arcot did not



Lord Clive in later years.

[From a portrait by Gainsborough about 1773.]

fall at once there would be a great accession of the natives to the British side. On the fiftieth day there was a grand assault. With desperate valour the assault was beaten back. Rajah Sahib raised the siege in despair and began to retreat; Clive's little band sallied forth in pursuit, scattered the great force at Arni, and again, having been joined by a force of Marathas, smote the foe at Kaveripak.

The tide had turned. Major Lawrence, the defender of Fort St. David, was back at Madras after absence on sick leave. Clive and Lawrence together effected the relief of Trichinopoli, outmanœuvred the opposing force, and

compelled it to surrender. Chanda Sahib was murdered, and Mohammed Ali was Nawab of the Carnatic.

Bussy was still dominant at Haidarabad, and the resourceful Dupleix was still by no means beaten. But Dupleix was after all a subordinate; his policy no longer found favour with the authorities in France, and his recall in 1754 was a fatal blow. Dupleix himself would not in the long run have been able to win, because when once Great Britain had become thoroughly alive to the importance of the struggle in India, a new war with France, which was inevitable, would enable her to exercise her sea power with decisive effect. Even apart from sea power the diplomatic talents of Dupleix would hardly have prevailed against the military genius of Clive. But when the actual final struggle came the French had lost Dupleix; and the renewal of war between France and Great Britain had brought into the field the naval power which was not available when the two nations were nominally at peace.

V

AFTER THE WAR

The ministry which was in office in England when the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle was signed was that which had been nicknamed the Broad Bottomed Administration on account of its comprehensive character. Walpole had retained office on the outbreak of the war nine years before; but his position became so hopelessly untenable that even he was forced to resign at the beginning of 1742. The nominal chief who succeeded him was Wilmington, while the real head of the government was Carteret. But Carteret was absorbed in the game of European politics which rarely interests, or is understood by, the majority of Englishmen. He ignored the necessity of placating parliament and his own colleagues; his "Hanoverian" measures were easily held up to popular execration; he had no personal party; his position was undermined by the Pelhams, of whom the younger, Henry Pelham, was a master of the arts of conciliation, while the elder, Newcastle, thoroughly understood jobbery, and very little else.

Pelham managed to obtain the support of politicians whom no one else could reconcile; he silenced the most dangerous critics by giving them office, and he clung to Walpole's principle of doing nothing in preference to arousing excited hostility. In fact he regarded it as his business not to carry out any particular policy, but merely to keep the machine running with as little friction as possible.

To the Pelham administration, therefore, fell the important task of the pacification of Scotland after the "Forty-five." The great insurrection had been made possible by the survival in the Highlands of the clan system, the Celtic equivalent of the feudalism which was bred from the contact of

the Roman and the Teuton. As feudalism in Scotland had attained a completer development than in England, owing to the comparative weakness of the central authorities, so feudal law survived in the Scottish Lowlands and gave to the great landowners the Heritable Jurisdictions, legal powers over their tenants which overrode the ordinary law, and sometimes even powers of life and death. But in the Highlands these legal powers were made very much more formidable, because the landowner was the chief of a clan bound to his service and to his obedience by the closest traditional ties of devotion. The Heritable Jurisdiction recognised by the law was merely a partial recognition of the relations between the chief and the clansmen, which were rooted in custom and sentiment, which counted for much more than mere law. The abolition of these jurisdictions which, somewhat in despite of the Act of Union, followed the "Forty-five," put an end to the authority of the chief over his clansman so far as the law was concerned. But it was not after all the most important factor in the change which took place. Some of the chiefs lost their lands by forfeiture, others were driven by impoverishment to sell them; and there were no bonds which linked the clansmen to the new lords of the soil, who were objects not of devotion but of hostility. The clan sentiment was weakened by the abolition of its outward and visible sign when the wearing of the tartan was prohibited. With vigorous disarmament, the improvement of roads, and the establishment of garrisons, it was no longer possible to carry on the old methods of freebooting. The Highlander who suffered what he regarded as an injury could now appeal for redress only to the law, not as in the old time to his own chief as his natural champion. In fact, the law at last penetrated into the Highlands, law with the sanction of physical force too strong for the resistance of the broken-up clan organisation; custom, hitherto more powerful than law, had lost its most vital sanction, loyalty to the chief, and so the strongest barrier which had hitherto kept the Highlanders as a people apart was broken down, and the way was made ready for their gradual amalgamation with the "Saxons."

Another measure followed after an interval of some years, which perhaps in the long run served still more effectively to create a sense of national unity. Not without hesitation on the part of the government, extension was given to an earlier experiment by which a regiment of Highlanders had been raised to form part of the regular army. The Highlanders, with the warrior tradition behind them, found a scope for their martial predilections in the new Highland regiments which were raised. Fighting shoulder to shoulder with Lowland Scots and English, they acquired a sense of comradeship on the one side, and on the other created a respect for their military qualities, which transformed the old hostility into a spirit of generous emulation. Those results were not felt immediately, but they have made their mark in many a stricken field.

Apart from the pacification of Scotland three measures stand to the

credit of the Pelham administration. The first was the creation of the consolidated stock, which ever since has been known as "Consols." The high interest payable on the National Debt was reduced in respect of something over fifty millions to $3\frac{1}{2}$ and then to 3 per cent., and in the following year, 1751, a group of nine loans was consolidated into 3 per cent. stock. The success of the scheme was a demonstration of the prosperity of the country and of the credit of the government; though this latter must have been in part at least due to the fact that no one was any longer afraid of that possibility of a Stuart restoration, which for fifty years had acted as a deterrent, however slight, to investment in Government Stock. Not only was the reduced interest accepted by the stock-holders, but the stock itself stood at a premium.

The second measure was the reform of the Calendar. A century and a half before, the revised Gregorian Calendar, named after Pope Gregory XIII., began to be adopted in Europe. It was observed that twenty-five leap years in the hundred were one too many, or all but one too many. To bring matters right it was necessary in the first place to cancel some days, and in the second place to omit the century year from the leap years; and in the third place it was held advisable to adopt the popular New Year's Day, January 1, in place of the ecclesiastical New Year's Day, the Feast of the Annunciation, March 25. The reformed Calendar was not adopted in England until 1752, when the eleven days between 2nd and 14th September were dropped; that is to say, 2nd September was the last day reckoned in the old style, the day following it being September 14th new style. From thenceforth also we escape the confusion caused by the uncertainty whether dates upon documents in the first three months of the year followed the old or the new style. For instance, taking January 1 as New Year's Day, Charles I. was beheaded on January 29, 1649 (N.S.). But taking March 25 as New Year's Day, he was beheaded on January 29, 1648 (O.S.). Private practice varied, though officially "old style" was retained, so that it would be impossible to tell except from internal evidence whether a private paper dated January 29, 1649, was dated on the day of the beheading of Charles I. or twelve months afterwards. After 1752 there was no more ambiguity. The carrying of the bill which brought Great Britain into line with nearly all Europe was largely due to Lord Chesterfield, a peer best known to posterity by the volume of *Letters to his Son*, which might be called a *vade mecum* for a young gentleman who was intended to pass through life with perfect manners and no morals. A higher but less remembered title to honour was derived from Lord Chesterfield's brief tenure of the Irish Deputyship, an office in which he distinguished himself by a complete disregard for the corrupting influences which generally at that time controlled the government of Ireland.

The last of Pelham's measures which deserves notice is Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Bill, which abolished in England the opportunities for surreptitious marriages by imposing heavy penalties on any clergy-

man who performed such ceremonies without either the publication of banns or the production of a licence. From this time Gretna Green assumed a romantic prominence as the refuge of young runaway couples ; since once across the Border the fugitives might celebrate their marriage under Scots law. The object of course was to prevent young girls from being enticed into elopements by fortune-hunting adventurers.

Pelham did what he was fit to do. He kept the machine running, not brilliantly, hardly even efficiently, but with a minimum of friction. But in 1754 he died. The storm-clouds were lowering, and Britain had great need of a strong and far-sighted leadership. Such leadership was not to be looked for in the man who succeeded Henry Pelham as the head of the administration, his brother Newcastle.

CHAPTER XXV

EMPIRE

I

THE GROUPING OF THE POWERS

THE storm-clouds were lowering not only for Great Britain but for all Europe. For two conflicts were inevitable. Frederick of Prussia had won for his country a new position among the nations at the cost of the bitter hostility of Austria, and it was quite certain that sooner or later he would have to fight for his life. British and French colonists in America and British and French traders in the East had begun a conflict for dominion which sooner or later would have to be fought out to the bitter end. Whether those two conflicts would be kept separate or would be merged together, and how, in the latter case, the Powers concerned would combine, were the great questions of the hour.

The question at issue in America was plain to view. From Nova Scotia on the north to the border of the Spanish Florida on the south the seaboard and the region inland to the Alleghanies were occupied by some two millions of British colonists, constituted as a number of independent states having no common central government, in most respects autonomous, but all ultimately subject to the control of the Crown and parliament at Westminster. Those two million colonists intended to expand westwards until one day they should reach the Pacific Ocean. But on the north the French occupied the basin of the St. Lawrence with their colony of Canada, and in the south they had planted the colony of Louisiana at the mouth of the Mississippi. The French had carried their exploration along the Mississippi itself and its great tributary the Ohio, which flows from north to south, its sources lying at no great distance from Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, the most easterly of the group of the great lakes out of which the St. Lawrence flows. The French claimed these two river basins; in other words, the whole belt of territory running from the mouth of the St. Lawrence on the north-east to the mouth of the Mississippi at the south-west. If that claim were admitted the British colonists would be cooped up between the French and the Atlantic; the French could expand westwards and the British could not. On the other hand, the British claimed the right of free expansion westwards, which in effect would have restricted the French to expansion in the modern Dominion of Canada, leaving them in the

south very little more than the mouth of the Mississippi. There was no possibility of compromising these rival claims ; one or other of the parties would have to be driven off the field.

The number of the French colonists was much less than that of the British ; *primâ facie*, if the two sets of colonists were left to fight the matter out between themselves, the British colonists ought to have been secure of victory. Had they enjoyed a common central government and a standing army there could have been little doubt of the issue. But they were subject to no common direction, and their fighting forces consisted in the separate militias of the separate colonies, organised chiefly for defence against the Redskins, and all having the strongest objection to serving outside the borders of their own particular state. The French in Canada, on the other hand, were under a single directing head ; and the head at this time was a man of genius, both military and administrative, the Marquis de Montcalm. Moreover, a factor in the situation was provided by the Red Indian tribes, who, for the most part, were on better terms with the French than with the British. Hence it is by no means clear that the British would in fact have had the better in a straightforward contest.

But in effect, however inert Great Britain and France might be, however little disposed to give serious attention to colonial questions, it was not possible that they should abstain altogether from intervention in the quarrels of the colonies. It is obvious that if they intervened the effective employment of sea-power would determine the issue precisely as it would determine the issue in India. Both in the west and the east the rivals on the spot were fairly well matched, and the issue, as between them, would turn very largely on the comparative capacity, diplomatic and military, of the leaders on the spot. But in both regions, if one party received energetic support from home and the other party did not, that support would more than counterbalance any local superiority. In both regions it followed that nothing but flagrant mismanagement could deprive the British of ultimate victory, if they made use of their naval ascendancy to prevent the arrival of French reinforcements and to carry reinforcements to their own people.

Now if we turn to Europe, the one thing certain there was that the Austrian government was set on the destruction of Prussia, or at the very least on the recovery of Silesia. And Prussia had at least one other enemy in the Russian Tsarina Elizabeth. By this time both Holland and Sweden had dropped out of the ranks of the Powers which had to be reckoned with as of first-class importance in European complications. But at the beginning of the century Peter the Great had set about the organisation of the vast but incoherent Russian dominion, at least semi-barbaric in its composition, into an empire approximating to Western models. The new Power had not been greatly concerned with the rivalry between Hapsburg and Bourbon, the "balance of power" which loomed so large in the eyes of Western statesmen. Still less was she concerned

with the over-seas rivalry between Great Britain and France, which had not yet been fully realised even at Versailles and Westminster. But she was concerned with the Turks and Poland, and for that reason was touched by the affairs of Austria and of Prussia. Her power was an incalculable quantity, and her intervention might weigh enormously in the scales.

As matters stood in 1748, Prussia and France were in alliance, and Austria and Great Britain were in alliance. Austria and France were traditionally hostile. According to all tradition, therefore, it was to be anticipated either that France and Great Britain would fight out their own duel and stand aloof from the Austro-Prussian quarrel, or that France would support Prussia and England would be on the side of Austria, though in a very half-hearted fashion, since she had no ill-will whatever to Prussia. Austria, on the other hand, could count on the good-will of the Tsarina because of Elizabeth's personal hatred not of the Prussian state but of Frederick himself, since he had been unable to resist the temptation to make sarcastic comments on her morals. Spain would in no case be brought into the embroglio so long as the present King Ferdinand remained on the throne.

At Vienna Maria Theresa had for her minister a clear-sighted statesman, Kaunitz. At Berlin all things were directed by the keenest brain and the readiest hand in Europe. At Versailles there ruled an autocrat who neither had statesmanship himself nor knew how to choose statesmen to help him, a king who was completely under the influence of his mistress, the Pompadour. In London the administration was a mere chaos; the Government was incapable of framing a policy, or of keeping consistently to any definite line. To Kaunitz it appeared that from the Austrian point of view the attitude of England was of less consequence than that of France. France, neutralised or brought into alliance, was worth more than an alliance with the British, who, in the last war, had repeatedly urged Maria Theresa to concede the unwelcome demands of the king of Prussia. France might be amenable because, among other reasons, Frederick had enraged the Pompadour very much as he had enraged the Tsarina. Kaunitz's plan was to combine Austria, Russia, and France for the destruction of Prussia. Saxony too would be drawn into the net, and the Hanoverian connection was more likely to be an embarrassment to Great Britain than a help to Frederick. Kaunitz's diplomacy was effecting a revolution in the system of European alliances. Frederick, preparing for a life and death struggle, preferred a British to a French alliance, because in the last war the French had very obviously neglected his interests to pursue their own ends; and British subsidies, extremely useful to a poor country engaged in a costly war, would at any rate be expended in the manner most useful to Prussia. Great Britain merely drifted, and ultimately found herself in alliance with Prussia and at war with the European coalition, while ministers themselves hardly understood how that position had been arrived at.

In the two years of drifting which passed between the death of Henry Pelham and the outbreak of the war, the one international fact forced to the front was the inevitability of a contest in America. In India affairs quieted down with the recall of Dupleix. Robert Clive was in England, trying to get himself into parliament, while the two companies had agreed to abstain from meddling with the native powers and were at any rate in a state of truce. But in America the Acadian question was acute, since the French and British frontiers had not been defined, and the French population within the unquestionably ceded territory were kept in a state of restless disaffection towards the British government by the French Canada. Moreover, the aggressive policy was in active progress; the French had already set to work to create a chain of forts extending from the great lakes down the line of the Ohio. The British colonists had attempted to force them back, but had the worst of the encounter. In 1754 Benjamin Franklin propounded a scheme for federating the colonies, which would have provided for united action under a common central government; but the spirit of particularism was too strong and the scheme was rejected. It became necessary therefore to appeal to the home government.

The appeal was answered by the despatch to America of a couple of regiments under the command of General Braddock, a valiant veteran who understood the formal methods of fighting practised on the European continent, but knew nothing of backwoods warfare. The French government responded by preparing and despatching reinforcements to Canada, though there was no declaration of war. Nevertheless Admiral Boscawen received orders to cut off the French expedition; this was at the end of April 1755. A second fleet was also being prepared to take the seas under Hawke. At this time the British ministers were still under the impression that what they had to fear was the alliance, not yet formally abrogated, between France and Prussia. George was desperately afraid that Frederick would be moved to attack Hanover, and the Government negotiated both with the Tsarina and with Austria for the protection of Hanover and the Netherlands, in case the colonial struggle between France and Great Britain should issue in an attack on those regions by France and Prussia. The Tsarina had no objection to being subsidised for an attack upon Prussia; but Austria rejected the proposals, which would obviously have destroyed her own private scheme of securing the neutrality if not the actual co-operation of France in an attack upon Prussia itself.

Bad news accumulated. Boscawen failed to intercept the French expedition, and Braddock, marching against the French post of Fort Duquesne, was ambushed and killed, and his force was cut to pieces. The only British success, if success it can be called, was the effective seizure of Acadia by the deportation of the French, commemorated a century later in Longfellow's poem *Evangeline*.

Now the thing that King George and his ministers wanted was to

secure the neutrality of Prussia, the supposed ally of France. To that end they had obtained the convention with Russia, which was to expose Prussia to Russia's immediate attack if she moved against Hanover in the French interest. To this end also the Convention of Westminster was now negotiated with Frederick, directly binding him to neutrality. Frederick had no inclination at all to be dragged into a war for the extension of the French colonial empire, a war in which he could not choose his own time for action, and in which he could by no means count on being effectively defended by France against Russia and Austria, which would quite certainly attack him at their own convenience.

Frederick accepted the convention in January 1756; with decisive, but perhaps unexpected, results. When the Tsarina learnt of it she became extremely angry, and Vienna was no longer in doubt that Russia would join actively in the destruction of Prussia. It was decisive moreover for France. Since she could no longer use Prussia as a weapon against Great Britain, she would join Austria and secure herself against Austrian intervention on the side of Great Britain. Besides, the superstitious Louis had an idea that he could compromise with Heaven for his private immoralities by joining a Catholic Power in attacking Protestant states. The old system of alliances and antagonisms was completely broken up, and it had become inevitable that Great Britain and Prussia should stand together in the coming struggle.

The almost unparalleled inefficiency of the British Government would have been absolutely ruinous if it had not been matched by that of France. The destruction of Prussia was no business of France. Her business was to maintain Prussia in Central Europe as a counterpoise to Austria, not to join in the attempt to restore an overwhelming Austrian ascendancy. By allowing herself to be seduced into the Austrian alliance, she was drawn away from devoting her energies whole-heartedly to the duel with England. For the purposes of that duel it was imperative that she should organise her fleets to their highest capacity, while Great Britain's actually very superior sea-power was neutralised by incompetent administration. She would have had nothing to fear from Austrian intervention; the real question for her was whether the preservation of Prussia called for her own intervention in spite of the British duel. She chose instead to exhaust herself in an attack upon Prussia, from which she could derive no advantage, while its inexpediency was certainly not counterbalanced by any moral considerations. And she neglected her navy until the British administration had been permeated by a new spirit which restored the British fleet to the plenitude of vigour that made its supremacy unassailable.

Not by far-sighted policy, but by drifting along in complete misapprehension of the whole situation, the British Government blundered into the alliance with Prussia; whereby in effect Great Britain got the help of Prussia and Hanover in fighting France. France suffered more from that combination than she would have suffered from a British alliance with

Austria; but it was not in the least what the British Government had intended. And apart from this, although it was perfectly well known that war with France for the colonies was inevitable, no proper precautions were taken. The garrisons of Minorca and Gibraltar were inadequate; neither Port Mahon nor the Rock was in fit condition to resist a strenuous attack, and the fleet which ought to have been ready to sweep the seas was not made ready at all.

These things were owing to the fact that the Government had no real head, no one to guide it, with clear and definite aims or a clear and definite idea of methods. Newcastle's idea of policy was party management; not the same thing, though a necessary means to it. He was too jealous to co-operate even with the men of ability who were nominally members of his administration. His most formidable critics in the House of Commons were Henry Fox and William Pitt, who both spoke from the government benches, until presently Pitt went out of office, and Fox was silenced as a critic in the House by official advancement and in the Cabinet by the fear of losing his emoluments. The man to whom the people of England turned their eyes was Pitt, whom neither Newcastle nor the king could endure; and Pitt was entirely without the qualities of a party manager, nor would anything induce him to condescend to the business of party management.

II

MISMANAGEMENT

In the spring of 1756 the Austrian combination for the destruction of Prussia was not yet avowed; it was not intended that it should be unmasked until all the Powers concerned were ready to strike in concert. But war between France and Great Britain was obviously imminent. The country was on the verge of panic over the expectation of a French invasion; and the ministerial idea of defence was to bring over troops hired from Hanover and Hesse—so little care had been given to the organisation of a fighting force. Pitt's demands for a reorganisation of the militia had been rejected. It was known that a French fleet was on the point of sailing from Toulon, though its destination was uncertain; and Admiral Byng was sent with ten sail of the line to take care of the Mediterranean. By the time that he arrived, in May, a slightly superior French fleet was already engaged in besieging Port Mahon. After an indecisive engagement on May 19th, Byng came to the conclusion that the risks of attempting to raise the siege were too great. He retired to protect Gibraltar, and, at the end of June, Port Mahon surrendered.

The loss of Minorca excited a wild storm of rage in England, where ministers clutched at the chance of diverting some of the indignation from

themselves by making Byng the scapegoat. They did not save themselves. Matters were not improved for them by unsatisfactory news from America. Fox resigned, Newcastle could not face both Pitt and Fox in opposition, and under the Duke of Devonshire a ministry was formed in which Pitt and a group of his connections, Lord Temple, Legge, and George Grenville, found places, by no means to the satisfaction of the king. Byng was court-martialled and ordered to be shot, in accordance with a technical regulation, although the court entirely acquitted him of cowardice, and accompanied the sentence with a protest against the rigour of the law. Public opinion admitted no plea for mercy, though Pitt risked his popularity by advocating the cause of the unlucky admiral; and Byng was shot.

The Devonshire ministry was moved to vigorous action by Pitt. His Militia Bill was passed, the army was increased, a couple of Highland regiments were raised, and a substantial force was despatched to America. Large supplies were voted, including a subsidy for Hanover, although throughout Pitt's career he had clamoured against the subsidising policy. Yet the ministry could not hold its own. Pitt was dismissed at the end of March, chaos supervened, and after a series of abortive attempts to produce a combination which could at once command the confidence of the country and control parliament, George, Newcastle, and Pitt realised that the only possible Government was a coalition between Pitt and Newcastle, in which Pitt had a free hand for action and Newcastle for patronage. The most creditable feature in the not discreditable career of George II. is the loyalty with which he stood by a minister whom he had always detested hitherto, from the moment that he learnt to trust him. Fox, who had been Pitt's most dangerous rival so far as ability was concerned, was quieted by the lucrative post of Paymaster. The formation of the Pitt-Newcastle administration was the beginning of the turning of the tide, which till then had been setting unfavourably enough for Great Britain. Even then some months elapsed before the turn of the tide made itself convincingly felt.

The attack on Minorca had opened the war between Great Britain and France. But Frederick at Berlin was fully aware that his own turn was coming, nor was it his intention to wait until the net had closed round him. He was satisfied that Saxony, which lay in on his southern border, was involved in the combination against him. It was of first-rate importance to him that he should strike before his enemies were ready, and force them to adopt a plan of operations imposed on them by his action, instead of leaving them the initiative and of being himself forced to adapt his own action to their operations. But he could not strike at Austria with Saxony ready to attack his own flank. Frederick never hesitated for his own part to subordinate the niceties of international law to the necessities of the hour. A couple of months after Port Mahon had surrendered to the French the King of Prussia marched into Saxony. If he could paralyse the Electorate, or, still better, if he could induce it to support him, he

designed an immediate invasion of Bohemia and possibly a blow at Prague before the winter set in.

The plan was foiled, because the Saxons offered an unexpected resistance. Their forces concentrated in an impregnable position at Pirna, covering Dresden. Frederick had no alternative but to commence a blockade. An unsuccessful attempt to relieve the Saxons was made by the Austrian Marshal Browne—Scottish and Irish family names are notable among the commanders of continental armies at this period. The Saxons



Map of the Prussian Area of the Seven Years' War, 1756-1763.

were starved into a surrender, Frederick entered Dresden, the Dresden Archives fell into his hands, and he was able to publish the evidence which justified his action. Saxon troops were obliged to serve in the armies of the king of Prussia, and Saxon money helped to supply the Prussian treasury. But the resistance of Pirna had delayed operations too long for Frederick to surprise Bohemia by a sudden blow.

Winter and spring were occupied in preparations and negotiations in which the diplomatic skill of Kaunitz was triumphant. The Treaty of Versailles, signed on May 1, 1757, established the terms of an alliance between Austria, Russia, and France, in which nearly all the advantages

were to go to Austria. Prussia itself was to be partitioned between Austria, Russia, Poland, and Saxony, the Saxon Elector being also king of Poland; in the event only of complete success France was to have her own reward in the Netherlands. On the other hand Hanover, after a vain attempt to get her own territory guaranteed in return for neutrality, was obliged to take part with Prussia and to undertake the defence of the line of the Weser against the anticipated invasion by the French. The command of this force was entrusted to the Duke of Cumberland.

The allies apparently reckoned that Frederick, against so vast a combination, would adopt a purely defensive attitude and confine himself to preparations for resisting attack. But for Frederick at least the true defensive strategy lay in a vigorous offensive. He was overwhelmingly outnumbered; his one chance lay in striking crushing blows which should keep the circle of his enemies perpetually broken; and for carrying out this programme he had the strategical advantage of holding the interior lines. That is, being himself at the centre of a semicircle, he could fling the mass of his troops from one point to another on the circumference much more swiftly than could his foes. But taking the offensive involved enormous risks, and demanded a supreme audacity which lay outside the calculations of strategists who practised warfare on orthodox lines.

The Austrians were startled when suddenly at the beginning of May Frederick flung himself upon Bohemia and shattered their main force before Prague, before a second army could come up to its support and overwhelm him. But when he attempted to repeat the blow against the second Austrian army he met with a crushing defeat at Kolin; he was forced to fall back into Saxony, leaving a column under Bevern to hold the Austrians in check, when they should have recovered from their exertions sufficiently to advance in force. And meanwhile the great French army was advancing to measure swords with Cumberland on the Weser.

This was the position of affairs when the ministerial coalition, headed by Pitt and Newcastle, was formed in England at the end of June. It was not yet known in England that events of vast importance had been taking place in India, and that even at that moment Robert Clive was master of Bengal. It was indeed only quite recently that the public had learnt of the tragedy of the Black Hole of Calcutta in the previous July, for Indian news might take any time from six months to a year to travel. The whole situation looked appallingly black.

Nor were there immediate signs that it would lighten. The Weser was not in fact a defensible river. The great French army got across it unopposed, and proceeded to attack Cumberland at Hastenbeck. A battle was fought which was indecisive. Nevertheless Cumberland, instead of holding his ground, fell back to the north as far as Stade on the Elbe, below Hamburg. There is reason to believe that in so doing he was acting against his own judgment under orders from his father, and that his own wish was to form a junction with Frederick. Whether that be true or not,

his retreat left the way to Prussia through Hanover open. But the Duke of Richelieu, who was now sent to take command of the French army, tarried to plunder the country, which he did very effectively, and then turned in pursuit of Cumberland, who found himself in a *cul de sac* and apparently about to be overwhelmed by a much larger army than his own. Negotiations were opened through the instrumentality of the king of Denmark, and a convention was signed at Kloster Seven on September 10. Under the convention the non-Hanoverian troops under Cumberland's command were to be sent home, while the Hanoverians themselves were to be permitted to remain in winter quarters in the neighbourhood of Stade. In deference to Cumberland's urgency, Richelieu consented to waive the term "capitulation," which implies the act of a commander in the field completely binding in itself, and to call the agreement a "convention," an act which requires ratification by a government.

It did not apparently occur either to Richelieu or to Cumberland that the convention might not be ratified; it was taken as a preliminary to the neutralising of Hanover. Nevertheless the convention was not ratified. Richelieu moved off to occupy the south-western corner of Prussia with a portion of his troops, while the rest were despatched to join the second French army under Soubise, which was on the point of invading Saxony. In England the news of the convention was received with a storm of indignation; its ratification was refused; Cumberland was recalled in disgrace, and refused to defend himself, though he believed himself to have been acting under King George's own orders. At the instance of Pitt Frederick was invited to appoint the Duke of Brunswick's brother, Prince Ferdinand, to the command of the forces in Hanover, while all idea of neutralising George's Electorate was abandoned.

The tale of misfortune was not yet complete. The first fruit of Pitt's accession to power in England was an expedition against Rochefort, on the west coast of France not far from Rochelle. But the General Mordaunt and the Admiral Hawke disagreed, and the expedition returned at the beginning of October, having accomplished practically nothing. The only good news so far was that in India Clive had captured the French factory at Chandernagur in March, for the conquest of Bengal was still undreamed of. American affairs still went ill. The French under Montcalm had long before cleared the line of forts connecting Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence with the Ohio valley; now they captured Fort William Henry on the south of Lake George. The British commander, Lord Loudoun, relinquished the plan of attempting to capture Louisbourg; and Admiral Holburne, attempting to strike at the French fleet, failed to bring it to action, while his own force suffered so severely in a hurricane that it had to return home.

But although defeat and failure still through the closing months of 1757 seemed to be the order of the day for the British arms, November and December saw two of Frederick's most brilliant triumphs. In October

the great French army under Soubise was preparing to deliver Saxony from its captor. It was always one of Frederick's supreme difficulties that he was precluded from playing a waiting game. It was of the utmost importance to him now to bring Soubise to an engagement and clear him off the field, so that he himself might get back to fight the Austrians. Soubise saw no reason to fight in order to please Frederick, and Frederick could not make a direct attack on him; but a raiding force of Austrians, directed upon Berlin, drew Frederick with his army to the protection of the capital. The Austrians retreated again; but Soubise had been tempted forward by Frederick's withdrawal, and before he could in turn draw back again Frederick forced him to a decisive engagement at Rossbach. Soubise, with an immensely larger force, attempted an enveloping movement; the Prussians fell upon the extended line, broke it, and crumpled it up.

Meanwhile the Austrian main army had entered Silesia in force and was threatening to reduce it. It was fully time for Frederick to hasten back if the whole province was not to be lost. Exactly one month after he had overthrown the French at Rossbach he was facing the Austrians at Leuthen with his victorious army. Even in the interval Bevern had been defeated and taken prisoner, and the very important fortress of Schweidnitz had fallen to the Austrians. At Leuthen, perhaps the most brilliant of all Frederick's brilliant victories, the great Austrian army was shattered as thoroughly as the army of Soubise. By the end of the year Schweidnitz alone was held in Silesia by Frederick's enemies, and Schweidnitz fell in the following spring.

III

PITT

The central object of Pitt's policy was the conquest of America from the French, together with the assertion of an overwhelming naval supremacy. But he was fully aware that the preservation of Prussia was bound up with that policy. America might be conquered, but, if Frederick were crushed by the alliance of Bourbon and Hapsburg, the conquest of America might go for nothing, when that alliance should be directed to crushing an isolated Great Britain. America was to be won in Germany as well as on the high seas and the American continent. But the method was not to be that of Marlborough and William III. We were not to place armies at Frederick's disposal; our own troops were wanted in America, which would draw quite as much fighting energy as could be spared from the development and extension of naval expeditions. Frederick in Europe was to be supported not with British soldiers but with British gold, gold which would maintain Hanoverians, Brunswickers, and other troops under the command of Prince Ferdinand, and would help to preserve Frederick's

own treasury from depletion. It was not without some reluctance that Pitt found himself obliged to strengthen the army in Hanover with some British regiments, when Ferdinand had justified his selection by a victory at Crefeld.

But this was not sufficient. From the Rochefort expedition onwards Pitt planned a series of descents upon the French coast and the French ports. They were in appearance singularly unproductive and even aimless; and they have often been condemned by critical historians. In that condemnation Frederick the Great did not concur. They were a very material contribution to the defence of Prussia. Immense numbers of French troops were kept out of action, out of the French armies which took the field against Prussia, locked up in France because they had to be in perpetual readiness to meet a British attack, at whatever point of the coast it might be delivered. Naval or military experts may differ on the question whether the policy was right or wrong, while the lay student is apt to judge it by the absence of any obvious resultant gain. But it was at any rate a policy approved and commended both in its intentions and in its effects by the greatest military authority of the time, in whose interest it was carried out. It must be regarded as having been in part at least the effective employment of naval supremacy to co-operate with the military forces by a constant diversion of the enemy's troops from their true military objective.

In 1757 Great Britain had achieved no successes; Frederick's victory at Prague had been more than counteracted by his crushing defeat at Kolin, and he had redeemed his position only by the two extraordinarily brilliant performances at Rossbach and Leuthen. But for the inactivity of the Russian armies beyond his eastern frontier—due to an idea that the Tsarina was dying and would be succeeded by a Tsar whose sympathies were entirely with Frederick—Prussia might even have been crushed in that year. In 1758 Frederick was able to open a campaign in Moravia, but in August he found himself obliged to strike at an advancing force of Russians. The hardly won victory of Zorndorf drove them back into Poland; but it was already more than time for Frederick to dash back to Saxony, and then he was actually defeated by the Austrian commander Daun. But Daun rested on his laurels, and again Frederick had to race off to Silesia to give check to another Austrian army and return in time to prevent the dilatory Daun from taking advantage of his temporary absence. Meanwhile Ferdinand of Brunswick had gradually forced the French in the North back across the Rhine and put them to rout at Crefeld. But he was still threatened by a second French army which Soubise had re-formed; and the French prospects were very much improved by the accession to power of the vigorous minister Choiseul, who began to infuse a new life and energy into the war.

Frederick, then, during the year rather more than held his own; but the campaigns illustrate the enormous difficulties of his position. He could

never adopt the tactics of defence, the methods of William of Orange, who never won great victories but always made sure that defeat should not mean disaster. The king of Prussia was always under the necessity of attempting to shatter the particular enemy whom he was for the moment facing. He had no time to follow up a success in one quarter or even to retrieve a defeat; because, the moment he had struck, he had to hurry at full speed to another quarter to parry another attack. Whenever he was in Silesia the French with recuperated forces were threatening Saxony; whenever he was in Saxony the Austrians were recuperating themselves and threatening Silesia; and when both French and Austrians had been temporarily beaten back, the Russians on the north-east were threatening Brandenburg itself. Each of the three allies was generally able to keep in being a couple of armies any one of which immensely outnumbered the largest force which Frederick could collect in any one quarter; although, happily for him, Ferdinand of Brunswick consistently proved himself able to deal effectively with the northern French army. As we have seen, neither of the French armies attained what should have been its maximum fighting strength because of the forces which were detained elsewhere by fear of British descents on the coasts and ports. One such descent was made upon Cherbourg in August with some success; stores and guns were captured and fortifications were demolished. But two attacks upon St. Malo in June and September were ineffectual, and the second was attended by a heavy list of casualties.

But British naval predominance was being definitely reasserted; the news of Clive's apparently miraculous victory at Plassey was an inspiration to deeds of prowess, and affairs in America took a more satisfactory turn. There Pitt planned a vigorous campaign. Loudoun was recalled, and the chief command was given to Amherst, with James Wolfe as his second in command. They, in co-operation with the fleet under Boscawen, were to capture Louisbourg, the great fort on Cape Breton commanding the estuary of the St. Lawrence, and were to proceed thence to the reduction of Quebec. A second force under James Abercrombie, who had been Loudoun's senior subordinate, was to attack the French on the Upper St. Lawrence and Lake Champlain, seizing Ticonderoga as a preliminary to the advance upon Montreal. A third force was to attack Fort Duquesne, not so much because the fort was dangerous in itself as because it symbolised the previous successes of France on the continent. Although Abercrombie mismanaged the attack on Ticonderoga, where his troops were cut up in making a frontal attack upon a very strongly entrenched position, both Fort Duquesne and Louisbourg were captured. Amherst, however, did not feel himself able to attempt the reduction of Quebec before the winter.

The next year, 1759, was the British year of victories and the French year of disasters, while Frederick himself for the first time definitely lost ground, and even for a moment during the course of it lost heart. He

was already becoming too exhausted to do more than watch for the point where he must strike at all costs. Again it was the Russian advance which had to be repelled. In August the Russian force was descending upon Frankfort on the Oder. It was joined by an Austrian contingent before Frederick could strike in and sever the two armies. He attacked the foe at Kunersdorf. The attack was successful, but Frederick attempted with troops already exhausted to improve his victory into the annihilation of the greatly superior force opposed to him; the tables were turned upon him, and his own force barely escaped annihilation.

He was saved from total destruction because neither Russians nor Austrians made any more use of their victory, and because only a few days earlier Ferdinand of Brunswick inflicted a decisive defeat on the French at Minden. The French were rolled back with very heavy loss. The disaster to them would have been even more overwhelming, but for the entirely unaccountable refusal of Lord George Sackville to employ his cavalry in accordance with repeated orders from Prince Ferdinand, conduct which ultimately led to his dismissal from the service. But the victory was admittedly won by the skilful dispositions of Ferdinand and the altogether admirable conduct of the British troops which bore the brunt of the fighting. Particular distinction was won by the Marquis of Granby, who commanded the second British line. His popularity in England, it may be observed in passing, is attested by the number of inns which adopted the gallant warrior's head as a sign. In spite of Lord George Sackville, the battle of Minden redounded to the honour of British arms.

But other glories of the year were exclusively British. Choiseul concentrated his designs on a plan for the invasion of England; nevertheless, so vigorously had the navy been developed that Pitt was able to despatch expeditions to the West Indies, where Guadeloupe was captured, and to the St. Lawrence, to co-operate in the plan of campaign against Canada, without fear that the remainder of the fleet would be insufficient to repel invasion, though another squadron was conveying reinforcements to India. Admiral Rodney bombarded Havre, where a flotilla awaited the embarkation of French troops, though with no very great results.

The two great French naval armaments lay at Toulon and at Brest, while Boscawen kept watch within the Mediterranean, and Hawke's fleet was on guard in Tor Bay. In August La Clue slipped out of Toulon, to join Conflans at Brest, with ten ships of the line and two ships of fifty guns. Boscawen caught them off Lagos Bay on the south of Portugal, and destroyed five of them, while five were blockaded in the harbour of Cadiz.

Hawke's blockade of Brest kept the main French fleet there completely shut up until contrary winds forced the British to shelter in Tor Bay. Conflans started from Brest, intending to pick up and convoy an invading force to Scotland. But Hawke too was released from Tor Bay by the change of wind. Conflans, with twenty-one sail of the line, was in pursuit of a small

squadron of British ships which were cruising in the neighbourhood, when Hawke's fleet hove in sight. A north-westerly wind was rising to a gale, and Conflans ran for Quiberon Bay in the hope that the pursuing British, who had twenty-three ships of the line, would find themselves pounded among the shoals and rocks. Though the gale was developing into a storm, Hawke was not to be baffled. His van overtook the French rear and won a victory not less crushing than that of La Hogue. Five of the French were sunk. Seven, lightened by throwing guns and stores overboard, got over the shallow entrance of the Vilaine, though four of them were completely disabled. Nine escaped to Rochefort or to the Loire; none had the chance of coming out again. The French line of battleships were hopelessly scattered in threes and fours in different ports, where it



General James Wolfe.

was an easy matter to keep them blockaded. The English lost in the fight or in connection with the fight only a couple of ships, which ran upon rocks. The year had added to the British Navy twenty-seven French ships of the line and thirty French frigates. From that time till the end of the war the bulk of the British fleet was available for despatch to any part of the world where it might be wanted; the balance was quite sufficient to prevent any French squadron from taking the sea. The dream of a French invasion was finally disposed of.


The battle of Quiberon Bay was fought on November 20th, two months after the still more celebrated but not more decisive triumph of the British arms in Canada. Not more decisive, because if Wolfe had been beaten on the Heights of Abraham Hawke's destruction of the French fleet would still have enabled the British to pour reinforcements into Canada unchecked, and the French would still have been almost certainly overwhelmed.

Again Pitt's plan of campaign meant an advance in three columns—one directed in the farthest west upon Niagara, the second with the main body under Amherst upon Ticonderoga, while the third, of which Wolfe now held the command, was to proceed up the St. Lawrence against Quebec supported by the squadron under Admiral Sanders. Quebec had received its last small reinforcement from France in May, before the blockade of the French coast was completed. It was intended that the two western forces should converge upon Quebec to join hands with Wolfe; but though they were able to capture Niagara and Ticonderoga, each found difficulties in the way which prevented its further advance.

At the end of June Wolfe, with the Admirals Sanders and Holmes, arrived before Quebec. Quebec stands on the St. Lawrence, on a height

which was accounted impregnable on the western side. On the east the river St. Charles, flowing into the St. Lawrence, was secured at its entrance by a boom; and the greater part of the French army, which outnumbered the British forces, lay entrenched between the St. Charles and the Montmorenci river to the east. Wolfe occupied the southern bank and the north bank east of the Montmorenci. Admiral Holmes, carrying twelve hundred British troops, moved up the river above Quebec, and so gave employment to a French corps of observation. Sanders made any relief of the French from the eastward impossible.

A complete investment of Quebec was out of the question until Amherst should arrive; but there was no sign of Amherst arriving, and if it held out till the winter the St. Lawrence would no longer be navigable, and the ships would have to retire. It was Montcalm's business to stand on the defensive; Wolfe could not force his lines, and the Frenchman was not to be tempted out of his entrenchments. An attack on the French camp failed, Wolfe



Plan of the Capture of Quebec, 1759.


himself became seriously ill, and at the beginning of September his despatches to England were full of the gloomiest forebodings. Two days after the arrival of the most depressing of these letters came an overwhelming revulsion. Quebec had fallen, and Wolfe too had fallen in the hour of victory. He had conceived the desperate design of scaling the Heights of Abraham on the western side of Quebec. Success was possible, if at all, only by effecting a complete surprise; defeat would mean disaster; but Wolfe resolved to take the risk. On December 12th Holmes moved up the river, threatening an attack from a higher point and drawing off the French detachment of Bougainville, whose task it was to prevent a landing on that side. A heavy bombardment of the French camp on the east was opened by Admiral Sanders as the prelude to a grand attack in that quarter. Both movements were feints, intended to withdraw the attention of the French from the real point of attack. Wolfe, in the night, with four thousand men in boats, dropped down the river to the point chosen; he had shifted camp to facilitate embarkation above Quebec. No sentries were on guard at the foot of the precipitous height which the force scaled undetected; the leaders surprised and caught the small guard at the top. By daybreak

something over three thousand men were beginning to be formed in order of battle. Montcalm's forces were rapidly brought up; how much they outnumbered the British is not known. At about nine o'clock the French swept forward to drive the English over the cliff; the British reserved their fire till the enemy were thirty yards off. At the first deadly volley the French checked and reeled; at the second they broke and fled, while the British charged with the bayonet, and were stopped only by the fire of the artillery from the town walls. Montcalm had received his death wound; but Wolfe himself "died happy" on the field. The victorious British entrenched themselves in the position they had won, and four days later Quebec capitulated.

During 1760 the main feature of the war was the completion of the conquest of Canada, together with the final blow dealt to the collapsing French power in India at the battle of Wandewash. Frederick throughout the year was in great straits. Prussia was almost drained of fighting material; all Prince Ferdinand's skill and all his men were required to hold back the still very much larger force which the French were able to put in the field. Already at the close of 1759 the coalition had made good their footing in Saxony, and were in possession of Dresden. But for the British subsidies it would have been impossible to maintain in the field armies which could now only be scraped together with the utmost difficulty. Frederick could indeed hardly have been saved but for the incomparable sluggishness of the Austrian Daun and the stolid immobility of the Russians. Thus aided he was enabled in the autumn to defeat Laudon at Liegnitz, and then Daun himself at Torgau, while the Russians did nothing. But Frederick's victories were no longer shattering blows; they were reverses for his enemies, not disasters; and before the year was over his prospects were seriously affected by the death of George II., and the accession to the British throne of a young king who was determined to rid himself of Pitt's ascendancy.

To Pitt's loyalty Frederick owed it that he was not left to his fate. For during the first month of the year Choiseul was doing his best to induce Pitt to enter on a separate negotiation. But in the first place nothing would induce Pitt to desert his ally; and in the second he was fully satisfied that in spite of his own enormous war expenditure, the strain on France was much more severe, that she was becoming thoroughly exhausted, and that the longer the war went on the more completely she would be prostrated. He was undeterred by the suspicion already awakening in his mind that Spain under a new king might join the coalition. For the pacific Ferdinand was dead and had been succeeded by his half-brother, Charles IV., who had resigned the throne of Naples to occupy that of Spain. Choiseul's negotiations with Britain were therefore fruitless.

Those negotiations, though they led to a temporary suspension of hostilities in the western theatre of the war in Europe, did not check the progress of events in Canada. The British now held Quebec, under



“ A VIEW OF THE TAKING OF QUEBEC, SEPTEMBER 13TH, 1759 ”

From a print published in the same year.

command of General Murray, as well as Louisbourg. Amherst was again setting forward his converging movement on the west. The French sought to strike the first blow by attacking Quebec, where the garrison could not obtain the support of a British squadron until the St. Lawrence became navigable again. For this purpose they were able to despatch a force which was double that under Murray's command; and at the end of April the British, after a sharp encounter at Sainte Foy, were driven within the walls of Quebec. But ten days later came the news that a British squadron was now making its way up the St. Lawrence, and the French retreated. All that was left for them was the attempt to maintain themselves at Montreal; but Murray was free to take his own share in the converging movement, advancing from Quebec. The three British columns united before Montreal on September 7th, and the next day the town capitulated. The whole Canadian dominion was surrendered to the British Crown under a guarantee that property was not to be disturbed and that religious liberty was to be secured, while the French troops with their officers laid down their arms and were sent back to France under promise of not again serving during the war.

The crisis of the struggle was over. In America and India the French had been beaten out of the field as rivals of the British, and the supremacy of the British race was assured. More than two years were to pass before peace was signed, a peace which in effect confirmed, as far as the British Empire was concerned, the position which had already been won when the old king died in October 1760. The reign of Pitt practically ended with the reign of George II. The control was taken from his hands, and the last phase of the war forms the first phase of new political and international conditions. It remains in this chapter to complete the story of the establishment of the British power in the East.

IV

BENGAL

In 1754 the two leading actors in the Anglo-French struggle in India were withdrawn from the scene—Dupleix to suffer from shameful ill-treatment at the hands of his countrymen, the victor of Arcot to seek parliamentary honours, which, happily, he failed to obtain. The strife had been restricted to the Carnatic; and the British and French governors in that province came to an amicable agreement that they would leave native politics alone and fight no more. Still it was anticipated that when France and Britain went to war again there would be some difficulty in preserving the peace in India. In 1756 Clive was returning to the East, and there was a small British squadron in Indian waters under the command of Admiral Watson. In conjunction with the admiral, Clive destroyed a pirate's

stronghold at Gheriah on the west coast and then proceeded to take up his command at Fort St. David. No active steps against the French were possible under the existing agreement, and it must be noted that the declaration of war between England and France was not known in India until early in 1757.

But in August there came to Madras the news of a ghastly tragedy at Calcutta.

The events in the Carnatic had attracted little attention in Hindustan. The Mogul reigned at Delhi, but in effect the whole north-west was dominated by Ahmed Shah, the master of Kabul. From Central India the Western Marathas had pushed their power up to the banks of the Jumna, the river on which stand the Mogul cities of Delhi and Agra. The whole Maratha confederacy recognised as its head the hereditary Peishwa, a sort of mayor of the palace, who was nominally the minister of the royal house of the Marathas. The peishwa's headquarters were at Puna. The chief of the Eastern Marathas was the Bhonsla, the Rajah of Berar or Nagpur, which is as nearly as possible the central point of the Peninsula; and the eastern Marathas raided the Ganges provinces as far down the river as Calcutta itself. Between Ahmed Shah on the north-west and the Marathas on the south the Mogul was practically without power at all, and the two nawabs of the great Ganges provinces, of which the upper was Oudh and the lower Bengal with Behar, had made themselves independent princes. The Nawab of Oudh, however, claimed the title of Wazir or Chief Minister of the Mogul.



Suraj ud-Daulah,
Nawab of Bengal.

[From a painting of the
Nawab and his sons,
by Kettle.]

Now at the beginning of 1756 Ali Vardi Khan, the old experienced Nawab of Bengal, died, and was succeeded by his grandson Suraj ud-Daulah, a half mad youth of nineteen, full of an inordinate vanity and a lust for blood, very much like the Roman Emperor Caligula. Suraj ud-Daulah, possibly at the instigation of the French, chose to take offence because the British at Fort William were strengthening their fortifications in case they should find themselves involved in hostilities with their French neighbours at Chandernagur. The nawab ordered them to demolish their fortifications, the governor replied with a remonstrance; and the nawab responded by despatching an army to Calcutta. The governor and some others fled on some British ships which were in the Hugli; those who remained behind had no choice but to surrender. The unhappy prisoners, one hundred and forty-six in number, were packed into a chamber twenty feet square, three human beings to the square yard, with one small grating to let in air, on a sultry July night in Calcutta. Then Suraj ud-Daulah forgot them till next morning, when twenty-three of the hundred and forty six were found to be still alive. Such was the tragedy of the Black Hole.

One course only was possible for the British in Madras. At whatever cost the perpetrator of so ghastly an outrage must be punished. Clive, with the company's forces and Watson's naval squadron of ten ships, were despatched to the Hugli. In the first week of January Clive had stormed and captured the forts of Baj-Baj and Hugli, and had driven the nawab's troops out of Calcutta. The nawab, who was beginning to discover that traders were more use to him alive than dead, was surprised to find that the British could fight as well as trade. He had collected an army to wipe them out, but that army in turn was scattered ; he began to treat.

But while he was making promises to Clive of restitution and compensation, he was secretly imploring the French at Chandernagur, and even Bussy at Haidarabad, to come to his aid. The way was cleared for Clive by news of the declaration of war between France and Great Britain. He gave no time for a combination to be formed against the British, but at once struck at Chandernagur, which fell on March 23rd. All the military stores and five hundred prisoners of war fell into his hands. That settled the question of French intervention in Bengal, and decided Bussy to confine his activities to the south. The question now was whether Clive had done enough for British honour and should return to the south, where the Carnatic was threatened with a French war. If he did so, Calcutta would be left defenceless, and there was every probability that Suraj ud-Daulah, free from the immediate terror inspired by the presence of the British forces, was sufficiently insane to seek revenge.

The call to remain in Bengal came from the natives themselves. The nawab's rule was a reign of terror ; his principal ministers resolved to get rid of him, and to set on the throne Mir Jafar, the commander-in-chief of his army. They applied to Clive to assist them. Mir Jafar as nawab of Bengal, established there by aid of the British, would be a puppet of the British as completely as the nawab of Arcot. Clive and the Calcutta Council entertained the proposal. While they amused Suraj ud-Daulah with empty negotiations, terms were arranged with the conspirators through their Hindu agent, Amin Chand. In the course of the negotiations with the conspirators Clive, with the support of the Council, committed the one act of his public career which is seriously open to censure. When all was ready except the formal completion of the agreements, Amin Chand (or Omichund, as Macaulay calls him) demanded the insertion in the treaty of a clause engaging to pay him £300,000. Every detail of the plot was known to him, and would be betrayed to Suraj ud-Daulah if his demand were refused. He was tricked by a fraud such as he might have invented himself. Two copies of the treaty were drawn up, one upon red paper, containing the required promise which was omitted from the other. He was satisfied when he was shown the red treaty with the British signatures attached to it. He did not know that one of the signatures was a forgery. Admiral Watson had refused to append his name, though, when the thing was done, he became a party to it. But it was the other treaty without


the blackmailing clause which was signed by the conspirators. Clive to the day of his death asserted that he was justified; but on no other occasion did he depart from the one sound rule for Europeans in dealing with Orientals, of holding fast not by the Eastern but by the Western standard of morals. For no Oriental would have been shocked by the deception practised upon Amin Chand.

When the treaty was signed, Clive no longer considered it necessary to play with Suraj ud-Daulah. He sent to the nawab a despatch, setting forth the whole of the British grievances, and announced that he was coming with his men to the nawab's capital of Murshidabad to receive his answer. He followed his letter at the head of his troops—something over three thousand men, of whom two thousand were sepoys, and ten guns. The letter was despatched and the advance began on 13th June. The nawab moved to meet him with sixty thousand men at his back. On the fifth day the British halted at Katwa. There was no sign of Mir Jafar carrying out his promises, and the march was checked by stormy weather. On the eighth day Clive, for the first and last time of his life, held a council of war. An advance must mean either a victory against unparalleled odds or annihilation. Would it be better to take the risk, or to entrench themselves where they were at Katwa and invite aid from the Marathas, which might involve indefinite delay, and the intervention of Bussy on the other side? Clive's own opinion was given in favour of the more cautious course; eleven of the council of war supported him, seven voted for the advance. The council was broken up and Clive withdrew by himself to meditate on the situation. The result was that he reversed the decision of the council, and the advance was renewed in the morning.

The next night the British force, wet and weary, bivouacked in the grove of Plassey; and with the dawn of June 23 they were drawn up face to face with twenty times their own number of the nawab's troops. The morning passed in cannonading; as the afternoon advanced a small body of fifty Frenchmen, who were with the nawab's army, were seen to move; one of the British officers at once without orders occupied the spot where they had been posted. The nawab's guns were put out of action, Clive's line advanced, and the whole vast army broke before it and fled. So slight was the resistance offered that the vanquished lost only a few hundred men, the victors only seventy. Suraj ud-Daulah, fleeing in disguise from Murshidabad, was caught and murdered by the son of Mir Jafar. Clive, according to promise, proclaimed Mir Jafar nawab, but would allow no bloodshed. To the natives Clive became at once a sort of demi-god; and he found himself not only effective master of Mir Jafar himself, but for all practical purposes responsible master of all Bengal; while the fame of his miraculous powers spread over half India. It never occurred to the new nawab to regard himself as independent of the power which had placed him on the throne, and which would in no wise permit him to play the despot. It was manifestly impossible to pretend that effective government could be assumed

by any one except Clive and the British, whose lightest word none durst disobey.

Above all, it was out of the question that Clive should leave the province until some system had been organised for preserving the British control. Without any such design on their part the East India Company had become at a stroke a territorial power, lords of the richest province in India. Instructions for the formation of a government were sent out by the directors from London, who understood so little of the situation that Clive himself was not included in the commission; perhaps it was assumed that his military services would be in requisition elsewhere. The British on the spot, however, had no doubts, and deliberately placed themselves at their



Clive's victory at Plassey

[From a plan published in 1760.]

great chief's orders. A little later the directors sent revised instructions, which made Clive officially what he already was in actual fact. It was not till the end of 1760 that he felt able to retire from the scene of his triumphs and returned to England.

During the two and a half years of Clive's personal rule in Bengal the struggle between French and British was fought to a finish in the south; when he left India the French were cooped up in Pondichery, and were on the point of surrendering their last stronghold. In the conflict with them Clive took no further personal part; Bengal gave him enough to do. Six months after Plassey the Oudh Wazir threatened an invasion, but his armies melted away at the mere threat of Clive's approach. In 1758 the enormous prestige he had won enabled him almost to denude Bengal of British troops in order to despatch an expedition to seize Masulipatam, a

city on the east coast situated in the district called the Sarkars, just south of the river Godavery, an episode which belongs to the last phase of the struggle with the French. The departure of the troops induced the Nawab of Oudh to contemplate another invasion, this time in conjunction with the "Shahzada," the heir to the throne of the Mogul. Clive could only collect some four hundred British and about six times as many sepoys. With this small force he covered in twenty-three days the four hundred miles which separate Calcutta from Patna, to which the Shahzada had laid siege. The siege was raised, and the hosts of the Shahzada and the Wazir scattered in hasty flight.

Yet once more Clive had to display his promptitude and energy in emergency. The Dutch had played no important part in India, but they too had a factory at Chinsura, on the Hugli. Towards the end of 1759 seven of the Dutch company's ships appeared in the river. There was no quarrel between Dutch and British, but in fact the Dutchmen were not profiting by the sudden development of the British ascendancy, and they had given ear to the appeal of Mir Jafar, who was growing secretly restive in his position of subordination. Clive's suspicions were aroused, and became certainty when the Dutch seized some English vessels. Forde, the trusted officer whom Clive had sent against Masulipatam, was now back at Calcutta, having achieved his task. He was at once despatched against Chinsura, while three English ships under the command of Captain Wilson attacked and captured the seven Dutchmen. Mir Jafar promptly turned against his intended allies, who had to appeal to Clive himself for the protection which he extended to them. And so collapsed the last extraneous attempts at intervention in Bengal.

Eighteen months earlier the French had revived the contest by sending to the Carnatic some troops under the command of Lally, the son of an Irish father who had been one of the gallant defenders of Limerick. A brave and efficient soldier himself, he was absolutely devoid of tact in dealing with his own officers, his own men, or with natives. Also he was under positive orders to have no dealings with the native courts, whereas such chance as the French had lay almost entirely in the influence which Bussy exercised at the court of the Nizam. Now the Nizam had bestowed upon the French the coast district known as the Northern Sarkars, from which supplies ought to have been procurable. But Lally proceeded to summon Bussy from Haidarabad, and the troops from the Sarkars, in order to besiege Madras. Madras held out under Stringer Lawrence, and the appearance of a British squadron sent the besiegers hurrying back to Pondichery, to the wrath of their commander. And, meanwhile, Forde's expedition from Calcutta was attacking Masulipatam, which fell in April (1759). The Nizam, no longer under Bussy's personal control, found the British victory convincing, and granted the Sarkars to the British instead of to the French. The British successes were crowned in the following January, when Lally was defeated at Wandewash by Eyre Coote, one of

the officers who had voted in the audacious minority in Clive's council of war before Plassey. By October the French were swept up into Pondichery, and Pondichery itself surrendered in January 1761. So ended the struggle between French and British in India with the complete loss of the French power, confirmed by the peace two years later ; and so was the British East India Company established as a territorial power in Bengal.

CHAPTER XXVI

THE THIRD GEORGE

I

THE NEW RING

GEORGE III. was twenty-two years of age when he succeeded his grandfather. The old king had always been on the worst of terms with Frederick Prince of Wales and his wife ; their residence, Leicester House, had habitually been the headquarters of

opposition to the king's government ; and young George was brought up to hold his grandfather in contempt, and to set before himself very different monarchical ideals from those which George II. had, though not without reluctance, learnt to accept. Young George's mind was full of ideas of the "patriot king" who ruled the destinies of his subjects with a beneficent hand. Every leading European government—every government except those of Poland, Holland, and Switzerland—was absolutist, with only very slight modifications ; in Great Britain alone the system



George III. in 1767.

[From the painting by Allan Ramsay in the National Portrait Gallery.]

of constitutionalism or limited monarchy had prevailed. Strafford and Charles I. had paid with their heads, and James II. had paid with his crown, for attempting to establish in England a monarchy on the lines which triumphed on the continent. There was no possibility of reviving the Stuart theory ; the Crown would never again be able to override parliament. But parliament itself was not the free expression of the popular will ; it was in the hands of managers, the group of great Whig families who, so long as they held together, could control majorities and dictate to the Crown. It was the young king's design to break up the Whig connection and to form a party of his own which should dominate

parliament. After a ten years' struggle his efforts were crowned with success. He formed a party which commanded a safe parliamentary majority and took its orders from the king.

There was another enemy to the existing government by the Whig connection. Pitt, who refused to be bound by party shackles, hated the system as heartily as George. But merely to substitute the ascendancy in parliament of a court party for the ascendancy of the Whig families, which was practically the aim of George III., would have been no improvement in the eyes of the great minister. The ultimate solution was to be found in a reform of the representation which should make parliament responsible neither to an oligarchy nor to the Crown, but to a free electorate; but this solution still lay in the remote future. In the meantime the king was no more disposed to submit to Pitt's ascendancy, won by the sheer force of his personality, than to the ascendancy of the Whig connection. The success of the Crown was to be achieved by setting the Whigs at odds with each other and with Pitt, and by rallying to the support of the Crown the forces which had been kept in abeyance by the fear of Jacobitism, and the sentiment of loyalty to the king's person which had been concentrated upon the "king over the water" during the last two reigns. That sentiment could be attracted to the new king, who was born and bred in England under the influence of English and Scottish preceptors, and could declare that he "gloried in the name of Britain" (not "Briton," as is commonly stated). George I. had been an uncompromising German who could not even converse in English; George II. was thirty before he had set foot in England; George III. was the fellow-countryman of his subjects. Moreover, now there was scarcely a flicker of Jacobitism to divert the sentiment of loyalty from a British king. James, now past seventy, had alienated the once ready devotion of his followers, and the promise of the youth of Charles Edward Stuart had already been drowned in debauchery and despair.

II

BUTE

After George's mother the most intimate personal influence over the young king was exercised by the Earl of Bute, a gentleman of some accomplishments, eminently respectable, and without any qualifications for statesmanship. George intended to get rid of Newcastle, the manipulator of offices; and of Pitt, who could command but would not serve. Bute was to be the minister who would carry out his policy; but nothing could be done while the ministry was united. There were openings for dissension, because Pitt despised Newcastle, and Newcastle was both afraid and jealous of Pitt. The "Great Commoner" had carried the nation through a crisis to

triumph ; British victories had become a matter of course ; but the war expenditure had been enormous, and the rewards of the struggle already secured appeared to be sufficient. A peace party was growing up among the ministers.

At the first, however, the new influences were brought to bear not for the displacement of Pitt, but to encourage and develop his antagonism to the Whig control. Although the king expressed himself strongly as to the war and his desire for peace, no attempt was made to check the vigour of the operations. In the early summer a British expedition captured and occupied Belle Ile, an island off the French coast which was of no particular importance in itself, but an extremely useful asset for purposes of negotiation, being actually French soil. British troops, led by Granby, again achieved brilliant distinction under Prince Ferdinand at the battle of Wellinghausen. In the West Indies the island of Dominica was taken from the French, and from India came the news of the fall of Pondichery.

Meanwhile, however, negotiations were passing with France, though with very definite assertions from Pitt that Great Britain would not desert the king of Prussia. Moreover, he was extremely suspicious of the sincerity of the French proposals, believing with justice that France was in fact working not for immediate peace but to bring Spain into the field. On the one side Pitt's demands stiffened, while on the other France began to make demands on behalf of Spain, and Spain on behalf of France; and before the end of the summer Pitt had information of the existence of a new Family Compact, though the details were as yet unknown. Newcastle, however, had already brought Bute into office as a Secretary of State. Pitt came to the conclusion that although there was no real *casus belli*, war must be declared at once against Spain. He failed to carry the rest of the ministers with him in that view, whereupon in October he and his brother-in-law, Lord Temple, resigned, since he declined to retain office if the direction of affairs were taken out of his hands.

Spain had denied the imputation that she was acting in concert with France; she had in fact been anxious to avoid a breach before the arrival of the annual Plate Fleet. When the fleet came in the mask was dropped and the new Family Compact was published; Pitt's attitude was justified, but he was already out of office. At the beginning of 1762 Bute, as the king's representative, dominated the ministry, and a few months later was able to force the resignation of Newcastle, who found his favourite business of exercising patronage entirely taken out of his hands.

During the past year it had seemed that Frederick's stubborn resistance must be gradually worn down. The Russians were in Pomerania, and the Austrians were slowly gaining ground in Silesia. It was fortunate for him that three months after his best supporter, Pitt, had lost the direction of affairs in England, the pressure from Russia was suddenly withdrawn by the death of Elizabeth and the accession to the Russian throne of a Tsar

who idealised him as much as the Tsarina had hated him. For Bute had no perception of the national obligations of honour to the indomitable ally who had held Europe at bay while Britain destroyed her rival's power in America and in India.

But when the Family Compact was published, even Bute could not

evade war with Spain, and even Pitt's retirement could not check the tide of British victories. In fact Spain had merely delivered herself as a prey to the power whom the Bourbons called the Tyrant of the Seas. Britain could strike where she would and when she would. The Bourbons tried to compel Portugal to join them; Portugal refused, and British troops were despatched to aid her in successfully defying Spanish coercion. A British fleet was engaged in appropriating one after another the French islands in the West Indies; one expedition deprived Spain of Havanna, and another in the East Indies, directed against the Philippine Islands, captured Manilla. Bute refused to renew the subsidies to Prussia, but Frederick was more than compensated by the change in the attitude of Russia.

If Pitt had been in power he would have dictated what terms he chose to France and Spain, and Austria would have been placed on the defensive. But Bute was too zealous for peace to dictate terms, and the Bourbons got from him a bargain very much better than was at all pleasing to the British nation. Preliminaries of peace, signed in November, were ratified by the Peace of Paris in February 1763. Frederick, deserted by his ally, was still enabled by the recent progress of his arms to make for himself a satisfactory treaty at Hubertsburg, though he never forgave what he and others regarded as the treachery of the British Government. Bute had achieved the isolation of Great Britain by deliberately throwing away

THE BOOT & THE BLOCK-HEAD.



A satire of 1762 on Bute and his Administration.

[From an etching by the Marquis Townshend, who, in 1767, became Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.]

Prussia's goodwill. And for Great Britain herself, he threw away practically the whole of the fruits of the last twelve months of the war. Had his course been dictated by magnanimity, by a belief that policy and chivalry combined to forbid the victor making too merciless a use of his triumph, he would have been justified; but the attempts of the Government to portray the Treaty of Paris as a diplomatic triumph merely stamped it as a diplomatic defeat. Great Britain could have well afforded to be magnanimous, but magnanimity played no part in the concessions made by Bute's Government.

The general principle of the treaty was the retention or exchange of conquests made during the war; but by a somewhat remarkable concession conquests which had been made, but of which no official information had arrived at the moment when the treaty was signed, were surrendered. Consequently the capture of Manilla went for nothing. France had made a single conquest, that of Minorca at the opening of the war; this was exchanged for Belle Ile. Minorca was extremely useful, while Belle Ile was very little use to Great Britain; but French *amour propre* was so deeply concerned in its recovery that the exchange could not be regarded as unequal. Spain, which had intervened without provocation in the last stage of the quarrel, escaped almost scot-free; since Britain accepted Florida in place of the infinitely more valuable Havanna, and France compensated Spain for this minor loss by ceding to her Louisiana, which remained in her hands till the end of the century, when it was retroceded to France, and was sold three years afterwards to the United States by Napoleon. For no very sufficient reason, Guadeloupe and Martinique in the West Indies and Goree on the African coast were given back to France. This completes the tale of the mere surrenders, for Bute himself could hardly give back what had actually been won before Pitt's retirement, though he gave way on points of detail where Pitt would undoubtedly have held firm, such as leaving to the French the fishing rights off Newfoundland which they had retained under the Treaty of Utrecht—ill-defined rights which were to be a source of complications down to the close of the nineteenth century.

But the acquisitions confirmed by the treaty were sufficient. All the French claims on the American continent were withdrawn; there was no check on the British expansion westward to the Pacific. The whole of Canada was ceded, and the French population, otherwise practically undisturbed, passed under the sovereignty of Great Britain instead of the sovereignty of France. In India the French factories were restored, but as factories and nothing more. No French troops were to be admitted beyond the very small number required for what were in effect police purposes, nor were the French to be permitted to enter into relations with the native courts. Political power in the peninsula, so far as the European states were concerned, was entirely restricted to the British. In the East and in the West a British Empire was established at the Peace of Paris,

not side by side with a French Empire, but to the total exclusion of all European rivals.

By the simultaneous Peace of Hubertsburg, Britain's deserted ally, Frederick, secured to Prussia all that she had held before his invasion of Saxony in 1756.

III

GEORGE GRENVILLE

The Peace of Paris was very unpopular, and Bute's personal unpopularity was still greater, partly because he was a Scot, partly because he was looked upon as a "favourite," partly because he had ousted Pitt, and partly because his statesmanship was regarded as pusillanimous. A couple of months after the Peace of Paris he resigned, although for some time to come the public at large continued to believe that he was the real director of the government. The king had got rid of Pitt and of Newcastle, but he had not got rid of the domination of that strong section of the Whigs, which disliked equally the personal ascendancy of Pitt and Newcastle's monopoly of patronage. George found himself compelled to submit to the tyranny of this group, headed by George Grenville and the Duke of Bedford, because the only alternative was to recall Pitt himself, and Pitt would only return upon impossible terms. Moreover, except in the desire to break up the Whig connection, the king's political views were diametrically opposed to those of the fallen minister, and were in agreement with those of the Bedford group; the trouble lay in the fact that the chiefs of the Whig group made themselves personally intensely obnoxious to the king. For two years he had to bear the yoke, though he was restive enough under it; and at the end of two years he could only free himself by calling to office, without Pitt himself, a group of Whigs whose most earnest wish was to serve under Pitt, and who sought to carry out a policy to which the king himself was intensely antagonistic.

George Grenville, who became the real head of the administration on Bute's retirement, was a capable official, but at the same time an incarnation of official pedantry, to whom the letter was everything and the spirit nothing. His absorption in details entirely prevented him from taking comprehensive views, or from realising the existence of forces which could not be tabulated in Blue Books. He was wholly devoid of that tact which is born of a sympathetic understanding of divergent points of view, and he lacked also that sense of perspective which distinguishes between the importance of what is trivial and the importance of what is fundamental. Consequently during his administration the trivial blazed into prominence, and the fundamental was overlooked, with disastrous results. An unscrupulous adventurer was enabled to pose as the martyr of Liberty in

order to salve the susceptibilities of the Government and the House of Commons, while the vital question of the relations between the mother country and the colonies was dealt with offhand as a mere byway of official routine.

John Wilkes was a clever scamp, with the loosest of morals and a passion for notoriety, which was not satisfied by a wide reputation for reckless and indecent dissipation. Wilkes had started a paper called the *North Briton*, chiefly devoted to abuse of Bute, the Scots, and the Government. The king's speech at the opening of parliament claimed applause for the Peace of Paris, and, with a singular audacity, for the satisfactory terms obtained by Frederick. Wilkes in "Number 45" of his paper very justly stigmatised this profession as a lie put into the mouth of the king by his ministers. George and the ministers were alike furious. A general warrant was issued for the arrest of the author printers and publishers of the paper, without mentioning the names of the parties. Wilkes was arrested, and his papers were searched without the formality of obtaining formal proof of the authorship, and he himself was rigorously confined and forbidden the use of pen and ink.

But when the matter came before Chief Justice Pratt, he ordered the release of Wilkes on the ground that members of parliament were immune from arrest, except for treason, felony, or breach of the peace, categories under which Wilkes's offence could by no means be brought. Moreover, the Chief Justice pronounced that general warrants were illegal. The ministers, not content to let ill alone, went on to demand in the House of Commons that Number 45 should be burnt by the public hangman as a "false scurrilous and seditious libel"; and the House of Lords carried an address praying that Wilkes should be prosecuted as the author of a certain obscene work entitled an *Essay on Woman*, which was produced by one of his old partners in debauchery and iniquity, Lord Sandwich, although the thing had never been published at all. Meanwhile Wilkes had betaken himself to France to escape the consequences of a duel; in his absence he was outlawed and the House of Commons expelled him. At the same time the courts awarded him heavy damages for false imprisonment, and riots attested his popularity with the mob. The whole of the proceedings gave Wilkes an entirely fictitious importance, and at the same time brought into prominence the arrogant claims of the House of Commons, or of a temporary majority in the House of Commons, to assert its own authority as overriding that of the common law. The privileges of the Commons, the rights of the electorate, and the right of free criticism outside the House of Commons, were again a few years later to provide a battlefield between the champion of liberty and the champions of privilege. For the moment the victory rested with the Commons, because it was not safe for the outlaw to reappear in England; but it was at the cost of their dignity and credit, and at the second encounter five years later they were very thoroughly worsted.

But even from a ministerial point of view the Wilkes affair was no more than an accident, though it was one to which their own conduct had given a preposterous importance in the eyes of the public. George Grenville's real business was retrenchment after the portentous expenditure on the war. The National Debt had swelled to alarming proportions, and it appeared to Grenville first that there must be an end of the long prevalent laxity in applying the revenue laws, and, secondly, that the American colonies in whose interests primarily Great Britain had entered upon the war, ought to make a substantial contribution to the expenses; propositions which were in themselves manifestly just. Therefore he proceeded to assert the technical rights of the mother country. Past governments had deliberately shut their eyes to the immense illicit traffic carried on by the Americans, their persistent disregard of the navigation laws, and their evasion of the customs duties. Instructions were issued that the smuggling was to be stopped, and ships of the Royal Navy were employed in the preventive service. The colonies were invited to consider and suggest proposals for laying them under contribution, but unfortunately Grenville had already made up his own mind that the contributions were to be obtained through the imposition of taxes by the British parliament—a scheme which took definite shape in the famous Stamp Act of 1765.

Now the colonists occupied the colonies under specific charters which reserved controlling powers to the Crown. The reservation of powers was admittedly a technical necessity; emergencies might arise when their exercise would be imperative. On the other hand, it could plausibly be maintained that they were intended to be used only on emergency; that apart from emergencies the colonies were entitled to regard themselves and to be regarded as autonomous states. In one respect at least that claim had never been admitted in England; it had at all times been assumed that the mother country was entitled to impose trade regulations on the colonists for her own protection, though the colonists might suffer. Also from time to time the Crown had interfered with the governments of particular colonies; but its doing so had always been resented, though the colonists had found themselves obliged to submit.

In fact the consciousness had hitherto been ever present with them, that they depended on the mother country for security against their French rivals. Detached from each other and without any central government, they might still have held their own against the French colonists in actual occupation of Canada and Louisiana; but if France herself took up the cause, they would be overwhelmed unless they could rely on British fleets and British regiments to support them. Therefore although they had grumbled, and on occasion had gone beyond grumbling, they had still on the whole accepted the control exercised from the old country as something which must be endured.

But the situation had been fundamentally changed by the war. The militia of the several colonies felt themselves able to cope with the Red

Indians, and now they had nothing to fear from France. It ceased to be tacitly assumed that the protection of the mother country was a necessity which was worth purchasing at the price of a subjection which only made itself felt intermittently. It was, in fact, certain that the colonists would



very soon demand a relaxation even of the technical authority asserted by the home government, laid down by the charters, and confirmed by practice throughout the century and a half which covered the lifetime of every colony except Virginia.

Now although there were already revolutionary spirits who would have

been by no means reluctant to demand complete independence, the great bulk of the Americans would have indignantly repudiated the idea of separation. They were in fact aware that they were very much indebted to the mother country for deliverance from the French menace, and in the abstract they were even quite willing to admit a moral obligation to repay a little of what Great Britain had spent primarily on their behalf. But there was no technical obligation to do so, and it was not difficult to maintain that the mother country was after all fairly compensated by the benefits that would accrue to it from the acquisition of Canada. A minister at Westminster with any real grasp of the situation would have used the occasion to encourage the sentiment of loyalty to the Empire by every means in his power, while appealing to colonial patriotism and gratitude to lighten the financial burden which the recent war had entailed upon Great Britain. Unhappily, Grenville could think of nothing but the relief of that burden. He did not believe that appeals to patriotism and loyalty would meet with an adequate response in hard cash. The states might feel conscious of their obligations as a body, but individually each would discover very good reasons why its neighbours were in duty bound to pay a much larger proportion than itself; and there was no common authority to lay down a general principle of contribution or to assess the respective shares of the different states. Grenville then having rejected the idea of a voluntary thank-offering, and having no idea of conciliating popular feeling, there remained to him the technical power of imposing and enforcing taxation for the purposes of revenue. In order to provide revenue the existing customs were enforced, and the new Stamp Act was passed, almost unnoticed in England.

In effect the minister at one breath informed the colonists that he had no confidence in their loyalty or gratitude, laid on them a new burden, which, while trifling in itself, was galling in the method of its application, and emphasised precisely what was most irritating to the colonists in the relations between them and the mother country. In dealing with the colonies the British parliament claimed to override what for England the English parliament had asserted to be the elementary right of English citizenship in that last palladium of English liberties, the Bill of Rights. No one should be taxed save by consent of a representative parliament, and the parliament at Westminster was in no conceivable sense representative of the colonies. There was an immediate outcry that such taxation was a monstrous and unprecedented innovation, in defiance of the base principles of English citizenship.

Perhaps we are apt at first sight to wonder why the new tax was treated as a monstrous innovation. The colonies were accustomed to duties paid at the ports imposed by the home government; why should they have resented the imposition of the Stamp Tax, which required a stamp to be purchased and affixed to give validity to legal documents? The explanation is that a "tax" in the technical sense was taken to mean an impost levied

for the purpose of raising revenue. The customs at the ports were, theoretically at least, levied not with the intention of raising a revenue, but in order to control trade and develop trade in the national interest. Thus, for instance, French wines were heavily taxed in British ports not because the toll upon them brought money into the treasury, but in order to check the purchase of French wines. Portuguese wines were lightly taxed, not because a larger revenue came in from lightly taxed goods than from heavily taxed goods, but in order to encourage the Portuguese trade. The Americans had been subjected to the payment of customs duties on the same principles. In the same way in the Plantagenet times the "ancient customs" for the regulation of trade were levied by the king by royal prerogative; parliament resisted any extension of the tolls by royal prerogative precisely because extension was attempted in order to provide revenue. The continued regulation of colonial trade by the king in parliament at Westminster was no breach of the established principles, for the king had merely handed over to parliament certain particular functions, theoretically as a matter of administrative convenience. Trade regulation was a burden which the colonies would not have borne much longer in any case; but a new and suspicious aspect was given to the existing system when the revenue laws began to be rigorously enforced avowedly for the purpose of increasing the revenue; and a definite innovation declared itself when an unmistakable tax was imposed, an internal tax for which there was no precedent, a tax which had nothing whatever to do with the regulation of trade, for the sole purpose of raising revenue. Here at last was actual taxation without representation. Even if the right did legally exist, even if it was a right of which the home government could not with safety technically deprive itself, its actual exercise was without precedent, and provided the colonists with precisely that technical ground of complaint which had before been lacking. The colonists were presented with a constitutional formula, "No taxation without representation," a formula to which it was difficult for Whigs, who professed to be the guardians of the principles of the Revolution of 1688, to close their ears.

Ministers were wholly unconscious of the importance of the issue which they had raised. The amount of the tax was not great, and it was taken for granted that opposition would be merely superficial. There was no practical possibility of giving colonists direct representation in the parliament at Westminster; no adequate response could be anticipated to an appeal for a voluntary contribution; and they had followed the merely obvious course in exercising a right which, as an actual matter of law, they did possess. The colonists would soon find that the burden imposed was too slight to be a real grievance. The colonists took a different view. One after another their assemblies passed resolutions denying the power of taxation. At the instance of Massachusetts the various assemblies sent delegates to a general congress at New York, where the unanimity of colonial feeling found expression. Associations were formed for the boy-

cotting of imported goods until the Stamp Act should be repealed. Riots took place in Boston and elsewhere; the officials nominated for the administration of the Stamp Act refused the appointments or were threatened into resigning; when the stamps themselves arrived it was obvious that they would never be distributed; for the most part they were seized and destroyed. In England the mercantile community at once suffered from the pressure of the boycott, and was strongly in favour of the repeal of the Act.

Meanwhile, other events brought the antagonism of the king and the ministry to a head, for on the colonial question itself King George was practically at one with Grenville. George developed symptoms of the brain trouble which so completely darkened the last years of his life. It became necessary to provide for a regency in case the king should be incapacitated. Ministers were bent on excluding George's mother, the Dowager Princess of Wales, believing that if she became regent Bute would recover his ascendancy. They persuaded the king to approve the omission of her name from the list of eligible persons by declaring that the House of Commons would certainly demand it, and a very awkward situation would be created. The king assented with reluctance; the Regency Bill was brought in—and the House of Commons proceeded to add the Princess of Wales to the list of possible regents. The king, who recovered his health for a time, was furious with the ministers, and determined to dispense with their services at any price. Twice he sent for Pitt and entreated him to form a government; twice Pitt refused, because his brother-in-law, Lord Temple, insisted upon impossible terms, and he would not separate himself from Temple. George had no alternative but an appeal to the Whigs who associated themselves with Pitt's principles, and a ministry was constructed in July (1765) by the Marquis of Rockingham.

IV

THE ROCKINGHAMS AND THE EARL OF CHATHAM

The old Whig connection which for a time had worked successfully in the days of the coalition between Pitt and Newcastle had been broken up. Even in those days, when its ranks included several men of marked ability and experience in affairs, it had not been productive of leaders. The Rockingham group represented the survival of that Whig tradition, but the individuals who formed it were for the most part comparatively young men of talent which could at the best be called respectable, and they were wanting in experience. More conspicuously than ever the Government rested upon family connection; it carried little weight, and was regarded with little confidence. It was a makeshift Government, brought

into being and preserved by the reluctant support of the king and the court party which the king had created, a support which was certain to be withdrawn as soon as the downfall of the ministry should be compatible with some alternative to the return of Grenville and Bedford. Pitt, although it was his own fault that he was not at the head of the government, chose somewhat ostentatiously to express mistrust of the men who for the most part would have been only too willing to submit themselves to his direct guidance.



William Pitt, Earl of Chatham.
[From the painting by R. Brompton.]

The ministers did not formulate a definite programme; it was not till the end of the year that they decided to reverse Grenville's American policy. In this decision they were guided mainly by the opinions of Pitt himself, who laid it down that the British parliament had no right to impose taxes, though it had the power of legislation for the colonies. Parliament did not meet till January 1766, when for the first time a new and notable figure appeared among its members — Rockingham's secretary, Edmund Burke. With the support of Pitt, the Government brought

in and carried by substantial majorities a bill for the repeal of the Stamp Act; and, in spite, of his opposition, an accompanying Declaratory Act affirming the legal authority of parliament to impose taxation. The latter, in fact, was passed merely in order to save the self-respect of parliament; it was a purely formal declaration, intended to be in practice a dead letter. During their brief tenure of power the ministry applied to America Walpole's principle of reducing tariffs, of which the Americans certainly could not complain, while its wisdom was demonstrated by the increased revenue which accrued. Smuggling in order to evade the reduced duties was not worth while; the lowered price following the lower duties extended the demand, and there was a very substantial increase in the quantity of goods on which duty was paid.

But there was no confidence between the Crown and the ministers.

King George in the course of a single week had authorised first Rockingham to say that he was in favour of the repeal of the Stamp Act, and then a member of the court party, now known as the "king's friends," to say that he was opposed to it. He explained the matter to Rockingham by saying that while he was in favour of repeal as opposed to the simple retention of the Act, what he desired was not its repeal but its modification. But the incident was a most unmistakable sign that he had no intention of giving the ministry his countenance longer than he could help.

It became known that Pitt was ready to resume office on his own terms, and no longer on terms dictated by Temple. But Rockingham, on approaching him, found that his terms meant a dictatorship, and a reconstruction of the ministry to which Rockingham could not with honour make himself a party. Pitt would not recognise the Whig connection; he would not work in conjunction with Newcastle, who was no longer a power, or with some other members of the ministry, and he would bring in other men who could not assimilate with the Rockingham group. Some of the warmer personal adherents of Pitt resigned, the administration came to an end, and once more Pitt returned to the helm.

Pitt's desire was to rule without party, to ignore party ties altogether; and he collected round him a singularly heterogeneous group of ministers gathered from every quarter—members of Rockingham's ministry, personal adherents of his own, king's friends, and others. What he might have done with such a body in the plenitude of his powers we cannot say. Assuredly he had large designs. The American question appeared to have been cleared out of the way. He would certainly have sought to reinvigorate the public services, which had achieved such a splendid efficiency under his previous régime, but had drifted rapidly towards decay under the Grenville policy of extreme retrenchment. He was certainly meditating the transfer to the Crown of the territorial sovereignty which the East India Company had acquired in India. But within a few months of his assumption of office the direction passed out of his hands. His popularity in the country and his personal effectiveness in parliament suffered grievously when the "Great Commoner," as he had hitherto been called, accepted a peerage, and was transferred from the representative chamber to the House of Lords with the title of Earl of Chatham. But more serious still was the breakdown of his physical and intellectual powers, brought on by the gout of which he was an unhappy victim. His sufferings exaggerated his natural arrogance and irritability until he became almost intolerable as a colleague, and then incapacitated him altogether for taking any part in public business. After the first month of 1767 the ministry, of which Lord Grafton was the figurehead, ceased to be in any sense Chatham's ministry. The things that Chatham would have done were left undone; the things that were done were precisely the things that Chatham would have condemned.

V

TOWNSHEND'S TAXES AND JOHN WILKES

Chatham in 1766 had no time to do more than take the first steps towards carrying out the foreign policy which he desired. The Family Compact had been a warning that neither France nor the new government in Spain had forgotten the old scheme for advancing the Bourbons, and the Peace of Paris had dealt with these powers tenderly enough to make the revival of those schemes a possibility. Chatham designed a general alliance of the Northern Powers, which would have very thoroughly bridled Bourbon ambitions. Frederick, however, was not greatly troubled by Bourbon ambitions; he was now intent rather upon the dismemberment for his own advantage of the kingdom of Poland. Also, while he had the highest admiration for Chatham, he had no sort of security that that statesman would remain in power in England, and he was not at all disposed to risk a repetition of the treatment he had experienced in 1762. It is likely therefore that Chatham would in any case have failed in achieving his Northern Alliance.

But failure in this direction would not have induced him, as it induced the Grafton ministry, to forget that British interests might be affected by affairs in Europe. British interests perhaps did not suffer in consequence, at least directly. But the isolation of Great Britain, for which Bute had been primarily responsible, was intensified, and one curious result of her indifference to European affairs is to be noted. The island of Corsica was subject to the republic of Genoa; but the subjection was very much against the will of the Corsicans. Corsican patriots, led by Paoli, resisted the Genoese government and defied all efforts to suppress them. The insurgents offered the sovereignty to Great Britain. Great Britain declined it; Genoa ceded the sovereignty to France, and Napoleon Buonaparte was born a few months afterwards a French instead of a British subject.

Chatham was no sooner incapacitated than his Chancellor of the Exchequer, Charles Townshend, took the leading place in the House of Commons, and, with a light heart, conducted it along a path which it was quite willing to tread, but upon which Chatham would never have allowed it to set foot. In America the repeal of the Stamp Act had allayed the public excitement, but had scarcely produced the effect hoped for. The colonials in fact conceived not that the British Government had made a magnanimous concession for which they ought to be grateful, but that it had been forced to give way. Their tone irritated English sentiment, which before had been rather favourably disposed towards them. Townshend at once proposed, as a practical corollary to the Declaratory Act of the Rockingham ministry, to impose new taxes—taxes upon imports, and therefore

not without ample precedent, but taxes for revenue, and therefore entirely obnoxious.

The taxes themselves were trivial; the revenue expected to be derived from them was only some forty thousand pounds. Glass, red and white lead, painters' colours, paper and tea were the imports upon which the new duties were laid. Of the whole group none was of the slightest importance except the last, and the tea tax was actually so arranged as to reduce the cost of the tea to the American consumers. In the ordinary course tea could only be carried to America after paying duty at a port in Great Britain. The duty now imposed at the American ports was not added to the duty at the British ports, but was a lower duty substituted for the latter. Financially



“A View of the Town of Boston in New England, and British Ships of War landing their troops.”

[From a print engraved and published by Paul Revere at Boston in 1768.]

the thing was a boon rather than a grievance. But a principle was at stake, not pounds shillings and pence. All the mollifying effects of the repeal of the Stamp Act were swept away, all the latent irritation broke out with renewed vehemence. In plain terms, the public at large and nearly all the leaders both in Great Britain and in America lost their tempers, and therewith the capacity for appreciating what was reasonable in the attitude of the other side.

When once mutual distrust has been generated the smallest points of friction become exaggerated, and the utmost tact and skill are always needed to bring about a satisfactory adjustment. But the difficulties are indefinitely increased when the parties are remote from each other and communication is slow. Knowledge of the mother country in the colonies was limited; knowledge of the colonies in the mother country was infini-

tesimal. Despatches from colonial agents in London and from government officials in the colonies took a very long time in passing; between the forwarding of a document and the receipt of a reply there was time for the whole situation to become completely changed. It is difficult enough even at the present day, when a trip to the remotest parts of the Empire provides a holiday amusement for persons of leisure, when the speech of a statesman in London may be printed and discussed in Melbourne and Montreal twenty-four hours after its delivery, for the British public to gauge accurately the views of Canadians and Australians, and *vice versa*. A hundred and fifty years ago it was infinitely more difficult for Westminster to be really in touch with Massachusetts and Virginia. The quarrel between Great Britain and the colonies may have been actually incapable of adjustment; but conditions of the time, which we of necessity have the utmost difficulty in realising, made the chances of adjustment infinitely less.

In America, then, the associations for exclusive dealing at once revived the activities which they had suspended when the Stamp Act was repealed. Illicit traffic and the evasion of customs became laudable aims for respectable, law-abiding citizens, while the officers of the law became the minions of tyranny. And at the same time in the eyes of the British public in general the Americans appeared to be revolutionary anarchists, with whom it was hardly possible for the law-loving Briton to sympathise, and for whom it was not easy even to make allowances. There was, indeed, a strong body of enlightened opinion which appreciated the reality of the American grievance, and perhaps weakened its own case with the public by the vigour of its expressions of sympathy; but there can be no doubt that the great mass of public opinion in Great Britain was entirely on the side of ministers.

The arch mischief-maker, Charles Townshend, died three months after he had fired the train. His place as Chancellor of the Exchequer was taken by the Tory Lord North, with whom allegiance to the king was a first principle. The ministers who were most inclined to maintain Chatham's views carried the least weight in a ministry to which were now admitted some members of the old Bedford connection, who showed themselves entirely ready to bow to the king's direction, while in the nature of things they were at one with the Crown on the real question of the hour. In 1768 parliament was dissolved and ministers returned with renewed strength, while there was still no sign of a recovery of health on Chatham's part which would enable him to emerge from his retirement.

The general election provided a fresh excitement which absorbed much popular attention. John Wilkes, though still under sentence of outlawry, reappeared and stood for the City of London; being there rejected, he came forward as a candidate for the county of Middlesex, and was returned by a large majority. Unfortunately King George was vindictive, and he was irritated by Wilkes's popularity with the mob. Wilkes was arrested upon the sentence of outlawry; there were riots, collisions between the

mob and the soldiery, who fired upon the rioters and killed or wounded a few. Wilkes, in prison, procured a copy of the order from the Secretary of State, Lord Weymouth, under which the soldiery had acted. He published it with comments, accusing Weymouth of having planned the "massacre." The publication was followed by a motion for the expulsion of Wilkes from the House, based on the old charges. In spite of the remonstrances of Grenville as well as of Burke the expulsion was carried by a large majority. A fortnight later Wilkes was re-elected. The House annulled the election, and declared him incapable of sitting in the present parliament; nevertheless he was again elected for the third time, for it was an entirely novel claim that the House should by its own authority, without colour of any law, declare any one incapable of election. The House again annulled the election. A certain Colonel Luttrell was procured to stand for Middlesex against Wilkes, and when Wilkes was again returned with a big majority over Luttrell, the House nevertheless pronounced that Luttrell was the duly elected member. The House of Commons had asserted the right of overriding the will of the electorate by the mere resolution of a party majority.

Wilkes was erected into the position of the champion of popular liberties against the arbitrary privileges of the House of Commons, far more decisively than in the earlier encounter.

The Crown of old, by straining prerogative beyond limits for which there was clear precedent, had brought upon itself the curtailment of prerogative. The Commons now by an extravagant insistence on their own privileges, not as against the Crown but as against the general public, brought upon themselves a curtailment of privileges. Wilkes, the rejected of the House, was made an alderman of the City of London, which gave expression to the popular antagonism. A conflict on a question of jurisdiction between the House and the City was mixed up with the general question of the liberty of the press, and the result of the conflict was the victory of the press.



Wilkes assuring George III. that he had never been a Wilkite.
[From the caricature by Gillray.]

There were two questions involved; one concerned parliamentary privilege, the other the law of libel. Technically, until this time parliamentary debates had been private; their publication was forbidden as a breach of the privileges of the Houses, while anything in the nature of comment was liable to be construed as libel. Nevertheless reports under very flimsy disguises found their way into print, and the press of the day was frequently both caustic and scurrilous. The House of Commons sought to protect itself by a rigorous application of the law of libel, and it was laid down by Lord Mansfield that juries were concerned only with the fact of publication, while everything else lay in the province of the judge. The general result was that juries refused to convict even in the face of unmistakable evidence; it became obvious that the publication of distorted reports and of comment thereon could not be prevented; and not less obvious that in the circumstances it would be very much safer to permit the open and avowed publication of reports, which would at least ensure approximate accuracy instead of deliberate distortion. A later result was the definite transfer of the decision as to the character of publications from the judge to the jury; and thus in effect the quarrel between Wilkes and the Commons secured the liberty of the press at least within the limits approved by public opinion. And at the same time the exercise of the undisputed right of the House of Commons to decide questions concerning elections was first delegated to a non-partisan committee instead of to the decision of a party vote, and was ultimately transferred to the judges.

At the end of 1768 Shelburne, the minister most favourable to the colonists, was driven from office, and this was shortly followed by the formal resignation of Chatham, who was recovering from his illness only to find that he was completely opposed to his nominal colleagues in their policy with regard both to Wilkes and to the colonies. Grafton, the nominal head of the government, sought again to conciliate American opinion by repealing Townshend's duties; but matters were only made worse when his colleagues insisted on retaining that upon tea. The Americans did not in the least care about the specific articles which Townshend had taxed; from their point of view there was just as much reason for resisting the tax on one article as on half-a-dozen. On the top of this the Bedford group proposed to act upon a statute of Henry VIII. which had not been applied for a couple of centuries, and to transfer the trials of rioters in America to a part of the country where there was no disaffection—in other words, to England. Chatham, now back in the House of Lords, flung his thunderbolts at the government; Campden, followed by Grafton, resigned; and so in 1770 the king was able to form an administration entirely after his own heart with Lord North at the head of it.

VI

INDIA

During the first ten years of King George's reign changes of importance were taking place in India. There were fresh developments in the expansion of the native powers, while the British were making their first experiments as rulers, at first *de facto* and then *de jure*, over great provinces in the dominions of the Mogul. In the twenty years between the appointment of Dupleix as governor of Pondichery, and the capture of Pondichery which signalled the complete overthrow of French power in India, the potentates directly affected by the struggle were the Nizam of the Deccan, his lieutenant the Nawab of the Carnatic, and the Nawab of Bengal. Both the nawabs had become merely puppets in the hands of the British, the nizam's power had become greatly curtailed, and the power of the Marathas, over whom the old nizam had exercised an appreciable dominion, had grown very greatly. It was the first time for centuries that a great Hindu power was getting itself organised in the peninsula, of which much the greater part had habitually been dominated by dynasties of Mohammedan conquerors of Turkish or Afghan descent, until the Moguls had won for themselves recognition as lords paramount of the whole.

The Maratha confederacy threatened to convert the Mogul into its puppet and to dominate all India, since the solidarity of the Mogul Empire had become a transparent fiction. But, naturally enough, it did not as yet occur to the Marathas that the weakening of the nizam could be of anything but advantage to them; that they were to find far more dangerous rivals and antagonists in the British, whose fighting qualities were wholly unknown before Clive's defence of Arcot. From time immemorial the Hindu had turned his eyes to the north-west and the mountain passes of Afghanistan as the region whence attack was to be expected; and the plan of the Marathas was to dominate the Mogul and carry their sway up to the Indus. In Central India their supremacy was already assured; and the potentates of Oudh and Bengal stood in awe of them, and generally paid them the tribute or black-mail called *chauth*.

Now the Maratha expansion towards the north-west was a direct challenge to the ruler of Kabul, who looked upon the north-west as his own. In 1761 Ahmed Shah came down from Kabul with a mighty army and smote the Marathas on the favourite battlefield of Paniput, in the Delhi district. The Afghan was a mighty raider, but no organiser of government; and when he had shattered the Marathas he went back across the hills. But the practical effect of the conflict was to reduce the Maratha power and check its attempts at aggression for some years, and this in itself facilitated the sudden growth of a new power in the south. A Moham-

medan military adventurer of genius, Haidar Naik, afterwards known as Haidar Ali, having obtained the command of the armies of the Hindu state of Mysore, seized the throne for himself in 1762, and so developed the military organisation that in a very short time Mysore was fully a match for any of its native rivals.

It is sufficiently obvious that there was no Empire of India for Clive or any one else to overthrow, except in the sense that various potentates professed to acknowledge the common sovereignty of the Mogul, and gave a colour of legality to their own actions by doing them in his name when they thought it worth while. But this fiction of the Mogul's sovereignty was preserved as carefully by the British as by any one else until the nineteenth century. What the British did during the eighteenth century was merely to establish themselves as one among several territorial powers among whom their intention was to preserve a balance. But because each of the native powers saw in the British the most serious obstacle to its own achievement of ascendancy, one after another they forced contests on the British, whereby their own power was diminished and that of the British was increased until it grew into an acknowledged ascendancy.

When Clive returned to England in 1760 the British were a territorial power *de facto* in Bengal and in the Carnatic, because the nawabs in both those provinces were completely under their control. But *de jure* they were still in possession of nothing but the districts immediately round Madras and Bombay, together with the Sarkars, which they held as a fief from the nizam. The British government at home had not taken charge, the British authority was that of the East India Company. There could be no permanence about an irregular control such as existed in Bengal, where Mir Jafar had to obey the orders of the company's officers forming the council at Calcutta, while the council itself declined all responsibility for the administration. They demanded for themselves privileges and exemptions, accepted the presents which were lavished upon them after the oriental fashion, and practically extorted a good deal more. It was not strange that when Clive's strong mastery was withdrawn the British in Bengal abused their position. The subordinates in a commercial company, suddenly placed in a position of immense actual power without official responsibility, would hardly have been human if they had not abused their position; they had behind them no tradition to live up to, and the temptations were overwhelming.

Mir Jafar found himself unable to meet the demands which were made upon him; the council deposed him, and made his finance minister, Mir Kassim, nawab. Mir Kassim laid his plans to free himself from the British tyranny, which the governor, Vansittart, a person of good intentions, was unable to check. The result was another revolution. Mir Kassim fled to Shujah Daulah, the Nawab of Oudh, and Mir Jafar was set up again. Then once more Shujah Daulah prepared to invade Bengal and subject it to Oudh; but Major Hector Munro, by a brilliant feat of arms

worthy of Clive himself, inflicted upon him a decisive defeat at Buxar, and convinced him of the wisdom of seeking British friendship. Buxar was hardly less important than Plassey in the establishment of the British power in Bengal.

But by this time the directors in England had become impressed with the necessity for putting an end to the misrule which their representatives in India were turning to their private account and not to the benefit of the company. Once more Clive was sent out to India with full powers to take matters in hand and organise the government. He set himself, on his arrival in 1765, to cure the existing evils by drastic measures, and to remove the worst of the causes from which they sprang. The receiving of presents and all private trading by the company's servants were imperatively forbidden; while the profits of the salt monopoly, which had been conceded to the company, were appropriated to the increase of the hitherto despicable salaries of the company's servants. This measure, however, was unfortunately modified by the directors, with the result that the private trading and the receiving of presents revived. The army in Bengal was reorganised, and its control was officially taken over by the company; and, further, the collection and administration of the revenue, what is called the *diwani*, in Bengal, was conferred upon the company by a decree of the Mogul as suzerain, procured by Clive. The position of the British was regulated; they were not only rulers *de facto* but were thenceforth responsible *de jure*. The Diwani of Bengal, the cession of the Sarkars to the British, and the formal separation of the Carnatic from the nizam's jurisdiction, were all obtained under the sanction of the Mogul's authority in August 1765. The British East India Company had become a legally constituted territorial power, and the repudiation of its authority could be accurately represented as an act of rebellion against the Mogul.

Before leaving India Clive also laid down the general principles of foreign policy. There was to be no attempt at the extension of dominion. Oudh was not penalised, but was to be strengthened into a buffer state against Maratha aggression in the north. In like manner the nizam was to be supported against Maratha aggression in the south. At the beginning of 1767 Clive again retired to England. The foundations of British power had been laid, but a working political system still had to be evolved. Chatham's scheme for transferring the sovereignty in England from the company to the Crown came to nothing; but it was impossible for the British nation long to ignore its responsibilities. The next experimental phase is represented by the ministry of Lord North in England and the rule of Warren Hastings in India.

CHAPTER XXVII

CLEAVAGE

I

THE BREACH WIDENS

WITH the formation of Lord North's ministry, King George's victory in parliament was complete. The most definite dividing line between Government and Opposition was fixed by colonial policy, and the Opposition included the whole of the Rockingham connection, together with Burke, the great exponent of Whig political philosophy, Chatham and all those who still revered him, and some even of those whom Charles Townshend had dragged with him more or less reluctantly. The king had secured the solid support of Toryism, of the group who, by whatever name they called themselves, regarded it as their first duty to carry out the king's wishes, and of the bulk of the Bedford Whigs who had brought the quarrel with America to a head and were rigid in their demands for a firm and uncompromising attitude. The king was not possessed of a merely accidental majority in the House of Commons; between boroughs whose vote was under direct control and constituencies which had been fairly bought, the majority was secure. There was no risk of the Government being defeated in parliament, and practically none that it would be defeated on appealing to the country. And virtually the majority was pledged to carry out the king's wishes.

There were three questions with which North's Government had to deal between 1770 and 1775. The first has already been discussed in connection with Wilkes. The second was India, which for the present we defer; and the third was the quarrel with the colonies.

The partial repeal of the obnoxious taxes failed entirely to produce the effect intended. Rioting did not cease, and the worst kind of agitators in America found a help to inflaming popular feeling in the "Boston massacre," an affray between the soldiers and the mob in which three of the latter were killed and a half-a-dozen more were wounded. A Boston jury acquitted the soldiers of blame, but when passions have been excited such occurrences acquire a fictitious colour and a fictitious importance. Still, for some time the agitation only simmered; the colonials, for the most part, contented themselves with refusing to drink tea. Then in 1772 the royal schooner *Gaspee*, engaged on preventive service, was decoyed into

shallows, where she grounded and was then boarded and burnt ; nor could any information be obtained as to the perpetrators. The resistance to the importation of the boycotted goods was more carefully organised ; the Americans who supported the home government were subjected to a persistent persecution. Ship loads of tea when they arrived at American ports, if disembarked at all, found no purchasers, and for the most part the ships sailed away again without unloading, At the end of 1773 such a consignment of the East India Company's tea arrived in Boston harbour. The consignees were the sons of the British Governor, Hutchinson. Hutchinson forbade the ships to sail till they had paid the duties ; the Bostonians refused to allow the tea to be landed. One evening, after a great public meeting, a party of pretended Red Indians boarded the tea ships in the presence of an applauding multitude which watched operations from the shore, and emptied the tea chests into the sea. No one revealed the identity of the "Indians" ; the entire city of Boston shared the responsibility.

Meanwhile public sentiment had been inflamed on both sides of the Atlantic by the publication of certain letters written to a private correspondent in London by Hutchinson the Governor and Oliver the Chief Justice of Massachusetts. Both men were honest supporters of the British government, and expressed their opinions with the natural freedom of private letters. Those letters, by some means unknown, fell into the hands of Benjamin Franklin, who was in London as agent for several of the colonies. In America the publication infuriated the colonials against the writers of the letters, while in England it infuriated most people against the men responsible for an entirely unjustifiable divulgence of a private correspondence. A bitter attack was made upon Franklin, which he never forgave. Hitherto he had at any rate believed in the possibility of an honourable adjustment ; henceforth he was to be numbered amongst the irreconcilables. The letter incident and the Boston "tea-party" between them had an exasperating effect, which perhaps destroyed the last chance of a peaceful solution.

For now the British Government, with British sentiment behind it, resolved upon penal measures directed against Massachusetts. Boston harbour was closed, the seat of the government was removed from Boston to Salem, the constitution was suspended ; the venue for trials of officers of the Crown on capital charges was transferred to England, and troops were ordered to be quartered upon the town, which was required to pay compensation to the East India Company for the tea destroyed.

At the same moment an entirely admirable Act was passed for the government of Canada. It emanated not from the brains of George's ministers, but from the statesmanship of Sir Guy Carleton, afterwards Lord Dorchester, who had for some years been Governor of Canada. While the Quebec Act extended the boundaries of Canada, it secured for the Roman Catholics complete freedom of worship and preserved their endow-

ments, nine-tenths of the Canadians being of the religion which was proscribed in Ireland and in Great Britain. It is an extraordinary paradox that Chatham opposed, while King George supported, this surprisingly liberal measure. But, further, the government was placed in the hands of a Governor and a Legislative Council of Crown nominees, the right of taxation was expressly reserved to the parliament of Great Britain, and the English Criminal Law was introduced while the old French Civil Law was retained. The religious and social institutions of the French population were thus fully protected, and they had no desire for an extension to them of political rights which they had never possessed under the French flag. Nevertheless this excellent measure was an additional source of irritation to their neighbours in British colonies. To the New Englanders in particular, with their Puritan tradition, and to the Virginians with their Anglican Cavalier tradition, the latitude allowed to the Romanists was a scandal; while the political constitution was looked upon as ominous of what the British Government intended to impose upon the old British colonies.

Again the assemblies of the thirteen colonies, or of twelve of them, since the youngest, Georgia, did not yet associate itself with the rest, sent delegates to a general "Continental Congress," which met at Philadelphia in September (1774). In that Congress, although there were as yet few who had brought themselves to welcome the idea of separation, the dominant voices were those of the men who had already made up their minds to work for that object, and with them lay the skill of political organisation. The Congress demanded the repeal of the whole series of obnoxious Acts, endorsed a policy of something more than passive resistance to the carrying out of the laws imposed by the British parliament, sanctioned the principle of the boycott, drew up a new Declaration of Rights, and addressed a petition to the king, and what may be called an open letter to the people of England. They claimed, in short, a return to the position as it was before 1763; but at the same time they expressly repudiated the idea that they desired separation. Congress voted by states, and the states voted solidly together with the exception of New York. It need hardly be remarked, however, that the congress had no legal powers, the sanction for its authority residing only in the Assemblies of the several states.


Massachusetts, which had taken the lead in the agitation and had been singled out for punishment, took the lead also in preparation for armed resistance. The new governor and commander-in-chief, General Gage, refused to summon the Assembly of the province; nevertheless it was elected and met, and was obeyed precisely as if it had been a legal body. Volunteer corps were organised and drilled, and military stores were collected. Gage, who had four British regiments at his disposal, for the most part massed in Boston, urged the home government to send him more troops. He did not get his troops, and North's Government made a belated offer which was intended to be conciliatory—the offer to exempt

from taxation any colony which elected to make such a contribution of its own to the Imperial Exchequer as satisfied the Imperial parliament. At this stage the proposal was worse than useless, and it was accompanied by other retaliatory measures against the colonists, closing American ports, excluding all American trade, and voting an increase of troops for Boston. It was in vain for Burke, Chatham, and the Rockinghams to present the case for the colonies to parliament. They were completely out-voted, and the majority in parliament was supported by the great body of popular opinion.

II

FROM LEXINGTON TO SARATOGA

The War of American Independence was opened by the skirmish of Lexington on April 18, 1775. General Gage sent a party of soldiers to seize and destroy military stores which were being collected at Concord, eighteen miles from Boston. The immediate purpose was accomplished more or less successfully, but the troops were attacked on the march by the Massachusetts militia, and had sufficiently the worse in the encounter to encourage the colonials in the conviction that the volunteers could hold their own against the regulars. Also it was felt that matters had now been fairly brought to the arbitrament of the sword. The Massachusetts men began to muster in force, Gage's regiments were for the time shut up in Boston, and a party of insurgents under Ethan Allen captured the fort of Ticonderoga. Before the end of May two thousand men were added to the British force in Boston; and, on the other hand, the Congress at Philadelphia, which was now accepted as the common directing authority of the colonists, took measures for raising a force of fifteen thousand men, and nominated as commander-in-chief George Washington, a highly respected landowner of Virginia, who had served with credit as a young man in Braddock's day, and whose force of character had won for him the confidence of Congress.




George Washington.
[After the painting by Trumbull.]

Then on June 17th occurred the first important engagement. An American column occupied a height called Breed's Hill (not the neighbouring Bunker Hill itself) to the north of Boston, from which they could command the British quarters. A strong British column only succeeded

in driving them out after being twice repulsed and at the cost of heavy losses. The battle of Bunker Hill or Bunker's Hill was in actual fact a British victory; but it was won so hardly and in such circumstances as to be a real moral victory for the colonials; because, on a much larger scale than at Lexington, they had faced the regulars and inflicted punishment much more severe than they had suffered.



The colonials were tolerably unanimous in their determination to fight, but they were without military discipline, without established organisation, badly supplied with stores, and very short of money. The British, on the other hand, had complete command of the sea, officers of experience, regular troops, and abundant resources. But they remained consistently inert, apparently under the conviction that the resistance of the Americans would perish of sheer inanition. General Sir William Howe took the



An American 20 dollar bill dated prior to the Declaration of Independence.

place of Gage as commander of the forces; his brother Admiral Lord Howe was in command of the fleet. But the fleet was not allowed to do anything, and General Howe preferred to do nothing. His army was concentrated in Boston, while Washington's was concentrated outside. Elsewhere, the governors of the southern colonies had to take refuge in British ships, which were unassailable, though in the circumstances useless for purposes of offence. Washington spent the winter in a long effort to organise and instil discipline into an army which was only held together at all with the utmost difficulty.

Active operations were restricted to an attempt on the part of the Americans to attach Canada to the rebellion. The first force of invaders led by Montgomery was on the whole favourably received by the French, and Montreal was captured. But the most persistent defect of the American armies immediately made itself felt. The men only enlisted for short terms, and the moment their time was up they went off home, much after the



PART OF A PANORAMIC VIEW OF BOSTON AND THE COUNTRY ROUND AT THE TIME
OF THE BATTLE OF BUNKER'S HILL, 1775

Taken from the original water-colour drawing made by a Lieutenant of the British army directly after the battle. The upper part looks towards Cambridge; the lower shows, on the right, the ruins of Charlestown and Bunker's Hill (4). In the foreground is a part of North Boston.

fashion of their Saxon ancestors a thousand years before. Meanwhile Benedict Arnold had been despatched against Quebec, where he arrived in December with a body of troops ragged, barefoot, half-starved. When the remnant from Montreal joined them the whole body barely numbered a thousand. Such a force had no possible chance of capturing Quebec. An attempt to storm the place was repulsed with heavy loss and Montgomery himself was killed. For some three months the besiegers hung on with a somewhat fantastic heroism which refused to recognise impossibilities. The wavering attitude of the French Canadians turned into one of hostility to the Americans, the siege was at last raised in March, and thenceforward Canadian loyalty to the Crown was never in doubt.

On the other hand, in the same month, March, General Howe made up his mind that Boston was a bad military centre for his purposes, so he put his troops on board ship and sailed for Halifax, which became his headquarters for the time. Such was the ignominious position twelve months after the outbreak of the war. The British, with complete command of the sea, with nothing to check the supply of reinforcements, with no foreign complications on hand to distract them, had retired from their one real foothold in the thirteen colonies in the face of an untrained army which was short of guns and ammunition, and was only preserved from dissolving by the invincible patience and firmness of its great chief; a chief who was himself the object of the perpetual attacks of jealousy, at the same time that the conditions in which he was placed forced upon him a rigour of conduct which inevitably made him unpopular, while they prohibited the active offensive by which popularity might have been won. The inefficiency shown by the British administration was almost without a parallel except during the first months of the Seven Years' War. The government had entered on a battle with the colonists for which the only possible justification was an iron resolve to conquer unmistakably and decisively. Right or wrong, such a programme would have been intelligible, and there should have been no sort of difficulty in destroying open resistance in the field. But no effort was made at conquest, apparently on the assumption that conquest would come of itself. The actual effect was to stiffen in the Americans the conviction that the British might be beaten and the determination to beat them.

Month by month the idea of separation took firmer root; the men who had begun with a conscientious desire to be content with a return to the old system were learning to believe that the old system had become impossible and that complete separation must be their goal. The new feeling at last found decisive expression in the Declaration of Independence issued by the Continental Congress on July 4th, 1776. Eighteen months earlier Congress had indignantly repudiated the charge that independence was desired; now the claim for independence was uncompromisingly asserted. As before, New York was the one state which declined to go with the rest. The Declaration, with its accompanying

resolutions in favour of seeking foreign alliances, at once and finally put reconciliation out of the question.

It was correctly anticipated that the British would return to the attack and would make New York their objective. Thither therefore Washington had removed his force after the British evacuation of Boston. At the close of June Lord Howe returned with a fleet and occupied Staten Island. Some little time elapsed before the resumption of active hostilities; it was occupied in fruitless efforts to arrive at a basis of negotiation, and in proclamations on the one side offering free pardon to all who should come in and on the other offering grants of land to the German mercenaries serving with the British force if they would enroll themselves as American

citizens. The renewal of fighting at the end of August soon brought New York completely into the hands of the British, and by the end of November Washington was forced to fall back across the Delaware River into Pennsylvania. Sir Guy Carleton descended from Canada and

John Penn John Hancock John Hart
 Geo. Ross Wm. Paine
 Robert M. Hooper Saml. Adams
 Stephen Kissel The N. Coopers Geo. Clymer
 Tho. M. Neah Charles Carroll of Carroll Thos. Mifflin George
 Roger Sherman Saml. Huntington
 Wm. Whipple Thomas Lynch J. P. C. Franklin
 Geo. Taylor Josiah Bartlett Benj. Franklin
 Wm. Williams Richd. Stockton John Morton

The first twenty-four signatures to the Declaration that the "United Colonies" of America "are, and of right ought to be, Free and Independent States."

occupied Crown Point near Ticonderoga, while another detachment from New York was threatening the New England States. But Howe was satisfied with what he had accomplished and relapsed into his normal inaction.

Congress, on the other hand, did something to strengthen Washington's hands by ordering the enlistment of the troops for the period of the war, instead of for the short terms which had kept the armies in a state of perpetually recurring dissolution. Moreover, it declined to listen to the chorus of complaints which arose from officers who were jealous of Washington and dissatisfied with their own appointments, or which were born of a general tendency to depreciate a commander who was admirably fulfilling the most thankless of all tasks, that of preserving in being an army which was quite unfit to adopt the vigorous offensive which was expected of it. Congress retained its confidence in Washington, and answered the complaints by enlarging his authority. Washington himself found his opportunity that winter, crossed the Delaware on the ice, cut up the British outpost at Trenton, and cleared the western part of New Jersey, in which he remained established. In the north Carleton was unable to make further progress and his command was transferred to Burgoyne.

No active movements were set on foot until the next midsummer. The campaign was designed with the object of cutting off the New England States. Burgoyne was to descend with the Northern force along the line of the Hudson River, while a column marched from New York to effect a junction. Washington's army would then be completely cut off from the Northern States, while the British would be able to sweep down upon him in irresistible force. It should have been Howe's business to despatch a strong column to join hands with Burgoyne, keeping at New York a sufficient body to hold Washington himself in check. But instead of carrying out this plan he directed his energies to the capture of Philadelphia, to which he appears to have attached an extravagant importance. Therefore, when Clinton ought to have been marching to join Burgoyne, he was detained at New York, whence Howe had carried off the bulk of the troops by sea to the Chesapeake to turn Washington's position and fall upon Philadelphia. Howe succeeded in his object. He was met by Washington at Brandywine Creek, defeated him, occupied Philadelphia, and again beat him at German's Town. The American commander had to fall back to Valley Forge, where for a long time his position remained exceedingly precarious.

But Howe's move upon Philadelphia ruined the plan of the Northern campaign. Clinton could not move to join Burgoyne; and the Northern American army under Gates, reinforced by troops spared at great risk by Washington, soon outnumbered Burgoyne's force and manœuvred him into a position at Saratoga, where he found himself with no alternative to the surrender of his whole army. Clinton, who had made a struggle to push up to his assistance, was obliged to return to New York. The North, instead of being secured by the British, was entirely lost to them, and was in the hands of the victorious Americans, a matter of more decisive import than the occupation of Philadelphia or the difficult situation of George Washington's army at Valley Forge.

III

FRANCE INTERVENES

The surrender at Saratoga had results much more far-reaching than the mere immediate change in the military situation on the American Continent. There was nothing in itself irretrievable about the disaster. A Chatham, bent on a vigorous prosecution of the war, would have found troops and officers numerous enough and capable enough to vanquish the Americans in the field in the simple duel. But after Saratoga the war ceased to be a duel. It became a struggle between Great Britain and a group of combatants who joined together for her destruction. She had sown the wind in the long years of incompetent and wrong-headed administration; now she

was to reap the whirlwind. The Peace of Paris had left her with no friend in Europe and with one implacable foe. That foe, France, had at least endeavoured to lay to heart one great lesson of the Seven Years' War, and had been steadily and persistently building up a fleet, while Britain had been neglecting both her naval and her military organisation. France had been drawing closer her union with Spain, and had been mollifying rather than exacerbating old animosities on the Continent. She desired nothing better than an opportunity of striking a blow at the rival who had defeated her.

But so far France had had no shadow of excuse for intervention. Moreover, at the outset her shrewd minister Turgot had perceived that in any event Great Britain was likely to suffer from the war so severely that it would not be worth while for France to intervene even if she could afford to do so, which Turgot very well knew she could not. French finances had been reduced to chaos ; Turgot was striving to bring them into something like order, and he knew that economy was imperative. But Turgot's tenure of power was brief ; his financial methods subjected the privileged classes to taxation, which they resented, and he was driven into retirement. The direction of foreign affairs was in the hands of Vergennes. Vergennes was inclined to an aggressive policy, although it was restricted to a secret encouragement of the American rebellion. International amenities forbade the immediate recognition of the American States as an independent nation ; but their agents, despatched to Paris after the Declaration of Independence, were welcomed by Parisian society, fêted, and patronised in a fashion which left no room for doubt that participation in the war would be exceedingly popular in France. The French court and French society were as yet unconscious that they were playing on the crater of a volcano. The "rights of a man" were in fashion, because from the point of view of Society they were entirely visionary and impossible in France itself. A theoretical enthusiasm for popular liberties could be comfortably enjoyed where privilege felt itself to be perfectly secure. The aristocrats had no suspicion that while they were encouraging revolution in America they were fomenting revolution at home.

France indeed could expect no direct benefit to herself from the American War ; it was enough that she thirsted for humiliation and disaster to fall upon the British.

But Saratoga gave an opening, an excuse for recognising the independence of the colonies, although it was tolerably obvious that such a recognition would involve war. It was not so easy for France to draw Spain in her wake ; for Spain was a great colonial power, and if the British colonies asserted their independence successfully, it was exceedingly probable that the Spanish colonies would follow the British example. Still Spain might hope that if she joined France and the British colonies in open hostilities she might achieve not only the gratification of revenge, but tangible results in the recovery of Gibraltar and Minorca. And the prospects were infinitely better than they had been when she was last

tempted to join with France in 1761. Then, Great Britain was advancing on the full tide of victory, and her fleets swept the seas unchallenged. Then, France was already exhausted by a war in which she had suffered a series of disastrous losses, besides being involved in the Prussian complication. Now, Britain stood entirely alone, a house divided against itself, engaged in a struggle with her own colonies in which it was exceedingly doubtful whether she could achieve success, while her fleet had been allowed to lose its old predominance, whereas that of France had been carefully nursed and expanded.

It was immediately realised in England that the disaster of Saratoga would probably involve her in another struggle for life against the combined Bourbons. Before the end of the year France had given private assurances to the American commissioners in Paris that the independence of the colonies would be formally recognised, and that they would receive open support ; although it was not till the following March that the formal treaty was notified in London. But the facts could not be altogether concealed, and the threatened danger only roused British doggedness to the utmost. Whatever else happened, the Bourbons should be defied and fought to the last gasp. King George was even ready to drop the American contest altogether in order to concentrate on the French war. Bills were introduced and passed to offer the colonists everything that they had demanded before the outbreak of the war. North himself urged the king to allow him to resign and to call Chatham to the leadership.

But Chatham's day was over ; even if George could have brought himself to a reconciliation, the thing was no longer possible. He was carried down to the House for the last time in order to insist that Britain should never consent to a separation, and should never yield to the Bourbons. His speech was an answer to the Duke of Richmond's motion, on behalf of the Rockinghams, that all fleets and armies should be withdrawn from America ; it was a dying effort. His suffering and exhaustion were evident, his words often barely audible. Richmond replied. Chatham endeavoured once more to rise and speak, but his strength failed him, and he fell back in a fit, while a great awe fell upon the House. This was Chatham's last utterance, though a month passed before the spirit passed from the worn-out frame. So ended the life of the great patriot, whom all men, friends and foes alike, recognised as the grandest figure of his time.

The scene took place on the 7th April, three weeks after the announcement of the French treaty. North's proposals had come far too late, and Congress refused to treat upon any terms except recognition of the complete independence of America. It had already laid before the colonies its proposals for a scheme of confederation, which were adopted by eight of the states in the following July ; the rest only came in by slow degrees. Though the vain attempts at negotiation were not finally abandoned until October, the war had already entered upon its second phase when the French fleet sailed from Toulon in April.

IV

THE STRUGGLE FOR LIFE

The force which had captured Philadelphia remained there through the winter, while Washington had the usual difficulty in keeping his troops together at Valley Forge. Howe was recalled, and the chief command was given to Clinton in New York; but with the certainty of French intervention the General could not afford to keep his forces divided. The skill of Admiral Howe successfully carried the troops which had occupied Philadelphia back to New York before the superior French fleet arrived in American waters. The French admiral, D'Estaing, had accomplished his voyage unimpeded. It is very significant of the change which had taken place in the naval situation, that, although this fleet from Toulon was larger than that under Howe's command, the British fleet in home waters could not spare sufficient strength to interfere with it, and was only able to fight a drawn battle with a second French fleet, off Ushant, at the end of July. The actual preponderance was with the French rather than with the British; it was ultimately to be restored to the British only because of their superior seamanship and their superior leading. It may be confidently affirmed that if Howe and D'Estaing had changed places the French fleet would have reached the mouth of the Hudson before the British fleet had got the Philadelphia force back to New York, and New York would have been very seriously in danger of falling.

It is a curious feature of almost all the naval operations throughout the war that the French, although habitually in superior force, always avoided battle, and missed repeated opportunities of crushing smaller British squadrons, while the British commanders were constantly prepared to challenge fleets larger than their own. Thus D'Estaing did not venture to attack Howe in the Hudson, but drew off to the North, and at the end of the year betook himself to the West Indies, which were to be the main scene of the operations of the rival fleets. At the same time Clinton had to send away a large force from New York to be convoyed by Admiral Hotham to Barbadoes. This would still have left the British commander with a sufficient force to undertake operations against Washington, since he was no longer menaced by a French fleet; but he was reduced to inaction by orders to despatch another body of troops to the southern colonies under the command of Cornwallis. Cornwallis was a capable soldier, but he could only overrun the country without securing any grip on it, while for once Washington passed the winter in comparative security. In fact, when the spring came, his main difficulty lay in restraining Congress from insisting on sending another expedition to Canada. Washington at least was well aware that the British had blundered in diffusing their energies

over an extended area, and he had no mind to follow their example. Moreover, however useful it might have been at an earlier stage to involve Canada in the struggle against Great Britain, now that the Americans were fighting in alliance with France he had no inclination to risk making Canada the reward of French assistance, and renewing the menace of French rivalry which had been removed by the Seven Years' War.

Neither side then made any material progress in the land operations; for while Clinton could not attack Washington, Washington could not




The West Indies, the scene of English and French naval operations 1778-1779.

attack him in New York, especially as the absence of D'Estaing still left the British in command of the communications by sea. And in the West Indies, while the French amused themselves by capturing islands which they were perfectly certain to lose again the moment the British should acquire a naval predominance, and while for the sake of capturing these islands they neglected opportunities of dealing damaging blows to the British squadrons, the British commanders directed their captures only to points of strategical value, such as Santa Lucia.

For eighteen months, then, after the French intervention, no striking successes fell to either party. On the other hand, in the summer of 1779

Spain too declared war. Her effective share in the operations was for some time limited to the siege of Gibraltar, but the British fleet was now heavily outnumbered. There was no British Mediterranean force to raise the siege of Gibraltar. The French fleet in the West Indies was larger than the British ; a combined Franco-Spanish fleet which made a great naval demonstration in the British channel was very much larger than the British Channel Fleet for defence, though the enemy were satisfied with demonstrating and accomplished nothing further. It was well for the British that co-operation between allied navies offers an even more difficult problem than co-operation between allied armies. Spain made Gibraltar her objective, the French made the West Indies theirs. No attempt was made to concentrate for the purpose of crushing the British Navy in detail.

The result was that by the summer of 1780 the destruction of Great



Gibraltar before the great siege of 1780.

[From a print by Coquart.]

Britain was no nearer. In the northern theatre of war neither Washington nor Clinton could attempt a decisive movement. In the southern theatre Cornwallis had practically put an end to open resistance, though it was clear that upon any withdrawal of forces from that region the insurgents would at once take the field again ; but the communication by sea between the northern and southern divisions of the British was uninterrupted. Both French and British had reinforced the squadrons in the West Indies ; the French, commanded by Guichen, was still in greater force, but the British Admiral Rodney, on his way out, had thrown reliefs into Gibraltar and had caught two Spanish squadrons separately, capturing one and destroying the other. In July Washington was reinforced by a strong contingent of French troops under Rochambeau and Lafayette. The substantial addition to his forces was indubitably of great value to the American commander, but did not diminish his personal difficulties, since the Americans were exceedingly jealous of the Frenchmen, and all Washington's diplomacy was constantly needed to prevent an open rupture.

During the ensuing twelve months Britain added yet one more to the circle of her maritime foes by declaring war upon Holland, because Holland joined the Armed Neutrality, a league of the Baltic Powers formed in this year to resist the doctrines of international maritime law maintained by Great Britain, which turned mainly upon the relative rights of belligerents and neutrals. The Dutch, however, being isolated, could not effectively co-operate with the other enemies of Great Britain. The main results were that Negapatam and Trincomali, two Dutch stations in India and Ceylon, passed into the hands of the British, and there was one obstinate sea-fight off the Dogger Bank (August 1701), in which British and Dutch fought each other with the old grim equality of stubbornness; but though neither side could claim a decisive victory, the Dutch fleet was placed practically *hors de combat*.

An incident of the autumn was the treason of Benedict Arnold, the American commander who had made the desperate attempt to capture Quebec in the first year of the war. His correspondence with Clinton was discovered. Arnold made his escape; but a young British officer, Major André, who was captured with letters of Arnold concealed on his person, was hanged as a spy in strict accordance with military law, and his fate aroused such deep public sympathy that a monument was erected to his memory in Westminster Abbey, whither his remains were brought for burial many years later. But the main importance of the twelve months after the midsummer of 1780 lay in the southern theatre, where Cornwallis set out with the object of effecting a junction with the northern force. The apparent subjection of the south was illusory. As Cornwallis progressed from Georgia through the Carolinas there was a series of engagements; Cornwallis was repeatedly in danger of having his communications with the sea cut off; as he moved northward, the detachments left behind to keep the country under control were cooped up in Savannah, Charlestown, and Wilmington; and in August 1781 he was obliged to throw himself into Yorktown at the mouth of the Chesapeake.

Almost immediately there followed the decisive blow, so far as the American War was concerned. In April the French Admiral, De Grasse, arrived in the West Indies with twenty-one ships of the line. No corresponding reinforcements came from England, which had been obliged to concentrate on the relief of Gibraltar, strenuously blockaded and periodically bombarded by the Spaniards. Hitherto the French squadron in the North American waters had not been strong enough to sever the communications between New York and the South. But now at last the opportunity presented itself for crushing one of the two British divisions. By a movement concerted with De Grasse, Washington, having convinced Clinton that he was preparing for a concentrated attack on New York itself, suddenly descended instead upon Yorktown. De Grasse sailed in force from the West Indies for the Chesapeake, for once with a real justification for avoiding an engagement even with an inferior British squadron. The

combined French fleet in the Chesapeake greatly outnumbered the combined British squadrons, which attacked it but without success; Yorktown was completely cut off from all assistance, and in October Cornwallis was obliged to surrender. With the capture of Yorktown American independence was no longer a doubtful issue. The question was rather whether Britain herself would survive. If De Grasse had failed to enter the Chesapeake it is conceivable that the American army would have broken up completely; for if Yorktown had received the relief which was despatched too late from New York, Cornwallis might have inflicted a blow from which it would have been extremely difficult to recover. On this single occasion

it can at least be maintained that the French commander was right in staking everything not upon the disabling of the enemy's fleet, but on securing the immediate capture of a vitally important post. The Americans owed their victory to his action, though it had become as impossible for Britain to retain her grip of the colonies as it had been in old days for the Plantagenet to keep his grip on Scotland.

But France had not yet paid her share of the price for America's victory. The next year, 1782, witnessed the final grapple between Britain and the Bourbons. In February Minorca was lost; in September a last overwhelming attack was planned upon Gibraltar. But the really decisive engagement had already been fought in April. De Grasse, after leaving Yorktown, had again neglected opportunities of bringing the smaller British squadrons in the West Indies to an engagement which ought to have meant their annihilation.

In February Rodney returned thither with a new squadron, which gave the British a slight superiority in numbers; but a Spanish fleet was intended to form a junction with De Grasse, and if that junction were effected the allied fleet would have more than twice as many ships of the line as the British. The British fleet lay at Santa Lucia and the French fleet at Martinique, when De Grasse set sail for the point of rendezvous in Hayti and Rodney started in pursuit. As the two fleets passed Dominica the French admiral again missed an opportunity. It was Rodney's business at all costs to prevent the junction; it was De Grasse's business at almost any cost to effect it. The pursuing British van came up with the French fleet, while the rear still lay becalmed under the lee of Dominica. Apparently De Grasse might have brought his whole fleet to bear upon the van, and if he had done so, he having the advantage of the wind, the British must have been seriously crippled. He engaged, however, with only a part of his fleet in order to ensure the escape of a convoy, and



An American General.

[From Barnard's "History," 1790.]

then proceeded on his way. But four days later the British again caught him up before he was clear of the group of islands called The Saints. The victory was won by the manœuvre which is called breaking the line, the British ships piercing the French line at two points, throwing it into complete disorder, with the rear unable to come to the aid of the van, and capturing five ships of the line, including the flagship, which carried De Grasse himself. This manœuvre was not part of Rodney's own plan of action, but was a happy inspiration due to a change of wind while the two fleets were running past each other on opposite tacks; and it is held that if Rodney had made full use of his victory he ought to have annihilated the French fleet. But as it was he made the junction with the Spaniards impossible, and secured a quite decisive ascendancy in the West Indian waters.

In September the last furious attack upon Gibraltar was repulsed by the indomitable valour of the besieged, and Sir George Elliott's magnificent defence was followed by a skilful relief effect by Lord Howe. There was no more fear that Gibraltar would be taken. There remains only one belated phase of the war to be dealt with in the account of Indian affairs, to which we shall turn immediately.

After the winter of 1781 no one in England believed that it would be possible to refuse the American demand for independence. After Rodney's victory in the West Indies, and the demonstration that Gibraltar was impregnable, the Bourbon Powers could no longer feel any confidence that a continuation of the war would bring them any advantage. As for the British, they had already suffered so severely that they were ready both to concede American independence and to make peace with the Bourbons upon honourable terms. The preliminaries of peace were agreed upon by all the parties at the beginning of 1783, though the definitive Treaty of Versailles was not signed till the following September. The conclusion of the war brought no very serious changes other than the separation of the thirteen colonies from the mother country and their formation into the United States. In effect there was a general restoration of conquests, except for the retention of Minorca and Florida by Spain.



Admiral Sir George Rodney.

[From the portrait by Reynolds.]

V

WARREN HASTINGS IN INDIA

While King George's government was forcing on the rupture with the colonies in America, while the British nation was fighting its own offspring, and losing the major portion of its empire in the Western Hemisphere, and finally was struggling desperately to preserve its own existence as the premier maritime Power, events of hardly less importance were fixing firmly the foundations of British dominion in India. Almost Warren Hastings might have said, "Alone I did it." The achievement was his, for almost without exception his colleagues thwarted and counteracted him at every turn, and half of the difficulties which were not imposed upon him by their actual malice were the outcome of the blundering stupidity of authorities who acted without reference to him. He had no voice in the selection of the colleagues or the authorities who thwarted him. The directors from home sent him admirable moral instructions, but instead of providing means for carrying them out, clamoured for handsome profits. He was forced into wars with the country powers, while his own country could spare neither ships nor troops to help him. And in the face of these enormous difficulties he preserved the British power and left it on a footing which enabled his successors to secure a decisive ascendancy.

Clive did much to reduce the evils which had followed naturally upon the sudden acquisition of a vast irresponsible power by a trading company. But he could not create an imperial system single-handed. The company's servants still evaded their responsibilities, still utilised their opportunities to make improper profits, and still neglected to make it their first aim to learn how the new territories ought to be governed. There was still no central British authority in India. The three Presidencies of Madras, Bengal, and Bombay were governed each by its own governor and council, and by land no one of them could even communicate with another except across Maratha territory.

In 1772 Warren Hastings, then acting as second official in Madras, was made Governor of Bengal, where before Clive's last visit to India he had been honourably distinguished by his efforts to support Vansittart in checking the general misrule. It was not till two years later that the Governor of Bengal was elevated into the position of Governor-General of the British dominions in India. An account of the career of Warren Hastings must still to a very large extent take the form of a defence, because the literary forces which were arrayed to denounce him during the best part of a century were so powerful and were applied with such picturesque effect as to produce the almost indelible but exceedingly misleading impression of an

able but unscrupulous and tyrannical governor, who achieved his ends very largely by grossly iniquitous methods.

The first instance is that of the Rohilla war which took place while he was only Governor of Bengal. Macaulay's exceedingly picturesque account, given in his essay on Warren Hastings, is a quite astonishing distortion of demonstrable truth. Just before the outbreak of hostilities between French and British, about the time when Nadir Shah swept over the north-west of India and sacked Delhi, a band of Mohammedan Afghans called the Rohillas made themselves masters of the territory lying on the north-western frontier of the province of Oudh. In 1770 some forty thousand Rohillas dominated the very much larger Hindu population in occupation of the soil. They were lords there by right of conquest and nothing else; they had been there for considerably less than half a century. They were a fighting race, and they rendered considerable service to Ahmed Shah when he smote the Marathas at Paniput. The Marathas wanted to punish them; they appealed to the wazir of Oudh for defence against the Marathas, and the wazir, counting them a valuable buffer against Maratha aggression, promised to defend them in consideration of a large indemnity.

The Rohillas did not pay the indemnity, and the wazir believed, or pretended to believe, that they were arranging a compact with the Marathas for the partition of Oudh. He put the case to Hastings that the expulsion of the Rohillas and the annexation of Rohilkhand to Oudh were necessary for the preservation of Oudh against an alliance between Marathas and Rohillas. And he invited Hastings to participate by lending him troops, for which assistance substantial payment would be made. The preservation of Oudh was an essential feature of the policy laid down by Clive and adopted by Hastings, who acceded to Shujah Daulah's proposals and sent a force to help in the suppression of the Rohillas. Experience had not yet taught the necessity of stipulating that British assistance should not be given unless the operations of war were carried on under British control. The wazir conducted the war upon oriental principles, in spite of protests from the British commander; but the suggestion that Hastings lent himself to an act of wanton aggression by a greedy and cruel potentate against an idyllic community for the sake of a bribe is preposterously remote from the fact.

Meanwhile, Government at home had awakened to the fact that the British nation must accept some share of responsibility for the government of India. A commission of inquiry gave an opening for a virulent attack upon Clive in parliament, but, to the credit of the country, the House rejected a proposed vote of censure, and affirmed instead that Clive had rendered great services to the state. But while parliament exonerated the man to whom the country owed so much, it applied itself also to a singular experiment in constitution making. It devised for India the system of Lord North's Regulating Act. The Governor of Bengal was to be Governor-General of India; the governors of the other two Presidencies being sub-

ordinate. But he was to have a nominated council consisting of four members besides himself. The votes of the five members of council were of equal force, the Governor-General having a casting vote only when the voting was otherwise equal. Also there was to be a High Court of Justice consisting of four judges, who were to be responsible not to the Government of India but to the Crown. Three members of the new council were sent out from England, who apparently regarded themselves as a committee appointed for the express purpose of overriding the will of the Governor-General in every particular. It would hardly have been possible to devise a scheme more hopelessly impracticable. Moreover, the Government of India was itself in the long run responsible to the management of the East India Company in London, which was vested in two bodies, the court of directors and the court of proprietors or large shareholders.

From the time of their arrival in India at the end of 1774 the three members of the council, Francis, Clavering, and Monson, commonly known as the Triumvirate, set themselves to reverse whatever could be reversed in the past doings of Hastings, and to thwart his actions in the present. To this strife between the Governor-General and his council belongs an incident too notorious to be passed over. The Triumvirate deliberately set themselves to procure evidence which could be used for a formal attack upon Hastings. An instrument upon whom they relied was a high-caste Brahmin, Nanda Kumar, whose name has been popularised as Nuncomar. Nuncomar was an adept at the fabrication of evidence, and Hastings was preparing to indict him for conspiracy when he was relieved from the necessity for further action. The new High Court of Justice presented an opportunity to an old enemy of Nuncomar, one Mohun Persad, who charged him before the court with forgery. The court administered English law, and forgery under English law was a capital offence. The court, after a long and entirely fair examination, found Nuncomar guilty and condemned him to death. They could have done nothing else. But the incident has been ingeniously perverted so as to represent Sir Elijah Impey, the Chief Justice, as a kind of Judge Jeffreys, and the trial itself as in effect a conspiracy for the protection of Hastings and the destruction of Nuncomar. It would be nearer the truth to say that a conspiracy against Hastings was thwarted by the fortunate accident that Nuncomar had exposed himself to destruction at the hands of a private enemy.

Meanwhile, however, Bombay had chosen to assert itself, with disastrous results. A posthumous child was born to the late peishwa of Puna. But before the child's birth the functions of the peishwaship were discharged by a kinsman, Ragonath Rao, or Ragoba, who wished to remain peishwa; but the adherents of the infant were too strong for him. The other chiefs of the Maratha confederacy, Sindhia, Holkar, the Gaekwar and the Bhonsla (three of these titles are born by hereditary princes to the present day), were in no haste to commit themselves. Ragoba appealed to the authorities at Bombay to support his cause, for which support they



India and the British Dominion in 1785.

demanded, and were promised as their price, the ports of Salsette and Bassein. The Bombay governor had no power to conclude such a treaty, since Hastings was already Governor-General. Hastings was entirely averse from superfluous meddling in native politics. But the Bombay authorities proceeded to active hostilities on behalf of Ragoba before there was time to stop them. Hastings felt that in the circumstances withdrawal was impossible. But the Triumvirate overrode Hastings, and negotiated a treaty with the regency acting for the infant peishwa at Puna. But then came the news that a French adventurer had arrived at Puna, while the intervention of France in the American War just at this time pointed to a serious danger of the revival of the French question in India. The Triumvirate at Calcutta had been broken up by the deaths of Monson and Clavering. With his hands thus freed, therefore, Hastings designed to co-operate with Bombay again in making Ragoba peishwa. Bombay did not wait to co-operate, but blundered into disaster in a hurry; only the brilliant march across India of a small force despatched by Hastings under Captain Goddard saved Bombay from an altogether ignominious collapse. Negotiations with the different Maratha chiefs, all of whom played fast and loose with each other and with the British, occupied the eighteen months following Goddard's arrival in the West—varied with occasional skirmishes.

Meanwhile, Madras had not been idle in the work of mischief-making. The authorities there had in 1773 made a present of Tanjur, which was not theirs to give, to the Nawab of the Carnatic, ostensibly because it would be inconvenient if Tanjur happened to turn hostile, actually because the Nawab of Arcot was heavily in debt to various servants of the company, and the possession of Tanjur might help him to pay a dividend. Then, after the Madras council had arrested and imprisoned the exceedingly arbitrary Governor Pigott, who had been sent out to try to restore order, the authorities proceeded to alarm the Nizam by proposing to cancel in the existing treaties with him such details as were inconvenient to them. As this was just at the time when Bombay had plunged itself into its worst difficulties, the Nizam thought the moment opportune for forming an anti-British coalition with the Marathas and Haidar Ali of Mysore, and perhaps with the French at Mauritius.

Now for the past ten years Haidar, a born captain, had been organising in Mysore an army more powerful than had been wielded by any potentate since the death of Aurangzib. He was much too shrewd to be in a hurry to quarrel with the British, with whom he would have preferred an alliance; but the conduct of the Madras authorities was not encouraging. Then came the declaration of war between Britain and France; Haidar opened communications with Mauritius. Hastings, as a matter of course, issued from Calcutta orders for the seizure of the French factories. The French port of Mahé on the west coast could not be attacked without violating Haidar's territory, nevertheless the British seized it without reference to him. This was the last straw; and suddenly in July 1780 Haidar Ali

swept down from Mysore into the Carnatic with a hundred thousand men, ravaged the whole country, cut up one British detachment, and swept all the whites into Madras.

It was fortunate that the native powers were incapable of making common cause for any long time. The Nizam at once became more afraid of Haidar than of the British. The Maratha chiefs were playing each one for his own hand. At the moment Sindhia and Holkar were on the side of the Puna regency; the Gaekwar and the Bhonsla, the most westerly and the most easterly of the confederacy, were keeping aloof. In August, while Haidar was ravaging the Carnatic, a small British force under Popham and Bruce, which had been detached to Sindhia's territory, completely restored the prestige of British arms by surprising and capturing that prince's headquarters, the rock fortress of Gwalior, which was supposed to be impregnable. Sindhia, who had been acting farther south in conjunction with Holkar, was at once drawn back to take care of his own territories, the Gaekwar and the Bhonsla decided to do nothing, and Sindhia, finding that Holkar was gaining credit at his expense, began to reconsider the position. Thus the opportune capture of Gwalior had the practical effect of preventing any other power from co-operating with Haidar, and of leaving Hastings free to concentrate almost exclusively upon the defence of the Carnatic. Eyre Coote was despatched thither from Calcutta, and although he was grievously hampered by the mismanagement of the Madras government, he routed Haidar's forces three times during the summer of 1781. It was just after this that the declaration of war between Britain and Holland led to the capture of Negapatam and Trincomali.

The close of 1781, however, was the lowest moment of the British fortunes. Yorktown fell, Britain had lost her naval supremacy, and the ablest, perhaps, of all French admirals, Suffren, was making for the Indian Seas. Still the obstinate valour of the British commander Hughes and his subordinates, displayed during 1782 in a series of engagements none of which could be definitely described as a victory for either side, prevented the brilliant abilities of the French admiral from effecting anything of a decisive character. The old Sultan of Mysore—he was eighty years of age—died, and was succeeded by his much less capable if equally ambitious son Tippu Sahib or Tippu Sultan; and in the following year, just as it seemed that the decisive struggle was on the point of taking place, the news came that the peace preliminaries had been signed between France and Great Britain. The Madras government, in defiance of Hastings, stopped the operations against Tippu and made peace with him on terms which he was able to represent as having been dictated by himself as victor. Hostilities with the Marathas had ceased some time earlier.

Hastings had not desired or aimed at any extension of British territory, and the only actual addition made under him to the British dominion was that of the district of Benares, ceded by Oudh in return for British support. But it was his vigour and audacity which enabled Goddard and Popham to

neutralise the blunders of Bombay, and permitted Eyre Coote to retrieve the position in the Carnatic which had been so terribly jeopardised by the government of Madras. It was the diplomacy of Hastings which severed the Gaekwar and the Bhonsla from the Maratha confederacy, and impressed upon the particularly intelligent Sindhia the wisdom of avoiding an irreconcilable breach with the British. Happily, during the greater part of these complications with the country powers Hastings had very nearly a free hand, because of the disappearance of the cabal against him in his own council; though at the last he again lost some of his freedom of action, because the cabal against him in England, reinforced by Sir Philip Francis, was in the ascendant. But we have still to give attention to some other aspects of his rule in Bengal itself and with relation to Oudh.

These are affairs of which the most conspicuous belong rather to the province of the biographer rather than of the historian, since they did not permanently affect the position of the British, whereas they were utilised as leading features in indictments against the Governor-General. Still they cannot be passed over. The first of these is the suppression of Cheyte Singh, the Rajah of Benares.

When Shujah Daulah, the Oudh wazir, died, he was succeeded by his son, Asaf ud-Daulah. The Triumvirate, newly arrived in India, made exceedingly heavy demands on the new wazir, insisting on an increase of the subsidies granted by his father for the maintenance of troops under British control in Oudh. They required also for the same purpose the cession of the district of Benares, and at the same time they caused very serious embarrassment to the wazir by guaranteeing to the royal ladies or Begums, his mother and grandmother, a quantity of treasure left by the old wazir, as well as sundry very rich estates which ought in the natural course to have supplied the wazir's exchequer.

Now the title of Rajah, which had been conferred upon Cheyte Singh's father by the Oudh wazir, has no very precise translation. A rajah might be an independent monarch, or he might be merely a big landowner or *zemindar*, whose title meant less than that of an earl in England. Cheyte Singh, in short, was a vassal of the wazir of Oudh, who, by the transfer of Benares to the British, became a vassal of the British. He had paid a tribute to the wazir, and that tribute was now due to the British. When the Maratha war increased the Bengal exchequer's chronic need of money, Hastings demanded an increase of tribute from Benares. Such demands were a normal part of the oriental system; if the overlord could enforce them, they were paid; if he could not, they were not paid. Cheyte Singh tried to evade payment; Hastings imposed a fine by way of penalty. Still the rajah evaded payment. Hastings went to Benares with a very small escort and arrested him; the population rose, and Hastings was in no little personal danger. Nevertheless the revolt was very promptly suppressed; the rajah was deposed, and Benares was forfeited to the company. The fines imposed were heavy enough to be called vindictive, though in no way

contrary to oriental precedent; but Hastings had the excuse that Cheyte Singh was under very strong suspicion of treasonable correspondence with Haidar Ali, or at least of taking advantage of Haidar Ali's hostility to the British to seek his own liberation from his British overlords. The most serious interpretation of Hastings's action was that he deliberately intended to goad Cheyte Singh into revolt in order to have an excuse for forfeiting Benares; but that view is hardly warranted by the facts.

Next comes the affair of the Oudh Begums. Asaf ud-Daulah, having his revenues seriously curtailed as compared with those of his father by the action of the Bengal government controlled by the Triumvirate, failed to meet his obligations. The Bengal government threatened him, whereupon he pointed out that he would have been able to meet his obligations if the British had not guaranteed to the Begums the treasure which ought to have been at his disposal. That guarantee had been given by the vote of the majority of the council, in flat defiance of the Governor-General. But the Triumvirate was now dissolved, and Hastings considered himself at liberty to withdraw the guarantee. Moreover, there was again the excuse that the Begums were more than suspected of having encouraged and supported Cheyte Singh. Hastings cancelled the guarantee; the wazir proceeded to make seizure of the treasure; the Begums resisted, and were declared to be in a state of rebellion, which justified his intervention. With the help of the British, the wazir had no difficulty in enforcing his claims; but, as in the case of the Rohillas, no proper steps were taken to prevent him from adopting oriental methods in the treatment of the Begums and their supporters, although ultimately the Begums were placed upon a fairly liberal allowance. There is no possible doubt that in both these cases Hastings was actuated by the pressing need of replenishing the exchequer, and that a severity was exercised for which only extreme need could furnish a plausible excuse. But indubitably the extreme need was there, and, judged by native standards and native practice, the Governor-General's action was a mere matter of course.


A third matter which has been employed to blacken the fair fame not so much of Hastings as of Chief Justice Impey is the contest between the supreme court and the council, and the compromise by which it was terminated. We have seen that the judges sent out from England claimed to be responsible only to the Crown, not to the council in India or to the directors and proprietors at home. They seem to have regarded it as their special function to call government officials to account. The com-



Asaf ud-Daulah, Wazir of Oudh.

[From a contemporary painting by Home belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society.]

pany's officers were perpetually haled before the court sitting at Calcutta by every one with a grievance real or fictitious, until the administration was brought almost to a standstill. At length the council, who had control of the troops, were driven to ordering the orders of the courts to be ignored. Such a state of things could not be allowed to continue. Hastings had no wish to rob the supreme court of legitimate authority, but an authority which endeavoured to override the Government itself could not be regarded as legitimate. As matters stood, the ordinary jurisdiction in the country for criminal cases was in the hands of the nawab's officials, while



Warren Hastings.
[After the portrait by Lawrence.]

the fiscal and civil jurisdictions were in the hands of the company's revenue officers, the fiscal questions being those of primary importance. Hastings separated the civil and fiscal courts, and constituted a court of appeal in Calcutta; and he offered the presidency of this court of appeal to Impey as an officer of the company. By this means the practical supervision of legal administration was put in the hands of the Chief Justice, although, acting as an officer of the company, he was, in that position, responsible to the council. The compromise was a perfectly reasonable method of getting rid of a hopeless deadlock. Macaulay has succeeded in translating the transaction into a huge piece of corruption on the part of Impey, because a substantial salary was attached to his


new position; but in fact it was only by the expedient of enabling him to exercise supervisory functions as a servant of the company that he could be freed from the necessity of exercising them as an independent authority, and he could not exercise them as an independent authority without coming into collision with the council. The arrangement was a *modus vivendi* which required sanction from home to be rendered permanent, and the purpose in view was substantially achieved. Impey, however, was consistently a supporter of Hastings, and consequently his conduct, like that of Hastings himself, was habitually distorted and misrepresented by the cabal in England, whose presentation of the case against Hastings generally won public acceptance until the investigations of a later age revealed their injustice.

VI

NORTH, THE WHIGS, AND THE YOUNGER PITT

Lord North held office from 1770 till March 1782. Throughout that time the king was supreme. North did his bidding, often very much against his own will; and at the general elections which took place the ministry always retained the support of the country.

That support had been won by the Crown's appropriation of the old methods by which Walpole and Newcastle had procured their majorities. Public money, patronage carried through every department, the distribution of sinecures, the ejection of political opponents from every kind of office in civil, military, and naval administration, secured the subserviency of parliament and the votes of the electorate. The system broke down in the long run because it produced an inefficiency so intolerable that the king was obliged to place him-



Lord North.

self in the hands of ministers who declined to look upon obedience to the Crown as their first duty. After an interval he found a minister of a very different type from Lord North, with whom he could work in harmony but whom he could not dominate. He retained enough of his personal power to be able in one critical case to override that minister's will with disastrous results; but the new royal supremacy which operated during Lord North's twelve years was a proved failure and was not again revived.

The North administration, destructive from an imperial point of view, was almost barren in domestic affairs. One measure for the relief of Roman Catholics in 1778 stand to its credit. Their disabilities in the inheritance and purchase of land were abolished, and the celebration of the Roman

Catholic rites ceased to be a penal offence in England. Nevertheless, the proposal of a similar measure for Scotland was received in that country with such an outburst of fanatical wrath that it had to be dropped. Even in England it was possible to work up the "No Popery" agitation to such a pitch that in 1780 the half-crazed Lord George Gordon stirred up a frenzy of rioting which the most disorderly elements of the community turned to their own account. Prisons were broken open, much damage was done, and the disturbances were only suppressed when the king himself assumed the responsibility of which ministers were afraid and ordered out the military to deal with the rioters.

The corruption of the existing system was brought home to the Whigs when they found it employed against them instead of in the interests of the great Whig families. The North administration began to totter at the end of 1777. North himself would willingly have given place to Chatham, but Chatham died; the only alternative to North was a Rockingham administration, and North held on. The Whigs directed their attacks against the system which excluded them from office; Burke brought in a bill for "Economic Reform," which meant mainly the abolition of sinecures and of the expenditure of public money as a means of corruption. But when it came to details so many private interests were touched that the bill failed. Chatham himself, at an earlier stage, had desired a parliamentary reform which would have abolished the pocket boroughs, and would to a considerable extent have anticipated the great Reform Bill which was passed in 1832. But both the king and the Whigs relied too much on the manipulation of pocket boroughs to approve of such a plan. The most notable outcome in parliament of the attack upon the prevailing system was the passing in 1780 of Dunning's famous resolution that "The power of the Crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished."

The disasters of the war, however, culminating in the surrender at Yorktown, made it impossible for the king to maintain his resistance to North's resignation. In March 1782 Rockingham accepted the task of forming an administration, prominent in which were Lord Shelburne, who represented Chatham's personal followers, and Charles James Fox, the son of Chatham's ancient rival, who at a very early stage had identified himself with the most extreme section of those Whigs who advocated the colonial cause in the most uncompromising fashion as the cause of political liberty. Burke, by far the greatest man among the Whigs, was not regarded as a practical parliamentarian and was given only a minor office. William Pitt, the younger son of Lord Chatham, who had already astonished the House by his precocious talents, declined, though he was only two and twenty, to join the ministry in a subordinate position. Three months later Rockingham died. Shelburne, by the king's choice, became the head of the ministry, and Fox resigned, being followed into opposition by Burke and some others who were personally hostile to Shelburne, who, in his turn, was the minister most in personal accord with the king, with the exception of the Lord

Chancellor Thurlow, the one survivor from North's cabinet. Young Pitt took office as Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The Shelburne ministry was divided by distrust; its main business was the settlement of the terms of peace. Fox with his followers, and North with his followers, joined in attacking the Government, which was deserted by one after another of its members. In February 1783 the two leaders of the Opposition formed an open coalition. Such a junction of opposites was without parallel, but it was decisive. Shelburne resigned; and after some weeks of despairing efforts to procure a ministry to his liking, George was obliged to surrender to the coalition. The Treasury was given to Portland as the nominal head of the administration, while Fox and North became Secretaries of State.

Pitt at an earlier stage had rejected overtures from Fox, which would have involved what he regarded as the betrayal of Shelburne; and he declined absolutely to be associated with North.

The coalition was the most extraordinary on record. For twelve years North had represented the principle of complete subserviency to the king and

of an uncompromising resistance to the claims of the colonies. Fox had advocated the cause of the colonies with a vehemence which verged upon treason, and had denounced the power of the Crown in unmeasured terms. There was no single point on which a positive agreement between the two could have been anticipated. A coalition between Shelburne and either Fox or North would have involved very much less strain than the coalition of 1757 between the elder Pitt and Newcastle. But that combination had been possible for the simple reason that every one concerned saw that nothing else could save the country from immediate ruin. The coalition of 1783 had no principles and apparently but one object, the exclusion of Shelburne. To that end, North consented that the Crown should be treated with respect but not with deference; and the two groups hitherto hostile presented for the time being a united front.

Shelburne being out, the coalition found no further need for demanding material modifications in the peace preliminaries which they had first condemned. Their Treaty of Versailles, signed in September, made no changes of consequence. The next question of the hour therefore was that of the government of India; and this during the last twenty years had come to be complicated by the presence in England of increasing numbers of the



“England Made Odious, or the French Dressers.”

[A caricature on Shelburne and Fox at the time of the arrangement of the Treaty of Versailles.]

"Nabobs"—men who had amassed great wealth in India, especially under the conditions prevailing before Lord North's Regulating Act. They were courted by the politicians; they were often large shareholders in the East India Company; they liked to feel themselves to be persons of importance and of influence; and they regarded patronage in India as to a great extent a perquisite of their own. The course of events in India had been very little understood by the public at large, and even those who, like Edmund Burke, had interested themselves in it honestly and deeply, had been led astray as to the actual facts by the misrepresentations of Francis and his friends. The House of Commons and the court of directors were both strongly biased against Hastings, who was preposterously blamed for not having prevented the blunders of the Madras and Bombay governments; and the Governor-General would have been recalled at an earlier date, but for the persistent confidence in him of the court of proprietors with which lay the final control of the new appointments under the Regulating Act.

Fox, then, introduced a bill for the better government of India. The political direction from London was to be withdrawn from the courts of directors and proprietors, and vested in a body of seven commissioners appointed by parliament for four years. Absolute control of policy and patronage was to be in the hands of the commissioners; vacancies in their number were to be filled by nominees of the Crown. A second body of commissioners, chosen by parliament from among the proprietors, was to control commerce, the vacancies among its nine members being filled by the court of proprietors.

The scheme at once aroused the hostility of the whole commercial community as being an abrogation of the East Indian Company's charter, and destructive of the position of all chartered companies. Politically it was resented as placing the whole of the Indian patronage virtually in the hands of the present majority in the House of Commons, who would thereby be enabled to secure the solid support of the nabobs at home, and therewith, as it was argued, a control of the electorate which would secure that majority permanently in power. The king saw in the bill the death-blow of the royal authority; the Opposition saw in it the death-blow of electoral liberty; and the mercantile community felt that their interests as a body were jeopardised by the violation of the East India Company's charter.

But the coalition had an overwhelming preponderance in the House of Commons. The bill was carried in that chamber by a large majority. The vote of the House of Lords was uncertain, but was decided by the action of the king, who made it known that he would treat the voting upon it as a personal matter. This turned the scale with many of those peers who in the past had been associated with North. The peers rejected the bill. The Government carried in the Commons a vote of censure on the unconstitutional intervention of the Crown. George dismissed the ministers, and Pitt accepted appointment as First Lord of the Treasury.

The obvious course for the dismissed ministers was to demand a dissolution. The rejection of a bill passed by a large majority in the House of Commons had been procured in the House of Lords by the king's unconstitutional interference. An appeal to the country on that issue would have given them an almost irresistible case, and the appeal could hardly have been refused. But they did not want a dissolution. They imagined that they could force the young minister to resign, and George to recall them to office, without risking an election which might weaken their preponderance because of the unpopularity of the India Bill. Thus they delivered themselves into Pitt's hands. Practically single-handed he fought from day to day in the House of Commons against the most famous orators and debaters of the time, and day by day the tide of his popularity rose in the country. The Opposition had dropped the constitutional issue which was their most valuable asset, and had made Pitt a present of a new one by claiming the right to force themselves upon the king, to dictate to him the choice of ministers, without an appeal to the country. And day by day the India Bill became more and more unpopular. At last Pitt felt that his moment had come; Parliament was dissolved in March, a mere remnant of the coalition were able to retain their seats, and Pitt came back to parliament with a record majority at his back.

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

I

IRELAND

THE eighteenth century had still some years to run when the destinies of the British Empire were committed to the guidance of William Pitt the Younger. But at this point a new era was dawning, an era of convulsion and revolution, political, social, and intellectual. The characteristic movements associated with the century had run their course, and if "The Eighteenth Century" is a somewhat inaccurate title for a chapter reviewing aspects of the period which have been left apart for continuous treatment, it is still more nearly appropriate than any other. Of these deferred subjects the first place is claimed by Ireland, which at the end of the period had acquired a greater political prominence than it had known since the sixteenth century, and had begun to assert as it had never done before a political nationality.

The triumph of the Revolution of 1688 had meant in Ireland a complete ascendancy of one-fifth of the population over the rest, and at the same time the subordination of that ruling Protestant minority to England, or, after the union of England and Scotland, to Great Britain. The Protestant alone had political rights, a voice in the parliament, a hand in the administration, a right to bear arms, to practise his religion freely, to educate his children in his own faith, to accumulate landed property. Even the inheritance of land was denied to the Roman Catholic whose brother was a Protestant. The political disabilities of the Romanist were partly shared by the Protestant dissenter.

The Protestant ascendancy was bound up with the Hanoverian succession. Protestant loyalty therefore was assured; and the Protestants could not have ventured upon any serious protest against the political subjection to the authority on the other side of St. George's Channel, even if their political aspirations had been active enough to make them desire to do so. Not only did they differ in faith from the great bulk of the population, but they were also to a large extent aliens, descendants of Scots or English who had dispossessed the old proprietors. Their very existence depended, or seemed to depend, upon an ascendancy which could only be maintained

by the sanction of force, and that sanction would disappear if they quarrelled with the English government.


But Protestants as well as Catholics suffered from the economic conditions. Virtually the only industries permitted by the English commercial laws were the cultivation of the soil and the linen manufacture; even the export of wool was prohibited. And if the Protestants had the administration and the legislature to themselves, the powers of the latter were exceedingly limited. A bill could be initiated only by the Privy Council, and before it was passed by the Irish parliament it had to be submitted to the English Privy Council, which might simply suppress it. Any amendments or alterations inserted by that body became substantive parts of the bill, which was then presented for acceptance or rejection as it stood by the Irish parliament. During the reign of George I. a Declaratory Act was passed in the British parliament which asserted the right of that body to legislate for Ireland on its own account without reference to the Irish parliament at all.

Still, during the first half of the century, Ireland lay almost inert, in a helpless bondage, although Jonathan Swift denounced the whole system with scathing satire. There was no organised effort on the part of the depressed majority to claim the rights of citizenship, or on the part of the dominant minority to assert an equality of citizenship with English and Scots. It was not till George III. was already seated on the throne that the revival of political aspirations and political activity began to make itself decisively felt.

At no time in their history have the Irish people been possessed with the spirit of legality which is so notable a characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon; and one at least of the causes for this is to be found in the fact that the law has been for them at all times something imposed upon them from outside by an alien conqueror, not, as with the Anglo-Saxon, a system evolved by natural development out of their own racial institutions. The Anglo-Saxon appeals to the law instinctively for protection from tyranny; to the Irishmen the law presented itself as sanctioning and supporting tyranny. If he suffered he did not appeal to that law for protection, but set the law itself at defiance and became a law unto himself, which is an attitude altogether unintelligible to the mind of the Anglo-Saxon, for whom, as for the Romans, the great imperial race of the ancient world, the sanctity of the law dominates all other considerations. In the eighteenth century the rural population found themselves oppressed by the law; and the first breaking up of their inertia took the form of fighting the law; not of seeking its amendment, which appeared to be a hopeless endeavour. The Irish peasant felt the pinch of oppression in the relations between landlord and tenant which were founded in the Protestant ascendancy and aggravated by absenteeism. The peasant began to fight the law by the formation of secret societies which exercised a counter-tyranny through the cruel outrages commonly resorted to by weakness which recognises no law. These

societies, "Whiteboys" and others, were exclusively agrarian and, at least to begin with, were neither religious nor political. If most of the landed proprietors were Protestant, there were districts also where there were many Protestants among the tenantry, so that the antagonism of classes was not exclusively an antagonism of religions.

At the same time the political instincts of the dominant class were awakening. What may be called a national party, a body which was discontented with the subordination of Ireland to Great Britain, a body which claimed that the legislature should do something more than register the decrees of the parliament at Westminster and of the British Privy Council, was coming into being. Its first demands were that money bills



The Irish Parliament House in the 18th century.
Now the Bank of Ireland.]

should originate in the Irish parliament itself, and that the principle of Septennial parliaments recognised in England should be applied also to Ireland. A third demand was for a Habeas Corpus Act, hitherto denied to Ireland, though acknowledged as a fundamental condition of the liberty of the subject in England. And behind these demands there were two more upon which the governing class were by no means agreed—one that the Catholics should no longer be treated as political pariahs, and the other for what in England was called Economic Reform. For the abuses of the electoral system in England were intensified in Ireland and in Scotland also; pensions and places were government instruments of corruption; and an immense number of constituencies were controlled by a few persons known as "Undertakers," who obviously were peculiarly exposed to these corrupting influences.

These demands became active about the time of the accession of George

III., and they were invigorated by the development of the constitutional issue between the British parliament and the American colonies. Still the British parliament would have nothing to say to a Septennial Act or a Habeas Corpus Act, while the Irish parliament made a point of rejecting the money bills sent over by the Privy Council from England.

When Charles Townshend became Chancellor of the Exchequer his brother, Lord Townshend, was sent to Ireland as Viceroy. It was intended that this viceroyalty should inaugurate a new departure. Hitherto the viceroy had resided in Ireland only for six months in two years of office; for the other eighteen months "Lord Justices"—in other words the Undertakers—had effective control of the administration. The Undertakers stood to George in Ireland in something of the same relation as the Whig connection in England. The king wanted to break up their power as a combination while appropriating some of it to his own uses. This end was to be achieved partly by the continuous residence of the viceroy and partly by corruption. In the next place, however, George was determined to obtain an augmentation of the standing army in Ireland at the expense of that country. The assent of Ireland to such a proposal could not be obtained unless some kind of a bargain, a *quid pro quo*, should be offered.

The concession first put forward was that the judges should be made removable on an address presented by both Houses of the Irish parliament on the English analogy; but the plan broke down on the demand of the British Privy Council that such an address should require endorsement by the Irish Privy Council. Then Townshend introduced an Octennial instead of a Septennial Bill, because the Irish parliament only sat in alternate years. The bill became law, the Government gained ground in a general election, and the augmentation scheme was passed, though the persistency of friction was demonstrated by another British refusal of the Habeas Corpus Act and another Irish rejection of a money bill sent from England. Townshend, however, judged himself strong enough to join battle with the Undertakers. Parliament was prorogued at the end of 1769, and when it met again in 1771 he had secured his majority by a lavish employment of every means of corruption at his disposal. The scandal, however, was too conspicuous, and next year Lord Harcourt took his place.

The Irish demand was now concentrating upon the question whether the control of taxation was to lie in effect with the Irish or the British Legislature. The burden pressed very heavily upon Ireland; and the Irish parliament proposed to meet the financial strain by taxing absentee landowners. Absenteeism inflicted grave injury on Ireland, because, among other reasons, the great rents drawn were expended not in Ireland but in England. Many of the greatest estates in Ireland were the property of Whigs who had still larger estates in England, and not unnaturally complained that they were to be penalised for residing on their English instead

of on their Irish estates. The Rockingham group, who were hard hit by the proposed legislation, found themselves disapproving of Irish control of Irish taxation, while they were committing themselves to the strenuous advocacy of American control of American taxation, though Chatham and his followers refused to allow the personal consideration any weight against a constitutional principle. Thus it was a matter of course that Irish public opinion was completely in sympathy with the Americans, and when the American War broke out the British government had no little ground for fearing that Ireland would follow the American example.

This fear was responsible for an inclination on the part of North's ministry to placate Irish sentiment in order that their own anxieties might be relieved. Hence North proposed a relaxation of the commercial restrictions on Ireland; but the determined refusal of the British commercial community to suffer Irish competition was too strong for the Government, and as in the case of the resistance of the English landlords to the absentee tax, British interests carried the day against those of Ireland. The concessions were reduced to little more than the admission of Ireland to the benefits of the Navigation Acts (1778).

More effective was the measure of Catholic relief extended to Ireland, where the penal laws were still more stringent and more flagrantly unjust than in England. The worst features of the laws affecting the purchase and inheritance of land by Roman Catholics were done away with. Though a Catholic was still unable to purchase a freehold, he could take what came to practically the same thing, a lease for nine hundred and ninety-nine years; and at the same time the laws which divided inherited land among all the sons, and the more iniquitous law which conferred the entire inheritance upon a Protestant brother, were abolished.

The close resemblance of the case for Ireland to the case for the colonies, the correspondence between their constitutional and commercial grievances, and the aggravation of the Irish case by the racial, agrarian, and religious questions, were sufficient warrant for alarm lest the Irish should take example by the colonists. The French intervention in 1778 gave the Irish an opportunity for a remarkable demonstration of their loyalty to the Empire in despite of grievances. The Government required every soldier it could muster to face its new foes. It had to withdraw the troops from Ireland and to take the immensely increased risk of an Irish insurrection and of the descent of French troops upon the island, as in the time of the Revolution of 1688; for, as we have seen, the British fleet at this stage was very far from holding an effective control of the seas. But instead of using England's peril as Ireland's opportunity for extorting concessions, the Protestants all over the country formed associations for imperial defence, arming and drilling enthusiastic companies of volunteers; and they were aided by liberal subscriptions from the Catholics, who were themselves forbidden by the law to carry arms. The great volunteer movement was emphatically imperial and loyalist, not insurrectionary.

Nevertheless, it was undeniable that the development of the volunteer movement involved a material change in the situation. The volunteers were there to fight for the country ; like the army of the parliament in the great Civil War, *mutatis mutandis*, they stood for the national cause, and the nation could not afford to disband them while threatened by foreign invasion. But they were men with grievances which they meant to have remedied ; they might combine insistence on the remedies with their loyal enthusiasm ; and if the remedies were not conceded they might postpone loyalty to insistence on redress. Certainly the leaders would not urge their demands for redress less energetically when they and the Government both knew that the appeal to force had become practicable. When parliament met in the autumn of 1779 the foreign menace had become more marked because Spain also had declared war. The loyalty of the address to the Crown was unqualified ; but it was coupled with a strongly expressed demand urged by all the leaders, of whom the most notable were Flood and Grattan, for the abolition of commercial restrictions. Supply was granted for six months only, and a bill for the relief of dissenters from the religious test, which had been rejected in England, was again introduced and passed. The argument was too convincing to be resisted. The British parliament opened the foreign trade to Ireland on the same terms as the foreign trade of Great Britain.

Specific grievances might be remedied by consent of Great Britain under pressure ; but there was nothing to prevent their reimposition when the pressure was removed. So long as the parliament at Westminster asserted its right to legislate for Ireland, so long as the English Privy Council could dictate legislation in the Irish parliament, Ireland was in the position not of a partner in the Empire but of a subject province. By every principle of English liberty asserted when William of Orange was called to the throne of England, king, lords, and commons in Ireland should be the sovereign body there as they were the sovereign body in England, and the Privy Council had no better right to authority in one country than in the other. In effect, the Irish leaders claimed at this stage that the union of Great Britain with Ireland was by rights no more intimate than the union of England and Scotland under one crown before 1707. They claimed for Ireland the independence which had always belonged to Scotland until she voluntarily accepted the incorporation with England. The theory was one which could not possibly be accepted without self stultification by the North ministry, which was irrevocably committed to the doctrine that the British parliament was supreme over all parts of the Empire ; even the Rockinghams had asserted that the supremacy could not be abrogated, though it ought only to be exercised in the very last resort.



Henry Flood.

[From a contemporary drawing
by J. Comerford.]

In April 1780 a resolution embodying the principle of independence was moved by Grattan but was not put to the vote. The next practical step was the introduction in the Irish parliament of an Irish Mutiny Bill. The point was this. The authority of the British parliament to legislate for Ireland had now been openly challenged. On Grattan's hypothesis, therefore, the English Mutiny Act had no validity in Ireland. Its effective administration depended on the magistrates; and the magistrates held with Grattan. Therefore, for the control of the army in Ireland there was need of a Mutiny Act passed by the Irish parliament itself. The Irish Mutiny Act, if it were annual, would give the same security to the Irish parliament which had been given to the English parliament by the annual Mutiny Act in England. The North ministry evaded the trap. The Mutiny Bill sent from Ireland was accepted, but it was made perpetual instead of annual; and when it was returned to Ireland in this shape, the government influence was sufficient to procure a majority which passed it. But the parliamentary majority was like Newcastle's in 1766; it was representative not of public opinion, not even of the opinion of the classes which monopolised political liberty, but only of the power of corruption. Outside parliament the demand for independence was as unanimous as the demand had been in England for Pitt to supersede Newcastle at the helm of the state in 1756.

Nevertheless, the volunteers were not to be shaken from their principle of associating the demand for political liberty with an unswerving loyalty. The surrender of Yorktown only confirmed them in this attitude. It was not government influence but the principle of loyalism that made them refuse an amendment to the address which would have added to it a demand for independence. Altogether the proceedings in the winter of 1781-82 showed great fluctuations of voting. There were stalwarts who, without fear of being called disloyal, voted steadily for the demands of Grattan and Flood. There was a less uncompromising group which voted with them, except when it felt that the Government in its present straits ought not to be pressed too hard. There were the solid supporters of the Government. And there were still those who generally took their orders from the Government, but occasionally ventured to vote with the Opposition. It was not difficult to infer the real trend of opinion, but at any moment the voting in parliament might run directly counter to the real general feeling.

But in February 1782 an assembly of delegates of the volunteers was summoned to meet at Dungannon. There was no doubt at all that this body was genuinely representative; they made it equally clear that public opinion endorsed the demands of Flood and Grattan; and, at Grattan's own instance, they added demands for the further relaxation of the penal code against the Catholics. In March the North ministry resigned, and the second Rockingham ministry accepted in the main the three Irish demands. The Mutiny Act was limited to two years, the control exercised by the Irish and English Privy Councils was abolished, and the obnoxious Declaratory Act was repealed. Grattan's parliament, the independent parliament of

Ireland, had come into being. The repeal of the Declaratory Act was confirmed and secured against misinterpretation in the following year by the Renunciatory Act, which expressly declared that the British parliament had not the power of legislating for Ireland. A new but brief chapter in the history of Ireland was opened, to be ended by the Incorporating Union of 1800.

II

ENCLOSURE, MACHINERY, AND CANALS


From the beginning of the seventeenth century until the middle of the eighteenth there was a steady and continuous commercial and maritime expansion, but it was attended by no great changes in the rural and industrial populations. The era of enclosures had come to an end; the greater part of the country in fact remained still unenclosed and still cultivated under the open field system, tilled by the small farmers, yeomen, copyholders, or small tenants-at-will who, in ordinary circumstances, remained in undisturbed occupation from generation to generation. The cottar and the labourer had little inclination and little temptation to migrate from the parish of their birth; if they did move they became liable under the Restoration Law of Settlement to be promptly ordered back to their previous abode lest any parish should find itself chargeable with the maintenance of pauper immigrants from other districts. The Elizabethan Poor Law prevented actual destitution, and generally provided some sort of work for the able-bodied. The development of the domestic industries of spinning and weaving supplemented the earnings of the farm-hand, and yielded a margin for the small farmer who lived chiefly upon the produce of his farm. Some new industries, too, were developed by the Huguenot immigrants who fled from the persecution of Louis XIV.

For the first fifty years of the eighteenth century matters went on in very much the same fashion. Yeoman and cottar lived on, not in penury but in a respectable kind of poverty, very rarely on the verge of starvation, but very rarely in a condition of what could fairly be called comfort. The age was apathetic and unambitious, too unambitious to be discontented; and benevolent moralists observed with satisfaction that children were taught the virtues of industry and helped to earn their own living almost as soon as they could talk. There was very little in the shape of class antagonism, none of the opposition between capital and labour which was the outcome of a later industrialism, none of the opposition between gentry and peasantry which was presently to become so terribly conspicuous in France—because in England the peasantry were in no sense serfs, and the gentry were commonly disposed to a mildly paternal benevolence. There was no incentive to agricultural progress because the old open field system still kept the comparatively enterprising spirits among the small holders at

the mercy of their slow-moving neighbours. The small farmer, even if he had the will, lacked the means to try experiments or to adopt new methods which paid when they were applied upon a large but not upon a small scale.

On the other hand, considerable progress was made in agricultural methods by large proprietors. They introduced the growing of roots and

grasses; they adopted an improved rotation of crops, and very considerable advances were made in cattle-breeding. But the point to be immediately observed is that the progress was made on the estates where enclosure had already been carried out—enclosure, that is, in the sense of the abolition of the open fields made up of acre strips, and the substitution of the large enclosed fields worked under a single management. The yeoman farmed for subsistence, the owner of a large estate farmed for commercial profit; he could turn experiment and enterprise to financial account, while he was able to produce at less cost than the small farmer with his antiquated methods. As yet, however, the yeoman



A typical "strip" farm or open field.

[At Laxton, Northants. Retained until late in the 19th century.]

did not feel the pinch of competition. The owner of a great estate might be desirous of extending his operations and anxious to carry enclosure further; but the yeoman, as long as he could hold his ground, was not inclined to make way for him, and he was able to hold his ground by help of the subsidiary occupations of weaving and spinning. Enclosure went on during the first half of the eighteenth century, but it went on very slowly.

Then a change began to set in, the change which brought about the practical extinction of the yeoman and the absorption of the land of the small freeholder and copyholder into the large estate. It is possible that if there had been no Industrial Revolution the yeoman and the cottar might have survived; possible but not probable, for the yeoman, through no fault of his own, or only partly by his own fault, stood in the way


of agricultural progress and prevented the development of the productive power of the country. The mere necessity for that development would probably have swept him away in any case, but his fate was sealed by the destruction of the domestic industries which had kept him afloat. Oliver Goldsmith, in his *Deserted Village* (1770), gives a sentimental description of the decay of rural life, attributed to the greed and oppression of the wealthy; but in fact the yeoman and the cottar were finding themselves no longer able to make a living; they were perishing from economic pressure, not from the avarice of their wealthier neighbours, who were able to make infinitely more productive the land which small men were driven to resign, while the small men themselves were absorbed into the mass of wage-labourers.

Throughout the first half of the eighteenth century four-fifths of the population, or not much less, was rural, living not in the towns but in farms and villages, and practically the whole of that rural population was occupied simultaneously with agriculture in the inclusive sense and the domestic industries. In the neighbourhood of the centres of cloth manufacture, still the principal manufacture of the country, the domestic industries were their mainstay and the field-work was supplementary. Further afield the order was reversed, and the product of field-work was supplemented by the domestic industries. Textiles of one sort or another—woollens, cotton, linen, silk—were the principal products, woollens having an immense preponderance in England, linens in Ireland and to a less degree in Scotland. Silk was the specialty of the Huguenot immigrants, and the importance of cotton was still in the future.

The spinning and weaving on which these manufactures depended were domestic industries—industries, that is to say, conducted at the fireside of each household—so long as the loom and the spinning-wheel might properly be called not machines but tools. When we distinguish between tools and machinery we mean by the former implements driven by the workman himself, by the latter implements in which another driving power is brought into play. Machinery existed in the windmills and water-mills, where the power of wind and water was utilised for grinding corn, and in the steam-pump, an invention of the last century which was in use chiefly in mines. The great feature of the last forty years of the century was the invention of machinery driven first by water power and then by steam power, which began by displacing the hand-loom and the spinning-wheel, and went on to revolutionise the entire industrial system.

The era of inventions was initiated with what was still a new "tool." The weavers could not produce fast enough; that is to say, the spinners could supply them with yarn faster than they could weave it. The output of the weavers was doubled when John Kay invented the fly-shuttle in 1732, for the new shuttle enabled them to weave cloth of double width. The spinners were left behind until, in 1764, Hargreave invented the spinning-jenny, which worked eight spindles at once by a single action; and

Hargreave was followed five years later by Richard Arkwright, who invented a jenny driven by water power. Arkwright's water-frame was the harbinger of the new machinery. It initiated the application of water power to manufacture; and the application of water power was the beginning of the end of domestic industries, because the hand worker could not compete with the machines, and the machines were necessarily set up not in the farm-house or cottage but where water power was available on the banks of streams. The water-frame was followed ten years later by Crompton's machine known as the "mule"; but the weavers did not get a power-loom



An old hand weaver at his loom.
[From the "Universal Magazine," 1747.]


until Cartwright's machine was invented in 1784. So far as concerned these two domestic industries of spinning and weaving, all the advances from 1764 until 1784 were in spinning.

Any improvements in tools and machinery mean that for a given expenditure of human energy and labour either a better quality or a greater quantity of goods can be produced, or both. An improvement in quality is a benefit which has no drawbacks; increase in quantity is injurious to the producer unless increased demand keep pace with increased supply. Labour-saving is almost always beneficial in the long run, because in the long run demand overtakes supply; but it is not always so at the outset. Thus,

before the invention of the spinning-jenny, it was the spinners who gained by the fly-shuttle, because the weavers with their increased power of production wanted all the yarn they could get. But for a time there was not enough yarn to go round among the weavers, and their profits were reduced. Then the spinning-jenny multiplied the productive capacity of the spinners; the weavers got as much yarn as they could manage, and a smaller number of spinners than before were able with ease to meet the whole available demand; therefore the spinners in their turn suffered. When the public wanted all that the clothiers could supply, the clothiers wanted all that the weavers could supply, and the weavers wanted all that the spinners could supply, every one was the better; but when the weavers wanted more than the spinners could supply they suffered, and when they wanted less the spinners suffered. It was only in the long run that the balance became adjusted, when lowered prices increased the demand.

In the period of which we are speaking the balance was not adjusted; the whole mass of those whose livelihood depended mainly or partly upon

the spinning-wheel suffered, and that meant the greater portion of the rural population. In part at least this was the cause of the disappearance of the cottar and yeoman, and the rapid progress of enclosure. And this in turn meant the increase of poverty and even of destitution in the rural districts, and a demand for a revised administration of the poor law in order to cope with it. Once again poor relief became a pressing problem, which was dealt with by Gilbert's Acts in 1782. One of these was directed to the combination of parishes in unions for the better organisation of poor law administration. But the Acts between them introduced a system of outdoor relief for the able-bodied, and gave extended power to the magistrates for the application of rates to the mitigation of distress. The magistrates were benevolent and well-intentioned, but short-sighted; and later we shall



The canal aqueduct over the river Irwell.

[From a print of 1793.]

see that before the end of the century they applied their powers with most disastrous results.

In another field a great change was inaugurated, the precursor of another change which was to be in operation three-quarters of a century later. Until after the middle of the eighteenth century, traffic and communication were conducted entirely by road, that is, by the packhorse and the waggon, or by sea. Practically no use was made of waterways; the roads themselves were for the most part villainously bad, and the cost of transport was exceedingly heavy. The Duke of Bridgewater was the pioneer of the canal system. He discovered an engineer of extraordinary genius in the person of the wholly illiterate James Brindley, and in 1758 he obtained sanction by an Act of parliament for the construction of a canal between Worsley and Manchester. In 1761 the canal was opened, although Brindley's schemes for it had been jeered at as visionary and impracticable. Men saw with amazement ships passing over an aqueduct forty feet above the river Irwell. So much did this seven-mile canal reduce the cost of carriage between Worsley and Manchester that the price of coal

in Manchester was halved. The effect of Brindley's success was instantaneous. In the next twenty years many hundreds of miles of canals were planned and carried out; before the end of the century there was a network of canals all over the country. An infinitely greater bulk of goods could be carried in much greater security on barges than in waggons, at a very much smaller expenditure of horse power and labour, though there was no diminution of either, owing to the enormous increase in the amount of traffic.

The spirit of invention was abroad. Hitherto we have spoken of it only in its application to the industries which touched the agrarian population. English pottery also rose to a new eminence, Josiah Wedgwood leading the way. But of all the inventions the most decisively influential on the national industries were those which were concerned with iron, coal, and steam. The development of the iron industry depended upon the furnace, and in the first half of the century charcoal was still the necessary fuel. Hence, although the quantity of iron in the soil was immense the output was small; the iron-fields were limited to the regions where forests were available, and Sussex held a foremost place among the iron counties. Coal was of no use, because a sufficient blast could not be obtained, although towards the middle of the century there was a considerable development in the use of coke in the works of the Darbies of Coalbrookdale. But in 1760 Smeaton applied water power to the production of a blast which at once enormously increased the employment first of coke and then of coal as fuel, as well as the output of iron. Iron rapidly became the standard material for purposes for which it had hitherto been undreamed of, and the first iron bridge was carried over the Severn in 1779.

This association of iron with coal instead of with charcoal gave an enormous advantage in production to the districts where iron and coal-fields were contiguous, and it drove out of the industrial race the iron districts like Sussex, which depended upon charcoal, as they were too remote from the coal regions to make use of that fuel. In these districts, therefore, there was a diminution of employment; whereas there was rapidly increasing employment both in the coalpits and in the iron works of the north and the midlands. It must be borne in mind, however, that the shifting of the population only followed the shifting of employment very slowly. The physical difficulties of migration were immense. It is easier to-day for the working-man to transport himself with his family from England to Canada than it was a hundred and fifty years ago for the Sussex labourer to remove himself to Lancashire. And to the physical difficulty of transport was added the artificial barrier of the Restoration Law of Settlement, which allowed the local authority to send the immigrant back to the parish or hundred of his birth.

The development of the coalfields and of the iron industry necessarily went together; the development of both and their mutual need of each other was enormously advanced when the inventions of James Watt made

steam the motive power of machinery. Iron was the material of which the new machinery was made, and the steam by which it was driven demanded coal. The steam-engine was the last and most important factor in the creation of the new industrialism which subsisted upon coal and iron. The steam-engine had established itself securely in the iron works before the American War was over and during the next decade; and it was rapidly pushing to the front as the leading power for driving mills. The effects will be discussed in a later chapter dealing with the period when they had come into full play.

In the first twenty years of George III. the employment of steam power was still in its infancy. Watt's steam-engine was the child of Newcomen's steam-pump, which, with modifications, had been worked in mines for half a century without leading to any notable development, when James Watt began his experiments. Watt, who at the time was engaged as a maker of mathematical instruments in Glasgow, was employed to repair one of these engines in 1763. The pump suggested experiments from which Watt very soon realised the tremendous powers of steam and the principles by which it could be employed in the service of man. The first opportunities for developing his ideas in practical material shape were given him in Roebuck's iron works at Carron near Glasgow; but it was not till 1776 that a really successful engine was constructed for Wilkinson, the Iron King, at Boxley; hitherto the practical difficulty of obtaining accurate workmanship in the hard metal which was required had stood in the way. When once that difficulty was mastered progress was rapid.



Adam Smith.

[From a medallion by Tassie.]

One more event must be recorded which forms a landmark in economic history, the publication in 1776 of Adam Smith's *Enquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. For nearly three centuries the doctrines collectively described as the Mercantile Theory had been generally accepted. With national power as the state's grand object, it had been assumed to be the business of the state to control commerce and industry, and to direct them along the channels most conducive to national power; wealth or material prosperity was assumed to follow power; and since the possession of treasure, that is to say gold and silver, was accepted as a condition of national power, the accumulation of treasure, the exchange of goods for treasure, was one of the leading objects which the state set before itself in the control of commerce. Other objects were maritime expansion and the encouragement of industries which were looked upon as fostering a healthy and vigorous breed of Englishmen. It was an accident, not of the essence, of the theory, that mercantilism carried with it in practice the protection of native industries against foreign competition. Adam Smith rejected the "treasure" theory, because the balance of trade rectifies itself automatically.

If there is deficiency of treasure in the country, money is in demand and its value in exchange rises ; in other words, prices fall ; the foreigner sees a market in which he can buy cheaply, and treasure flows in again. Not treasure in particular, but material wealth in general, the abundance of useful commodities, is the source of power, and the maximum amount of general wealth is to be obtained not by the artificial direction of commerce and industry into particular channels, but by leaving the individual to pursue his own interest. Power follows wealth, not wealth power ; everything which checks the development of wealth checks also the development of power ; and therefore all restrictions for the direction of commerce and industry are *prima facie* injurious. Further, it is a mistake to suppose that our own prosperity is increased by injury to our neighbour's, and that their prosperity is detrimental to us ; our neighbour's prosperity would increase the volume of our own trade. The control of trade may be warranted for a specific purpose, as in the case of the Navigation Acts, since an island nation is directly dependent for its prosperity on the maximum development of its marine ; but in general the fullest freedom of exchange is desirable, irrespective of the questions whether the particular country exchanges more treasure for goods or more goods for treasure, which had hitherto been the controlling consideration in framing commercial treaties. Adam Smith's doctrine bore fruit in the next decade in the commercial and financial policy of William Pitt, who was his enthusiastic disciple ; later it was developed into those principles of the *Laissez Faire* Economists, which gradually gained an ascendancy during the first half, and were completely dominant during the second half, of the nineteenth century, in Great Britain.

III

LITERATURE

John Dryden died in the year 1700. Samuel Johnson died in 1784. The date of Johnson's first notable publication was 1738, a few years before the death of two of the most prominent literary figures of the previous period, Pope and Swift, the survivors of a literary circle which had once included Addison. Johnson's own circle after 1761 included Burke and Goldsmith and touched Sheridan. This list of names suggests the characteristics of the whole period ; in the whole number there is only one, Edmund Burke, who was not essentially a man of his century—whose work was not an expression of its conventions. As concerns literary form, these were the men who themselves set the conventions which lesser men followed ; but the literary form was itself the finished expression of the moral and intellectual spirit of the age. Within a few years of Johnson's death an entirely new spirit had manifested itself, and the canons which

had guided or had been laid down by the writers of the eighteenth century were entirely discarded.

Poetry, a great critic has said, is a "criticism of life"; the poetry in which an age expresses itself affords at any rate a conclusive criterion of the way in which that age looked upon life. The predominance of the lyrical over the rhetorical implies the predominance of the emotional over the rational, and *vice versa*. Until Johnson was dead, rhetorical poetry held the field throughout the eighteenth century; the era produced only one lyrical poet of importance, William Collins, though Pope was the most consummate master of the art which claims a purely intellectual appreciation. The Restoration in the seventeenth century brought with it a revolt of the intellectuals against the tyranny of moral strenuousness—not merely the sour rigidity of the narrowest Puritanism but the emotional intensity which had produced a Milton and a Cromwell. In its first emancipation it flung aside morality altogether. Then came a reaction, when it was realised that there was no essential antagonism between the moral and the intellectual.

Under the serene guidance of Addison, decency again became "the mode," and Pope, in finely polished couplets, stereotyped the somewhat superficial philosophy of cultured common-sense. The morality which could be expressed in epigrams reigned supreme, even while immorality which could shelter behind epigrammatic formulæ was rampant. But the criteria applied were those of the intelligence, not those of the heart; the emotions, except as playthings appropriate to the boudoir, were at a discount. Where there is no enthusiasm there can be no lyrical poetry, and the Augustan Age knew not enthusiasm.


It called itself Augustan not inappropriately, for it had much in common with the age of the first Roman emperor, an imitative age with little in it that was spontaneous; an artificial age; on the surface graceful, refined, and polite, below the veneer barbarically gross, and at heart earthy and materialistic. Literature took possession of what was best in it, and that best has a unique charm, an attraction of its own;

but it is something very different from the best of the Elizabethans with their vivid and all-pervading vitality, of the Puritans with their fervour of righteousness, or of the new spirit which burst into life with the dying century. The materialism was at its worst in the second quarter of the



Dr. Johnson.

[From an engraving by Finden.]



Alexander Pope.

[From a crayon drawing in the Bodleian Library.]

century ; but it continued dominant even while a sturdier morality, deeper rooted, more akin in its nature to Puritanism, was making progress ; while Samuel Johnson by force of character more than of intellect was gradually achieving a supremacy among English men of letters ; while the Great Commoner in the political world, Wesley in the religious world, were breathing life into the dry bones. The breed of English men of action had not worn itself out, but the reviving national capacity for enthusiasm, faith, and loyalty was not to bear full fruit until a later generation.

In such an age, then, it was impossible that lyrical poetry should flourish in England. Collins stood by himself, while Gray's Odes have little if at all

more of the lyrical quality than those of Dryden or Pope. In Scotland song still lived, for Scotland was still emotional, still capable of enthusiasm, or there would have been no "Forty Five." But even in Scotland the song which was spontaneous was also anonymous. And as the repression of the deeper emotions was destructive of song, so also it was destructive of the higher drama which involves the dramatic instead of lyrical expression of the deeper emotions. Tragedy, instead of depicting human passion, was unreal, conventional, and rhetorical.



An "Exquisite" of 1720.

But the very conditions which were ill adapted for tragedy were perfectly compatible with the development of a prose comedy which is of its nature concerned with the light and superficial aspects of life ; and in their own delightful kind, towards the close of our period, the comedies of two Irishmen, Goldsmith and Sheridan, are unsurpassed ; just as at an earlier stage Pope's *Rape of the Lock* was a quite perfect piece of irresponsible daintiness.

The eighteenth century, however, if it was not a great age of poetry, was great in prose, and in other realms of prose than that of theatrical comedy. At its outset the short essay was almost perfected by Steele and Addison in the pages of the *Tatler* and the *Spectator*. Pamphleteering was elevated into a fine art by Defoe and Swift. Defoe, in a series of works unmatched in their realism from the *Journal of the Plague* to *Robinson Crusoe*, created the English Novel ; and Swift made the travels of *Gulliver* to Lilliput and Brobdingnag almost as convincing as the adventures of Crusoe himself. Addison's creation of Sir Roger de Coverley reveals an aspect of English life which shows that the general materialism was still far from being universal, and gives the first promise of the English novel of character.

About the time when Johnson was first shouldering his way into the London world of letters, the novel of sentimental respectability was given its vogue by Samuel Richardson's *Pamela*, which helped at least to inspire Henry Fielding to the production of *Joseph Andrews* as a sort of antidote to Richardson's mawkishness. Richardson wrote for ladies, Fielding did not. Richardson was a moralist and a sentimentalist, Fielding was neither. But it was Fielding who, like Defoe, held the mirror up to nature and painted life as he saw it in the middle of the eighteenth century, with the robust and virile humour and fidelity which made Scott and Thackeray regard him as the father of the novel. Of the same school, though with an exaggerated coarseness, was Tobias Smollett; with these two names is associated that of Lawrence Sterne, whose exquisite humour was counterbalanced by a sort of refined indecency much more corrupting than the audacity of Fielding or the grossness of Smollett; and Goldsmith gave Sir Roger de Coverley a companion in the "Man in Black" of the *Citizen of the World*, and produced an exquisite novel of real life which was neither mawkish nor coarse in the *Vicar of Wakefield*.

Before 1760 Ireland and Scotland had taken their share in the production of English literature. Swift and Steele were both born in Dublin. Smollett was a Scot, and so were such minor lights as James Thomson, the author of *The Seasons*, and John Home, whose tragedy of *Douglas* was received with enthusiastic if evanescent applause. Hardly recognised as yet, but destined to be far more influential, was the work of the Scotsman David Hume, whose importance in the history of moral and metaphysical speculation can hardly be over-estimated, while his *History of England*, though in many respects untrustworthy, gives him a place in the front rank of English historians. In the realm of philosophy Hume, himself an audacious and original thinker, was almost equalled in originality and importance by his predecessor, George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne.

And after 1760 the prominence of Scots and Irishmen increased. In the lighter walks of literature the achievement of Goldsmith and Sheridan has already been noted. If Johnson, the greatest literary figure of the time, was English through and through, his biography, the acknowledged masterpiece of its kind, was the work of the Scot Boswell. Burke, the Irishman, was the greatest political thinker of the day, unless we except the Scot Adam Smith, whose great work the *Wealth of Nations* raised political economy, which had hitherto been little more than empirical, into an acknowledged



Henry Fielding, by Hogarth.

[From the 1772 edition of Fielding's "Works."]

science, and revolutionised the prevalent ideas on the subject. But though Hume as a historian was surpassed by another Scot, William Robertson, the acknowledged supremacy in that field belongs to the Englishman Gibbon, whose *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* stands by itself without a rival.

BOOK VI

THE ERA OF REVOLUTIONS

CHAPTER XXIX

BETWEEN THE WARS

I

PITT'S DOMESTIC POLICY

THE return of Pitt to power was something very different from the establishment of a ministry of king's friends fourteen years before. Pitt was no subservient politician prepared to act merely as the mouthpiece of the king. He had behind him in parliament a large majority, but not a compact one, nor one upon which he could rely to follow his lead, although in the main it accepted his guidance. The principal reason why that majority had been returned was that public feeling was disgusted by the coalition of Fox and North, in which it appeared that both Fox and North had thrown over their principles in order to secure power by combination. A large proportion of North's former followers retained their old attachment to the Crown, and deserted North when he deserted the Crown. Chatham's admirers rallied to the support of Chatham's son; there was a proportion of Whigs who would not commit themselves to the latest Whig doctrine, that the king had nothing to do but to accept the ministers at their own dictation. These various elements gradually crystallised into what became the new Tory party; but in the first years of its existence, before it acquired a special character in consequence of the French Revolution, its leader was a reformer, many of whose aims were only realised by what was coming to be called Liberalism half a century afterwards. Pitt, like his father, was personally incorruptible, and anxious to cut at the roots of the practice of corruption. He desired the reform of representation. He desired the removal of the restrictions on trade. He desired the relief of Roman Catholics, and was a warm advocate of the abolition of the slave trade. But, while he was able to carry out his financial policy, he was able to retain office only because it was not yet recognised constitutional doctrine that ministers defeated in the House of Commons on an important issue should either resign or appeal to the country. He could not command

a majority in the House on specific issues ; but he did not therefore resign until a specific issue arose between himself and the king on a question as to which he considered himself finally pledged.

When Pitt began his long career as Prime Minister the world at large believed that the British Empire was tottering. It had been rent in twain ; it was exhausted by the strain of a long war, waged against a group of powers. Its naval ascendancy had been all but lost, and even now was

in question. Its government had gone to pieces, and the reorganisation depended on the wisdom and skill of a youth of four-and-twenty. But now for nearly nine years Pitt kept the country at peace ; during the peace its commerce and its wealth expanded with renewed vigour, and when once more Britain went to war, she was able to emerge from it triumphantly. The wealth she had acquired provided her with the means, and her maritime power preserved her commerce till she had what was practically a monopoly of the sea-borne traffic ; while the exploiting of her native supplies of coal and iron joined with the triumphs of her inventors to create for her almost a monopoly of manufacture. The new manufacture and the new organisation of transport secured the success of Pitt's financial policy.

The main principles of Pitt's finance were derived from Adam Smith. The error of seeking to raise

revenue by high tariffs had been shown by the successful lowering of tariffs under Walpole and in the first Rockingham administration. The high duties on tea and spirits ensured to the smugglers large profits which compensated the risks of the illicit traffic. Vast quantities of these articles were brought into the country without paying the duties, and many eminently respectable persons profited thereby, since they considered themselves to be under no obligation to know whether the goods they bought were smuggled or not. Pitt lowered the duties, and to compensate the immediate loss of revenue he imposed a window tax—which could not be evaded, because the number of windows in a house could be ascertained by the simple process of counting—and every penny of the tax except the small amount absorbed in collecting it went direct to the revenue.



The Right Hon. William Pitt.

[After the portrait by Gainsborough.]

For it was one of Adam Smith's principles that since all taxation is to a certain extent a check upon the increase of wealth, the state, which must impose taxation for the purposes of revenue, should see that the whole of the tax goes to the revenue; taxation to regulate trade, not for the purposes of revenue, being inadmissible because the only effect must be to hinder trade. On the other hand, the lowering of the duties on tea and spirits reduced their price in the market correspondingly, diminished the inducement to smuggling and the expenditure on the preventive service, and brought an increased quantity of the goods into the country through the legitimate channel. The same principles were applied to other imports, as had been done half a century earlier by Walpole. In particular the import of raw material was encouraged by reduced tariffs, although the British manufacturer had not yet learnt, as he learnt in the first half of the nineteenth century, to believe in the admission of the foreign competitor. It was not yet possible to attack tariffs of a purely protective character, in each one of which some vested interests were at stake.

The passing of the old ideas of commercial policy was illustrated when Pitt negotiated a commercial treaty with France in 1786. Each country had hitherto followed a policy of excluding the other's goods. No one since 1713 had attempted in practice to traverse that principle. But now professed economists had nothing to say against opening up commerce with France; the opposition was mainly expressed by Fox, who denounced the treaty on the ground that France, our hereditary foe, would profit by it. A few years later Fox was less ready to denounce our hereditary foe. The French denounced the treaty, because they profited by it a good deal less than the British. But nobody denounced it as injurious to the balance of trade.

An important economy introduced by Pitt was the abolition of the existing method of receiving tenders for public loans. Such loans had been floated by private arrangement and were a gross means of corruption, North's Government in particular having conceded the most extravagant terms for party ends. Pitt threw the tenders open to public competition, which at once secured the best terms possible for the Treasury and destroyed a principal source of corruption. It is remarkable, however, that the financial scheme in which Pitt himself took most pride, and which was hailed with the most enthusiastic applause, was one whose unsoundness



"The Rare Show."

[A caricature on Pitt's taxation and foreign policy.]

was already apparent within a few years of his death, and was possibly realised by himself some time earlier. This was his scheme for a Sinking Fund which was to wipe out the National Debt. Walpole had instituted a sinking fund, but it had been so repeatedly and so unscrupulously raided that only a fraction of it had really been appropriated to the reduction of the debt. Pitt's plan was to set aside £1,000,000 annually, which was to be handed over to a special board, not political, which was to invest it. It was imagined that, accumulating at compound interest, it would in a few years extinguish the entire debt. So long as the money could be set aside out of revenue it was true that the higher interest received by investing money would accumulate a fund for paying off the capital debt; but the scheme broke down as soon as the pressure on government compelled it to resort to borrowing at higher rates. For in effect the sinking fund was then provided for out of the borrowed money, not out of revenue, and when the country was at war, the money was borrowed at a higher rate of interest than that obtained by its investment. A sinking fund for paying off the debt on which there is a low rate of interest at once becomes unsound if it can only be provided for by incurring a new debt at a higher rate of interest.

In another attempt to act upon free trade principles Pitt was defeated. The question of commerce was still an acute source of friction with Ireland, in the same sort of way as had been the case when there was an independent Scottish legislature. There had been a partial relaxation of the restrictions upon Irish trade under North's Government. Pitt proposed to carry the matter very much further, and in effect, though still with some exceptions, to treat Great Britain and Ireland as a fiscal unit. The commercial gain to Ireland would have been great; nevertheless in Ireland, as well as in England, Pitt's measure was resolutely opposed. In England the opposition came from the commercial classes, who resented being exposed to Irish competition. In Ireland the opposition was political, and was based on the fact that, if the countries were treated as a fiscal unit, the whole financial control would lie at Westminster, and Ireland, unrepresented at Westminster, would have no voice in it at all. The independence of the Irish parliament won in 1782 would be curtailed in a very important particular, and to this the Irish parliament would not assent, especially in view of the limitations which the commercial interest in England had forced upon Pitt's own scheme. The measure therefore was dropped and was not again revived.

While Pitt was still an independent member of the British parliament, outside the Government, he had constituted himself the champion of parliamentary reform of which his father had been a strong advocate. The system had ceased to be representative; but while the demand for reconstruction became periodically insistent outside parliament, so that Chatham had pronounced that if parliament did not soon reform itself, it would be reformed "with a vengeance" from outside, the members themselves were not reformers. Too many of them sat for pocket boroughs to be willing

for the abolition of pocket boroughs, and the controllers of pocket boroughs were equally adverse to a change. Pitt's plan now was to extinguish thirty-six of these constituencies, and to increase the representation of the counties correspondingly. London and Westminster were also to have an increase, a share in the seventy-two seats provided by the abolition of thirty-six constituencies. So far Fox and his followers were ready to support Pitt against the vested interests which were opposed to reform; but Pitt proposed to recognise those vested interests by buying them out, and to this Fox would not consent. The result was that Pitt was unable to carry the measure, and parliamentary reform was driven off the field of practical politics for forty years by the anti-democratic reaction born of the French Revolution.

In spite then of this defeat on sundry measures of first-rate importance, to which may be added his failure to carry parliament with him in his desire to abolish the slave trade, Pitt remained Prime Minister; nor did the theory and practice of the constitution call for his resignation. Yet at the end of 1788 it seemed exceedingly probable that his ministerial career would be brought to an abrupt conclusion. The king was again attacked by the brain malady with which he had been threatened twenty-two years before. At once the question of the regency became acute. The Prince of Wales and his brothers, in accordance with the family tradition, were on bad terms with their father, and the prince himself was on intimate terms with the leaders of the Opposition, Fox and Sheridan. Obviously he was the natural person to assume the regency. The Opposition claimed that it belonged to him by constitutional right; that if the king were incapacitated, it followed that the heir-apparent should discharge the monarchical functions unless it had been otherwise decided by the king in parliament. Pitt, on the other hand, claimed that it rested with the Estates to appoint the regent and to define his powers, although it was admitted that the Prince of Wales was the person who would naturally be appointed. The power of the Crown, however, was still so great that it was assumed on all hands that, if the prince became regent, Pitt would be dismissed and the government would pass to a Fox ministry. The curious spectacle was seen of the Whigs, led by Fox, asserting the hereditary prerogative in a most uncompromising form, while Pitt and the Tories were the champions of the rights of parliament, the paradox being partly accounted for by the suspicion that if the Whig doctrine were carried and the prince became in effect king, the king himself would not recover power even if he recovered his health. English public opinion was with Pitt, and demanded the limitation of the powers which should be conferred upon the prince as regent, and the recognition of the principle that he could not claim the regency as a constitutional right. There was no precedent for the situation, but in any case it was felt that the regency of the prince would involve Pitt's retirement. The position, however, was saved by the king's recovery before the Regency Bill had passed through the Lords. Pitt, instead of

being driven into private life, was more firmly established in power and in the royal favour than before.

II

FOREIGN POLICY AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

For five-and-twenty years after the Peace of Paris, Great Britain had stood aloof from continental politics, in the isolation which Bute had procured for her.

For a dozen years she had neglected Europe as though its affairs had no interest for her; she had paid no attention while France absorbed Corsica and while Russia, Austria, and Prussia absorbed the greater part of Poland among them. Then the American War had put it out of her power to concern herself with the doings of other nations, though other nations had found the opportunity to concern themselves very actively with her affairs; and then Pitt, in the early years of his administration, recognised that the first essential for Britain was to set her own house in order.



Map of Europe, 1789-1794.

The revival of prosperity however was rapid, and by 1788 Pitt was ready for the country to assert itself in foreign affairs if the occasion should arise.

In spite of the French commercial treaty, Bourbon aggression was the inevitable object of suspicion for British statesmanship, and Pitt achieved a temporary diplomatic triumph by forming in that year, 1788, the Triple Alliance with Prussia—now under a new king, Frederick William II., since Frederick II. died in 1786—and Holland. The primary end secured was

the establishment of the supremacy in Holland of the Stadtholder William of Orange, with whose house Great Britain had always remained in alliance, whereas the republican and anti-Orange party habitually leaned to France.

The restored prestige of Great Britain was presently decisively asserted in a quarrel with Spain, which laid claim to Nootka Sound on the west coast of North America, where there was a British settlement. The Spaniards took possession and seized the British settlers, on the ground that Spaniards not British had discovered the country. Pitt replied that the claim to possession rested not on discovery but on occupation, and prepared to back the argument with a fleet. Spain appealed to France, but France, already in the throes of the Revolution, declined to intervene; and by the Convention of 1791 Spain surrendered completely. In another direction,



TAMING of the SHREW: Katharine & Petruchio; - The Modern Quisotte .. or, what you will -

Pitt averting the partition of Turkey by Catherine of Russia.

[A caricature of 1791.]

however, Pitt met with a defeat. He viewed with alarm the aggressive policy of the Russian Tsarina Catherine, who was already scheming for the absorption not only of Poland but also of Turkish dominions, which would establish Russia as a maritime power on the Mediterranean. Chatham at an earlier stage had favoured the progress of Russia as a Power which could be called in to counteract Bourbon ascendancy on the Continent; while to Burke and Fox, as to later English Liberalism when it was dominated by Mr. Gladstone, the suppression of the Turk appeared to be far from undesirable. With Pitt began that attitude of suspicious hostility towards Russia which so largely dominated British foreign policy at most periods of the nineteenth century. But Pitt found himself unsupported by public opinion; having threatened war, he was obliged to draw back. At the Peace of Jassy Catherine obtained her immediate desire by securing the line of the Dniester; and Frederick William of Prussia, who had expected to check her advance by British aid, began instead to seek the

Tsarina's friendship, looking upon Pitt as a broken reed. The result was shortly afterwards shown in a fresh dismemberment of Poland.

In the four years, however, from the beginning of 1789 to the close of 1792, the French Revolution and the fall of the Bourbon monarchy were totally subverting the whole European system. France was the type of an absolute monarchy associated with a completely exclusive aristocracy, entirely dominant over *bourgeoisie* and peasantry who bore the whole burden of taxation without having any voice in the government. The burden of the taxation was cruel, and the finances of the country had been reduced to utter chaos by a century of costly and perpetual wars. There was no civilised country where the "Rights of Man" were less regarded in practice. But in theory the Rights of Man were regarded with enthusiastic admiration. French thinkers and writers had pointed out, sometimes with scathing ridicule, sometimes with remorseless logic, and sometimes with sentimental rhetoric, the iniquities and follies of the existing system, and had contrasted them soberly with the infinitely more equitable government of Great Britain or picturesquely with the ideal life of an imaginary Golden Age before man had learnt to tyrannise over man. French aristocrats made much of the heroes of liberty who set America free from British tyranny; some of them magnificently gave their swords to serve the same cause; and at last, when French finances were persistently going from bad to worse, the advisers of Louis XVI. bethought themselves of summoning the States General, the assembly of the Three Estates of noblesse, clergy, and commons, which had not been called together since the early years of the seventeenth century.

The States General were brought together in May 1789, when the Third Estate, supported by a few of the clergy and a few of the nobility, promptly asserted itself. At the outset it seemed that there was going to be a constitutional revolt against privilege and absolutism. Everywhere the souls of lovers of liberty rejoiced when the populace of Paris pulled down the Bastille, the emblem of arbitrary power. Monarchs and aristocrats, however, took alarm at the idea of the subject masses laying claim to political rights and repudiating their subjection. British respectability reproved but on the whole did not condemn a praiseworthy if ill-regulated effort to follow the paths of constitutionalism along which the British nation had already advanced with so much conscious rectitude. It was not long, however, before Edmund Burke, with more penetration, was denouncing the proceedings of the French as an attack upon every conservative principle, destructive of all the ideas upon which the framework of society rested. In England constitutionalism had been an orderly development, a steady growth, rooted always in the same principles. Progress had been made not by introducing innovations but by closing the door to reactionary innovations, by a process of adaptation to changing conditions. France was setting herself to cut down the system which had developed naturally, and to substitute a brand new logical system wholly unrelated to the

existing conditions. The inevitable result would be first a hideous anarchy and then a military despotism. In English democrats, however, the first stages of the French Revolution inspired no such terrors. In their eyes there was room for a good deal of reform even in the sacred British constitution, in which privilege still played far too large a part, and popular rights were scandalously repressed.

The French Revolution was a war upon privilege. As it went forward it became more and more violent, more and more destructive of everything which could preserve a society that assumed distinctions of rank to be the first fundamental condition of public order and decency. In England itself, in the lower social strata, men were already beginning to feel the pinch of the rural and industrial revolutions that were going on. The aggregate of wealth was increasing rapidly, but the area of its distribution was becoming more and more restricted. The agricultural and industrial output was expanding, while the amount of labour employed on it was diminishing, and the population was multiplying rapidly. The superabundant supply of labour was driving wages below the subsistence level; and for this state of things men found the cause not in the economic but in the social conditions. There were not wanting those who persuaded themselves that the remedy was to be sought in a political reconstruction, of which France was setting the example.

In 1789 the States General, converted into a National Assembly, made a clean sweep of feudal privileges. Then it set to work to invent a new constitution. There was a considerable exodus of the nobility, and then in 1791 Louis attempted flight. His departure was detected, and he was brought back to Paris from the frontier; but France believed that he had been on his way to make an appeal to his brother monarchs to restore the French monarchy by force of arms. A corresponding interpretation was placed upon the attitude of the King of Prussia and the Austrian Emperor, with the result that early in 1792 Louis was compelled to declare war upon Austria.

Thus began the European conflagration, for which, in the first instance, France had two distinct motives. The first was national resentment at the interference of a foreign Power in France's conduct of her own private affairs, and the second was the revival of the old idea of Louis XIV. that France was entitled to extend her borders to her "natural boundaries," the Rhine and the Alps. But by this time the French monarchy was already doomed, and very shortly a third motive was added—that of extending



Edmund Burke.

[After the portrait by Romney.]

"liberty" to all the peoples of Europe, who were ready to burst the bonds of monarchical and aristocratic dominion.

In the early months of 1792, Pitt's attitude towards France was still one almost of benevolent neutrality. He saw no reason to anticipate that the country would be involved in war, and his budget was framed without any regard to such a possibility. Leopold of Austria who, during his all too brief reign, which was ended by his premature death early in this year before the declaration of war by France, had shown himself the most practically intelligent statesman in Europe, had declined to yield to the clamour of the French émigrés or to dictate to France after Louis accepted the constitution. Pitt certainly saw no reason for Great Britain to interfere on behalf of the French monarchy, especially as the Crown was still recognised as an integral part of the constitution. If France chose to involve herself in a war with Austria and Prussia, the struggle was not likely to last long in view of the chaotic condition of the French government and the French finances, to say nothing of the French army. France, in short, might create a great deal of disturbance, but there was no reason to be afraid of her aggression.

The prophets who prophesied her downfall derived support from the blunders of her first military movements on the Netherlands frontier, followed up by the Prussian declaration of war. Then the effective government was captured by the Paris Commune, which was led by the extreme revolutionists; the mob broke into the palace of the Tuileries, and the king and the royal family were virtually made prisoners. From the frontier came the news that the foreign invaders were on French soil, and Paris in a panic massacred a number of "suspects" who were accused of treason to the state and of being in league with the alien invader. Terror turned to sudden triumph when the attack of the Prussians was repulsed at Valmy by Dumouriez, an engagement which inspired a new and indomitable confidence in the patriotic national levies which had gathered to hurl defiance at the invader.

But the "September massacre" had sent a shudder of horror through Europe, while the Revolution set the seal upon its defiance of the world by making the proclamation of the French Republic the first act of the new National Assembly. Though hitherto France had claimed to be acting on the defensive against the unwarrantable dictation of foreign Powers, an attitude for which she had at least exceedingly strong warrant, she now became avowedly aggressive. The new Republic openly asserted its right to absorb Savoy and Belgium, and to carry its frontier to the "natural boundary." It proclaimed itself the friend and ally of every people which desired freedom, the enemy of all monarchies. It asserted its right to ignore existing treaties, and its intention of enforcing the opening of the navigation of the Scheldt, in defiance of the guarantees given by Great Britain as well as by other Powers; and in the terrible phrase of Danton, it resolved to "fling before the kings of Europe the head of a king as the

gage of battle." Before the year was out "Louis Capet" was brought to trial for his life; within a month his head fell beneath the guillotine. But before that, war with Britain had already become a certainty. France had assumed an impossibly dictatorial attitude to the courts of Europe, setting at nought all the rules of diplomatic intercourse; and Britain was pledged up to the hilt to oppose the opening of the Scheldt even at the cost of war. In January 1793 war was declared.

III

INDIA AND CANADA

The coalition ministry of 1783 was dismissed in consequence of the battle over Fox's India Bill; it followed that a new India Bill was almost the first measure of Pitt's government when he was returned to power with a substantial majority behind him. Chatham, Clive, and Warren Hastings had all been disposed in favour of an assumption of complete control by the Crown; but it was not easy to reconcile such a scheme with the vested interests of the East India Company. Fox's bill had proposed to reduce the company's authority to a minimum, placing the control even of trade in the hands of a commission chosen by the legislature. The bill had aroused intense opposition, partly because it brushed aside the chartered rights of the company, partly because the arrangement of its details was expected to be utilised in such a manner as to give the then existing Government a permanent control not only over the government of India but over the imperial parliament. The new bill was one of those compromises in which the British constitution is so rich, illogical and unsymmetrical but workable in practice through its indefiniteness and elasticity.

There were three powers concerned—the executive government on the spot in India, the East India Company itself, and the imperial government. The first essential was that the government on the spot should be able to act with a free hand according to the exigencies which it had to face, without being tied and bound by instructions from a body which, in the nature of the case, could not be fully informed of the circumstances, seeing that a full twelve-month was bound to pass between the sending of a despatch from India and the receipt of a reply from London. But, secondly, the Indian government could not be allowed to become an irresponsible autocracy; it must be ultimately responsible to the imperial government, which must approve beforehand the general lines of the policy to be followed, and must be able to penalise any unwarrantable departure from those general lines. In the third place, the power of the imperial government must be reconciled with the chartered rights of the company.

The system now established remained in force for almost three-quarters of a century, and was brought to an end only in 1858 with the disappearance of the East India Company and the transfer of the government to the Crown. A strong executive government in India was wholly incompatible with the system created by Lord North's Regulating Act. Under the new system each of the three Presidencies was to have its own governor, its own commander-in-chief, and two other members of the governor's council; but since the governor had a casting vote, he could get his own way unless he stood alone in the council. But the governor and the council of Bengal were also to exercise a controlling authority

over the other two Presidencies, while the governor was to be Governor-General of India, or rather of the British dominions in India. Further, under special circumstances the Governor-General had power to act without consulting his council. In the next place the India House, that is the management of the East India Company in London, retained their authority to lay down general directions for policy and their general powers of patronage and appointment. But these powers were subject to the supervision and approval of a Ministerial Board of Control, whose members were appointed by the Government of the day, and whose president was a member of the ministry, this body having access to all correspondence. The



“Blood on Thunder.”

[A caricature of 1788 by Gillray of Warren Hastings.]

principal direct restriction on the powers of the Governor-General was that he was forbidden to make compromising alliances without authority from home, while indirectly he would render himself liable to censure and recall if he departed from instructions without reasonable justification.

Warren Hastings left India in 1785 on the completion of his term of office which had been once renewed. He was soon attacked by the leaders of the Opposition, the three principal charges against him being the affairs of the Rohilla War, the Rajah of Benares, and the Oudh Begums, though there were many others as well. At first it appeared that the Government would support him, since whatever might be thought about the Rohilla War his conduct on that matter had already been judged and condoned; for it had preceded his appointment as Governor-General, and that appointment had afterwards been renewed. But Pitt withdrew his support on the Benares question, which had arisen during Hastings's final term of office, and in respect of which Pitt judged that his demands on the rajah had been excessive and had been enforced with unjustifiable tyranny. The result was that the great Governor-

General was impeached, and he himself was held up to obloquy and execration by the most brilliant orators of the day. The impeachment opened in 1788, and dragged on for seven years, during which the public interest dwindled; and ultimately Hastings was unanimously acquitted by the peers on every one of the charges, though it was not till some years later that the East India Company offered a tardy recognition of the immense services which he had rendered.

The first Governor-General appointed under the new system was Cornwallis, a man of tried capacity and of the highest integrity, too strong and too universally respected to fear the attacks of interest or of malignity. The appointment exemplified the principle generally adopted, that the Governor-General's council should be men of direct experience in Indian affairs, but that the Governor-General himself should have been trained in other fields.

Cornwallis arrived in India in the autumn of 1786, fully resolved to have nothing to do with designs of aggression and to devote himself to organisation and retrenchment. In the interval the government had been efficiently conducted by an experienced Indian official, Sir John Macpherson. But Cornwallis very soon found, like most of his successors, that expansion was forced upon him, however little it might be to his liking. In India there was not as in Europe a long established system of states with fairly defined territories. For centuries every dynasty, wherever it had reigned, justified its own existence by expansion and conquest; it was assumed that a power which did not seek to make itself feared abstained from doing so only on account of conscious weakness. If the British chose to remain quiescent, one or another of the native powers would take advantage of that quiescence to develop an aggressive policy. Aggression could not be met by mere resistance, however effective; it must be directly penalised by loss of territory. If the defeat of the aggressor brought no worse penalty than a return to the *status quo*, the aggression was quite certain to be renewed; the moderation of the victor would be construed as weakness, as a recognition of the strength of the defeated power; and neutral on-lookers would be converted into allies of the aggressor.

The aggressor at this time was Tippu Sultan, of Mysore, the son and successor of the great Haidar Ali. There is no doubt that he was aiming at the acquisition of a complete supremacy in Southern India, and that he regarded the expulsion of the British as a necessary part of his programme. Cornwallis found himself compelled by an old treaty to promise aid to the Nizam for the recovery of certain districts which had been filched from him by Haidar. But Cornwallis would do nothing more than carry out the treaty obligation; he would not take the initiative and attack Tippu himself. Nor did Tippu wait to be attacked. He wanted Travancore, a district at the south of India which was under British protection. He marched into Travancore an army which was repulsed, whereupon he collected a very much larger force. Cornwallis had no alternative but to

strike. Three campaigns were needed before Tippu was reduced to submission, although the Nizam and the Puna Marathas played at helping the British, while both of them were in correspondence with Tippu himself. The general result was that Tippu was deprived of about half his territories, and the districts ceded were divided not unequally between the Marathas, the Nizam, and the British.

Cornwallis established the prestige of the British arms, and, not without reluctance, but as a necessity forced upon him by the conditions, added to the territory under direct control of the British. But his most important achievements were in the field of administrative organisation. He was not a statesman of supreme genius, with an intuitive power of getting straight to the heart of every problem that presented itself, and he did not perfect an ideal system. But he was intellectually clear-headed, trained in affairs and in the knowledge of men, broad-minded and free from stereotyped views. Morally he was absolutely straightforward, fearless and disinterested, and he was thorough. Fortunately for himself and for India, the general confidence in him was so complete that all attempts to hamper or



Tippu Sultan, of Mysore.

[From an Oriental painting at Apsley House.]

challenge his freedom of action recoiled on the heads of those who made them. Consequently the mistakes he made were those of a sensible man under conditions which forced him to act upon data which were inevitably incomplete and in some degree unintelligible.

The arrangement most definitely associated with his memory is the "permanent settlement" of the land system in Bengal. The main source of the Bengal revenue as of Indian revenues generally was the tax upon land. Now under the old Mogul system the districts had been farmed out to individuals called *zemindars*, who were responsible for paying the land tax while they were left to collect it for themselves. As long as they paid the taxes no questions were likely to be asked as to the amount they collected or how they collected it; and these *zemindaris* tended to become hereditary—that is, when a zemindar died, his son was usually

confirmed in succession to the office. Misled by the analogy of Western ideas and practice, the British government in Bengal supposed the zemindars to be in practically the same position as great English landowners. They were taken to be the proprietors of the soil from whom the population of cultivators held it as tenants. An assessment therefore was made of the land; on the basis of that assessment the amount of the tax was permanently fixed; and the zemindar was established on what was virtually the same footing as that of the landowner in England. He had security of

tenure, power of alienation, and reaped the whole benefits of all improvements, whereas heretofore he had lacked security, and had been tempted to reap all that he could as quickly as he could without consideration of the remote future. The weak points of the system were two: first, from the government point of view, that a settlement for a long term would have given the zemindar all the security that he needed, while leaving the government free to revise the assessment at the end of the term, to its own advantage. In the second place, it was not realised that the zemindar had not in fact been the proprietor of the soil, which properly belonged to the peasants or "ryots," who cultivated it. At the same time, while the system was actually a new one instead of being

as was supposed an adaptation of the old one, it was in practice a great improvement upon the prevailing methods. Experience showed where its weaknesses lay, and in other parts of India settlements were carried out at later times in closer accord with native conceptions.

Probably, however, the most valuable feature of Cornwallis's Governor-Generalship was that his personal prestige and authority enabled him to do what his predecessors had attempted in vain. He resolutely set his face against the abuse of patronage, and he finally enforced the payment to the company's servants of adequate salaries which freed them from the almost irresistible temptation to enrich themselves by illicit methods; and he thus transformed the Indian service from one of the most corrupt into one of the most incorruptible that history has known. Cornwallis retired at the end of 1793, and was succeeded by an experienced Indian official, Sir John Shore, who afterwards became Lord Teignmouth.

The American War had severed the thirteen colonies from Great Britain,



Lord Cornwallis.

and they were thenceforth established as the United States. But Canada, Newfoundland, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia remained under the British flag. In the United States there were great numbers of loyalists, known during the war as Tories, who refused entirely to acquiesce in severance from the British Empire. They resented the republican government, which, in its turn, looked upon them as traitors to the national cause. Rather than accept the new conditions large numbers of these "United Empire Loyalists" left their property and their homes and migrated across the northern border, where they were welcomed by the British government, and were planted chiefly in Upper Canada and in New Brunswick. This immigration of a large British element changed the conditions of a colony which had hitherto been practically French in race, in tradition, and in custom, and Roman Catholic in religion. This led to the Canada Act of 1791, whereby Upper Canada or Ontario was made a separate colony. Lower Canada or Quebec retained its French characteristics, while the consequent peculiarities of its government and administration were not applied to Ontario. Upper and Lower Canada had each its own governor and legislature, while each had its own tradition of hostility to the newly born republic on the south. But in each case the self-government of the colony was on the old lines; that is to say, the executive was in the hands of the governor and his council, who were free from control by the legislature just as the administration in England had been independent of parliamentary control before the revolution of 1688. The legislatures themselves consisted of two chambers, one elective, corresponding to the British House of Commons, the other nominated, corresponding to the British House of Peers. In due time, but not yet, the battle was to be fought out which ended in making the executive responsible to the legislature, or, in other words, establishing party government.

These years witnessed also the first step to that expansion in another quarter of the globe which was to be Britain's compensation for the loss of the better half of North America. Although Spain had taken possession of the Philippines and the Dutch were in occupation of the great archipelago known as the Spice Islands, there had been no organised exploration, still less any settlement, in the Southern Pacific, until in 1768 Captain Cook began his series of voyages. Having surveyed the eastern coast of Australia, Cook, in 1770, proclaimed the British sovereignty of that region, to which he gave the name of New South Wales; but still the formal proclamation was not followed by effective occupation. There was, in fact, no particular inclination to seek for colonial expansion, since it was now the general belief that colonies were merely a temporary acquisition, which in the course of time would naturally sever themselves from the empire. But it was very soon found that the loss of the American colonies had one decidedly embarrassing result. For more than a century convicted criminals had been transported to those colonies to pay for their misdeeds by servitude. The government wanted some new region to which it could trans-

port its convicts. In 1783 it was suggested that Cook's formal annexation of Australia, not yet made internationally effective by occupation, should be followed up by planting a convict settlement on the Australian coast. Accordingly in 1787 an expedition was despatched, carrying seven hundred and fifty convicts together with a detachment of marines, and Captain Philip as governor. In January 1788 the expedition landed at Botany Bay, though the settlement was immediately transferred to the more convenient position which was named Sydney after one of the Secretaries of State. Six days after the British occupation French ships appeared ; it is possible that, if Captain Philip's arrival had been delayed for a week, France, not Britain, would have annexed Australia.

CHAPTER XXX

THE WAR WITH THE REPUBLIC AND THE UNION WITH IRELAND

I

THE FIRST STAGE

WAR was declared between Great Britain and France on February 1, 1793. This first war was brought to a close by that suspension of hostilities which is called the "Peace of Amiens," in 1802. Primarily it was a war against an aggressive France which, with the cap of Liberty on its head, was reviving the pretensions of the most ambitious and the most absolute of its monarchs to dictate to Europe and to tear up treaties. It could not lose that character while the policy of the French government was persistently aggressive, and it remained aggressive from beginning to end. On the other hand, public opinion supported and urged on the war because public opinion conceived an intense and ineradicable terror, not so much of France as of the French Revolution. While at first the revolution had excited a considerable amount of sympathy, the proclamation of the republic, the beheading of King Louis, and the subsequent reign of terror in France produced an immense reaction of sentiment, for which the way had been prepared by the eloquent denunciations of Burke, whose prophecies concerning its course were repeatedly justified by literal fulfillment. Those who believed that fundamentally the cause of the Revolution was the cause not of anarchy but of liberty, that the Revolution was driven to its excesses not by its inherent character but because foreign intervention had brought it to bay and forced it to fight savagely for its life, persistently denounced the war as essentially unnecessary, unjust, and reactionary; while the country, thoroughly convinced that the Revolution must be fought to the last gasp, regarded them as traitors. Great Britain, hitherto far in advance of the rest of Europe in the doctrine and practice of political liberty, was nevertheless the most determined in its resistance to revolutionary France, and the downfall of England became a primary aim of the man who concentrated France in himself.

The course and the meaning of the war will be followed more easily if we have before us a sort of ground plan of controlling events. In the last days of September 1792 France had declared herself a republic. During the next three months the republican government proclaimed itself the enemy of monarchies at large, being already at open war with Austria,

Prussia, and Sardinia, because the appropriation of Savoy was a part of the programme of securing the natural boundaries. The French armies, after the turn of the tide at the cannonade of Valmy, made continuous progress. At the end of January Louis was guillotined, and immediately afterwards Great Britain was added to the hostile belligerent powers. Until mid-summer there was a struggle for supremacy in the French Assembly between the orthodox literary republicans—the Girondins—and the extremists of the “Mountain.” The Girondins were beaten, and the control passed to the body called the Committee of Public Safety, which was composed entirely of extremists, among whom the greatest man, Danton, very soon became a suspect on account of his counsels of comparative moderation. From October 1793 to June 1794 the reign of terror was in full operation, and the tumbrils carried their daily loads of victims to the guillotine, beginning with Marie Antoinette and the leading Girondins. In course of time the Revolution began to devour its own children; in March the infamous Hébertists were struck down; in April Danton fell; and at last, partly in sheer revulsion from the carnage, partly because every man felt that unless the thing were peremptorily ended the next turn of the wheel might send him to the guillotine, the downfall of Robespierre himself and his principal colleagues was compassed. With their fall at the end of June the terror came to an end. Fifteen months later, in October, 1795, the new government was formed, known as the Directory, which lasted till its overthrow at the end of four years, in November 1799, by the *coup d'état* of Bonaparte, who established himself as Dictator with the title of First Consul.

It will be seen, then, that the first eighteen months of the war covered the period at which the excesses of the Revolution were at their height, and produced that indelible impression of the atrocities of Jacobinism which made the reaction irresistibly dominant in England. And during this same period, when, according to all rational calculations, France ought to have been entirely bankrupt, when she should have been utterly prostrated by internal dissensions, when her armies ought to have been practically impossible to levy or, when levied, to lead, she carried on her government, fought with continuous success by land against the gathered armies of more than half Europe, and produced mainly from the lower social ranks generals of the highest ability—who were seldom given the chance of blundering twice, since failure was virtually construed as a proof of treachery to the republic. Even before the Directory was established two of France's enemies, Prussia and Spain, had withdrawn from the European coalition; and before the end of 1797 the French victories on the Continent had broken it up altogether and Great Britain was left standing alone.

Now we have seen that to the very last Pitt had continued firmly convinced that the British Empire would remain a neutral spectator of the events on the Continent. Like Walpole, he had believed that the one

fundamental necessity for England was peaceful recuperation and commercial development. Like Walpole, he had succeeded in accumulating the sinews of war without making any preparation to carry it on should it be forced upon him. And, like Walpole, when war was forced upon him he did not know how to organise it. But, unlike Walpole, when war came he faced it with indomitable resolution, in a high spirit of patriotism which the whole nation caught from him, even as it had been inspired with a like spirit by his father. In spite of mismanagement, neither Pitt, nor the nation, nor

the king ever faltered even in the darkest hours, nor did the king or the nation ever slacken their confidence in "the pilot who weathered the storm."



Napoleon Buonaparte.

[From the unfinished painting by David.]

Pitt's lead was immediately followed by the accession to the coalition of Holland and the Bourbon Powers of Spain and Naples. Virtually it was only the outer ring of the Scandinavian states, Russia and Turkey, with the Venetian Republic and Portugal, which stood aloof. And besides these enemies of France outside there were still royalist centres in the country itself which of necessity distracted a share of the French government's attention. Until the fall of the Girondins in summer, there was a check to the successes of the French arms which had been so marked during the winter.

But from the time when Carnot on the Committee of Public Safety devoted himself to the military administration, he earned his title of "Organiser of Victory."

The royalist insurrection in La Vendée was crushed. The Prussians and the Austrian and British armies in the Netherlands, after capturing Valenciennes and Mainz, failed to co-operate for an effective invasion and wasted their opportunities. In the South the royalists at Toulon, sheltered by the guns of a British squadron under Admiral Hood, defied the besieging forces of the republic until the genius of a young artillery officer, Napoleon Buonaparte, devised and executed a movement which made resistance hopeless. The royalists were taken on board the British ships, and Toulon was abandoned to the republicans. The attacks of Sardinia on the south-east, and of Spain on the south-west, were repulsed and followed by counter attacks. Austria and Prussia quarrelled over the partition of Poland, instead

of devoting their attention to the French war; and along the line of the Rhine and in the Netherlands the French, under the command of Jourdan, Hoche, and Pichegru, once more drove back the hostile armies.

Nor did any better success attend the arms of the coalition in 1794. Prussia, already threatening to withdraw, was only prevented from doing so by a treaty with Great Britain, which paid her a large subsidy for the maintenance of sixty thousand men; and then the Prussian army remained persistently inactive, because the whole real interest of the Prussian government was concentrated upon Poland. Before the end of the year the British had been driven back out of the Netherlands into Holland, and the whole of the Austrian and Prussian forces were on the further side of the Rhine; while the French were making progress on the Italian side of the Alps and the Spanish side of the Pyrenees. In one field alone were the allies successful. Britain had fully recovered her naval ascendancy, although she made nothing like a full use of it because of the lack of direction at headquarters. There was no organised strategical plan. Nevertheless the republican government had too much to do on land to organise fleets which could hold their own against such a commander as Lord Howe, whose victory off Ushant on the 1st of June was the only relieving event of the year. The French fleet was conducting a convoy of corn-ships to Brest, when Howe caught it and shattered it, though the corn-ships made their escape.

British self-respect was saved by Lord Howe's victory, for the British performances on land were far from creditable. The Navy preserved the great tradition which made it possible, if difficult, for capacity and merit to win recognition even in the absence of any very marked aristocratic connection. But commands in the Army were still an aristocratic preserve in which connection outweighed demerit. As a matter of course the chief command was given to the king's second son, the Duke of York, who, at the head of an army, was thoroughly inefficient, although when he was transferred to the administrative control he did very much better work. But the fact remained that he was wholly unfitted to cope with generals of the order of Jourdan or Pichegru. His incapacity was not redeemed by any efficiency in his subordinates, still less in the wholly incompetent military administration at home.

Before the end of 1794 Pichegru had invaded Holland, and had taken possession of the Dutch fleet in the Texel. The stadtholder, William,



"The greatest general of the age—
General Complaint."

[From a caricature of 1796 by Woodward.]

withdrew to England; the now dominant republican party in Holland, always inclined to France, accepted the French alliance; and Holland was transformed into the Batavian Republic. In April 1795 Prussia deserted the coalition and made peace with France by the Treaty of Basle; Spain followed suit in June. But neither Austria nor Great Britain would make peace except on condition of the restoration of the Netherlands to Austria. The Austrian generals too met with better success, and Pichegru, dissatisfied with the order of things in France, was as inactive as he could venture to be. But the establishment of the Directory at the end of the year gave France a more stable government, and early in 1796 the command of the French armies in the north of Italy was entrusted to

Buonaparte, to whose services the Directory were indebted for the successful *coup d'état* which had placed them in power.

The brilliant campaign of the young general of six-and-twenty made the French complete masters of North Italy before the end of the year, and established Buonaparte's reputation; although the invasion of Austria by co-operating armies under Jourdan and Moreau was foiled by the skill of the Archduke Charles, who fell upon Jourdan before a junction could be effected, and crushed him, so that Moreau was also obliged to fall back. On the other hand, the British fleet failed to accomplish anything of importance. Its energies had been dissipated in the futile seizure of islands, which were perfectly useless from a military point of view. Admiral



"A model officer."

[From Rowlandson's caricature, 1796.]

Hotham, who held the Mediterranean command, was a hopelessly unenterprising person, who, when he caught a French fleet which he ought to have annihilated, considered that he had "done very well" in capturing a couple of ships, to the intense disgust of Nelson, who was serving under him. More ominous, however, was the fact that the Dutch fleet was now virtually under French control, though it was not yet able to take the seas; and the further fact that in the late summer Spain entered upon an alliance with the French Republic which, therefore, had three fleets at its disposal. Hotham, in the Mediterranean, was happily displaced by Admiral Jervis; but the alarm created at headquarters by the transfer of an actual preponderance of ships to France caused that great sailor's activities to be crippled by instructions that he was to evacuate the Mediterranean itself.

At the turn of the year, then, the danger was grave. Austria had just failed in one great effort to recover Lombardy, and was preparing another which was to be equally unsuccessful. The Dutch fleet was being made

ready in the Texel, and a French fleet was blockaded at Brest; but the Spanish fleet was very much larger than Jervis's squadron at Gibraltar. If that fleet succeeded in evading or overwhelming Jervis, a complete disaster might easily result. In February, however, that particular question was decisively settled. The Spaniards, with twenty-seven sail of the line, sailed from Cartagena for Cadiz. On February 14th, Jervis, cruising off Cape St. Vincent with fifteen ships of the line, fell in with them. Ten of the Spaniards were separated from the rest to leeward, and Jervis sailed down to engage the main body. The battle was practically decided by the action of Commodore Nelson, who, supported by two other captains, left the formal line of battle to engage five of the Spaniards which were endeavouring to join the leeward division. The manœuvre threw the Spanish line into confusion, and the result was a decisive victory. Although only four of the enemy's ships were taken, the action completely demonstrated the utter inefficiency of the Spanish Navy. It was made evident that this supposed accession of strength to the maritime power of France was illusory. Nelson's manœuvre was in contravention of orders; nevertheless it won the hearty approval of the admiral, who fully recognised his subordinate's justification. Jervis was rewarded with an earldom and the title of St. Vincent, and Nelson was gazetted Rear-Admiral.



Admiral Duncan.

[After the portrait by Hoppner.]

Still the danger was not past. It was manifest that Britain's power and even her existence depended upon the Navy; and in April the fleet at Spithead mutinied. The men's grievances were flagrant and intolerable. They had petitioned for redress and their petitions were ignored. The Spithead mutiny was orderly and well organised. There was no violence, but the men stood together. The justice of their demands was so conspicuous that all were conceded, including the removal of officers of whose tyranny they complained. The men promptly returned to their obedience, and there appears to be no doubt that they were determined throughout to be perfectly loyal though resolute in insisting on the redress of grievances.

More serious, however, was another mutiny which broke out a month later in the squadron at the Nore. Here the ringleaders were men who had become imbued with the French revolutionary doctrines; and while these had the upper hand the danger was extreme. The mutiny spread through the North Sea fleet, whose duty it was to keep guard over the Dutch fleet in the Texel, which was expected to put to sea immediately. All but two of the ships deserted and joined the mutineers at the Nore. Still

Admiral Duncan with his two ships sailed for the Texel and adopted the rather simple device of signalling to an imaginary fleet in the offing, in order that the Dutch might believe that the British were present in force. Happily, however, they were not ready to come out. Then the loyal minority began to get the upper hand among the mutineers; one ship after another returned to its obedience, and the ringleaders were handed over to the authorities. The real grievances were remedied, and only eighteen of the worst offenders were put to death, the Government recognising that the men had been led astray and were honestly repentant of their treason.



“Grandfather” George with the Princess Charlotte.

[From a caricature by Woodward, 1796.]

Meanwhile Buonaparte (or Bonaparte, as he now spelt his name) had been continuing his victorious career, and had extracted from the Austrians at Lobau a provisional agreement which was in effect ratified by the substantive Treaty of Campo Formio in October. Pitt at this stage was ready to go great lengths to procure a peace. But a change in the personnel of the French Directory confirmed in power the group most hostile to Britain; and the only terms which the French chose to discuss were impossible for British acceptance. Negotiations were broken off, and the Dutch came out of the Texel only to be decisively beaten in an engagement of the traditional character at Camperdown by Admiral Duncan. There was no doubt about the spirit of the fleet when it came to actual fighting. Duncan shattered the Dutch fleet, in spite of the

enemy's obstinate courage, as Jervis had shattered that of Spain. The great crisis was over, although Great Britain was formally left in complete isolation by the signing of the Treaty of Campo Formio six days after Camperdown.

Some months earlier in the year there had been a serious financial crisis in England. There had been a heavy drain upon the supply of gold in the country, and a run upon the Bank of England was threatened. The crisis was met by an order suspending cash payments, which was confirmed by an Act of Parliament extending it to the close of the war. The loyalty and confidence of the mercantile community were displayed by its readiness to accept the Bank's notes, although they would not be convertible into currency until the war was over; and it is remarkable that even under these conditions the value of the Bank paper was scarcely depreciated.

II

THE SECOND STAGE


A point had now been reached in the war when the French Republic had established itself in possession of the natural boundaries of France, and, beyond its own borders, had set up in the north of Italy and in Holland republics which were virtually dependencies, while Switzerland as the " Helvetic Republic " was practically in the same position. Spain was the ally of France, as in the days when a Bourbon reigned. The victorious General Bonaparte had been careful to avoid humiliating Austria, whose friendship he desired, while Prussia had long ceased to be hostile. The one remaining enemy recognised was Britain, and the French Directory was determined upon her humiliation. What was of more importance than the determination of the Directory was the determination of France's most distinguished general, of whom the Directory itself was beginning to stand in no little fear ; for he had ignored orders and acted on his own responsibility both in campaigning and in negotiating, after a fashion which showed that the nominal servant of the state might very soon aim at making himself its master.

Bonaparte was bent on the destruction of England, but Camperdown had at any rate deferred the possibility of immediately carrying out the plan of sweeping the British Navy off the Channel with the combined fleets of France, Spain, and Holland, and flinging an army of invasion upon her shores. Ostensibly, however, this was still the scheme which was in preparation in the winter and spring following the Treaty of Campo Formio. Bonaparte was appointed to the command of the army of invasion. Nevertheless, the scheme which he was revolving in his mind was less obvious but more tremendous. He had conceived the idea of an Asiatic conquest which should enable him to set out to achieve the empire of the West with Asia as his base. The British Empire was already the dominant power in India ; in India it should be destroyed, and the way to India lay through Egypt. The supreme defect in all Bonaparte's schemes of conquest lay in his failure to understand the enormous importance of sea power ; and because he did not understand it every one of his schemes for the destruction of the British was brought to nought, from his Egyptian expedition to his Continental System.

Bonaparte's plan, then, was to seize upon Egypt and Syria and to make them the base for further conquest. The Directory was not ill-pleased at the prospect of getting its alarmingly powerful servant out of the way, and it readily adopted his plan. The proposal of invading England was only a feint. Egypt was the real objective of the Toulon armament,

although Egypt was technically a province of the Turkish Empire with which France had no quarrel.

The Navy did not believe that the Toulon fleet was intended for the invasion of England, a project which for the time had in fact been rendered impracticable. But Nelson was detached by Jervis to take charge of it. The expedition succeeded in sailing however before Nelson's arrival. Nelson, finding that his prey had escaped and guessing its



The Battle of the Nile in Aboukir Bay, August 1, 1798.

destination, made straight for Alexandria; but Bonaparte took Malta *en route*, so that the British fleet missed the French fleet, reached Alexandria before it, found no trace of it, and started again to hunt for the quarry. Two days later the French came to Alexandria, the fleets having passed each other in hazy weather. Bonaparte landed, and began the subjugation of Egypt, which was to be followed by that of Syria, and then by further developments. Nelson left Alexandria on July 10th, but after some vain searching he got news of the movements of the French, which brought him back again, and on August 1st he found the French fleet lying in Aboukir Bay.



HORATIO, VISCOUNT NELSON

After the painting by Hoppner at St. James's Palace.

In each fleet there were thirteen sail of the line, but the French ships were bigger and carried a greater weight of metal, besides having four frigates to two of Nelson's. The French were lying anchored in line very nearly from south to north with shoals on their left when the British came down on them with a northerly wind. It was already late in the day, but Nelson resolved to fight. Reckoning that where there was room for French ships to swing there was room for British ships to sail, his five leading ships passed down on the left of the French, between them and the shoals, and engaged the van. The rest passed down on the French right and also engaged the French van, which was thus crushed by the fire on both sides, while the rear was unable to come up to its assistance. The battle raged through the night; the great French flag-ship, the *Orient*, was blown up; and in the morning the French fleet had ceased to exist. Only two vessels escaped; one besides the *Orient* was burnt, and nine were captured. The battle of the Nile or Aboukir Bay gave the British not a mere ascendancy in the Mediterranean but control, absolute, unqualified, and irresistible. Bonaparte and his army in Egypt were completely cut off from all communication with France. The overwhelming supremacy won by Hawke thirty-nine years before at Quiberon was at last completely restored by Nelson's victory of the Nile.

To that victory must also be attributed the formation of the second European coalition against France. Moderation on the part of France might have kept Europe acquiescent in the arrangements established by the Treaty of Campo Formio; but early in 1798 she took aggressive action against the Papal States, and added a Roman Republic to those which she had already established in Northern Italy. The Tsarina Catherine of Russia, intent on her own designs in the East, had stood aloof from the complications of Western Europe, though favourably disposed towards France, because French activity was conveniently embarrassing to her own neighbours Prussia and Austria. But Catherine died at the end of 1796, and the new Tsar Paul I. hated the French Revolution and looked askance upon the multiplication of republics. He was further excited by the French seizure of Malta when Bonaparte was on his way to Egypt; for Malta was the stronghold of the ancient Order of the Knights of St. John, whom he regarded as being under his special protection. Even at an earlier stage, when the British fleets had mutinied at the Nore, he had shown his friendliness to Britain by detaining a Russian squadron in British waters to give help until the mutiny should be over. Now he began actively to negotiate for a new coalition, and encouraged the Sultan of Turkey to declare war upon France in consequence of Bonaparte's unwarrantable intrusion in Egypt. Pitt eagerly associated himself with the Tsar. Naples was threatened by the French aggression in Italy; and after the battle of the Nile the presence of Nelson with his fleet on the Italian coast encouraged the king and queen of Naples to make war upon France—a short war, which resulted in the ejection of the monarchs

from Naples and the establishment there of another republic called the "Parthenopean"; it did not however extend over Sicily. A treaty at the close of the year allied Britain with Russia, Turkey, and Naples. Two months later Austria, which had been haggling over terms, joined the new coalition.

Bonaparte, though isolated in Egypt, did not abate his designs. He opened a correspondence with Tippu Sultan of Mysore, and having established his own government in Egypt, marched into Syria. But before he could follow the example of Alexander the Great and plunge into Asia, it was necessary to secure the port of Acre, which would otherwise be a gateway through which hostile armies could be poured upon his rear. But Acre defied him. Sir Sidney Smith, in command of the British squadron in the Levant, intercepted the siege materials which he was endeavouring to obtain from France, and the stronghold could only be invested on the land side. British sailors took vigorous part in the Turkish governor's stubborn defence; by the end of May Bonaparte had to retire foiled, with no alternative but to fall back upon Egypt. There he received news which decided him that the time had come when he should leave Egypt and return to France to seize the supreme control of the state. With a few comrades he slipped away from Egypt, evaded hostile ships, and landed in France. At the end of the year the Directory was overthrown and Bonaparte was proclaimed First Consul, which meant that for practical purposes he was the absolute ruler of the nominal republic.

Meanwhile general success had at first attended the arms of the coalition. A Russian army entered Italy under the command of Suvarov. The French met with crushing defeats and were all but cleared out of the country. A British expedition against Holland under the command of the Duke of York captured the Dutch fleet in the Texel.

The royalists at Naples succeeded in restoring the Bourbon monarchy with help from Nelson, in circumstances for which he has been severely and justifiably blamed, since the restoration was accompanied by a savagely vindictive punishment of the rebels. But the tide turned. The British in the Low Countries met with some reverses, and were forced to a capitulation under which they retired themselves and released some thousands of French and Dutch prisoners, although the captured fleet which had been carried to Yarmouth was retained. The Austrians and the Russians quarrelled. Masséna in Switzerland inflicted a decisive defeat on the second Russian army under Korsakof, and before the year was over Russia in dudgeon withdrew from the coalition.

Bonaparte, who, long before he assumed the title of Emperor, began to use his first name Napoleon, made overtures for a general peace; but he offended diplomatic susceptibilities by addressing himself directly to the king of England. Had there been any mutual confidence, Fox and his followers would have been fully justified in their contention that there was now an opportunity for a lasting settlement; but there was at least ample

justification for lack of confidence in the French professions, which were interpreted as having no other object than that of gaining time for the organisation of further aggressive designs. On the other hand, the tone of the British in the negotiations revived the popular hostility in France, which had been diminishing. Austria saw no prospect of terms which would satisfy her, the negotiations fell through, and the war continued.

Another Italian campaign conducted by Napoleon ended triumphantly in the victory of Marengo, which in effect paralysed Austria. Again negotiations were opened; the French attempt to treat separately with Austria and with Britain failed, and then Napoleon tried to obtain an armistice, naval as well as military. This did not suit Pitt, since it would have enabled the French to send supplies to Egypt and to Malta, which was now being blockaded. The negotiations broke down, Malta was taken, but when hostilities were renewed between France and Austria a quite decisive victory was won by Moreau at Hohenlinden. Napoleon was able to dictate his own terms to Austria, and the Treaty of Lunéville once again left Great Britain isolated.


The isolation was the more serious because the Tsar Paul had completely changed his front. If he hated the Revolution he had discovered in Bonaparte an incarnation of the principles of absolutism entirely admirable. He was already angry with Austria, and angry with England for standing by her. When the second coalition was formed, it was understood that if the British fleets captured Malta the island would pass practically under his protection; but since his withdrawal that was no longer to be expected. He was dreaming of a conquest of India, and he revived the old grievance of the Baltic Powers that the British interpretation of maritime law was destructive of neutral trade. France, it is true, was not more careful of the rights of neutrals when they clashed with her own interests, but the British fleet could enforce the views of the British government, while the French fleet was practically inoperative; so Paul now proposed to revive the Armed Neutrality. The treaty of the Baltic Powers was signed in December.

The British answer was decisive. There had been no positive act of war on the part of the Baltic Powers, but it was scarcely possible to wait while they were arranging to place their fleets at the service of France. A fleet was despatched to coerce the Danes, Nelson being second in command with Sir Hyde Parker as his chief. Nelson forced his way into the harbour of Copenhagen, where, after a furious engagement in which he ignored the admiral's signal to retire, the Danes were forced to submission and surrendered their fleet to the British. The Swedes had no inclination to meet with similar treatment, and the assassination of the Tsar placed on the Russian throne the young prince Alexander I., who was completely out of sympathy with his father's policy and very soon made terms with the British.

Ten days before the battle of the Baltic a decisive blow was struck against the French army of occupation in Egypt; Sir Ralph Abercrombie

landed at Aboukir on March 21, and routed the French. Although the gallant general himself was killed, the French troops were shut up in Alexandria, while a Turkish army was besieging Cairo, which was taken in June. Reinforcements from India joined the British force, and Alexandria surrendered in August. The French troops were allowed to return to France, but their ships remained in possession of the victors.

While Bonaparte was scheming for the conquest of India, the British ascendancy there was confirmed, and the British dominion extended by the Governor-General, Lord Mornington, better known as the Marquess Wellesley, the elder brother of the still more famous Duke of Wellington. The rule of Sir John Shore, the successor of Cornwallis, was deficient in firmness, and the native powers, especially Mysore, were developing hopes of overthrowing the British, when Mornington arrived in India just as Bonaparte was preparing to sail for Egypt. Tippu, the Bhonsla, and Sindhia all had forces under French officers; and Tippu at least was



Seringapatam, Tippu's capital, stormed in 1799.

[Taken from a view in Home's "Mysore," Madras, 1794.]

in active correspondence with the French commandant at Mauritius. Mornington acted promptly. He applied immediate pressure to the Nizam, who dismissed his French officers and accepted in place of the force which had been maintained a British contingent—that is to say, a sepoy army with British officers—theoretically for the defence of his dominions against the aggression of native powers; for the maintenance of which force he ceded territory, a system known as that of "subsidiary alliances." Similar pressure was brought to bear upon Sindhia, and then Mornington proceeded against Tippu.

It must be remembered that Tippu's father had usurped the sovereignty of Mysore not forty years before, and that Tippu himself was a fanatical Mohammedan ruling by the sword over subjects who were for the most part Hindus. The war with Tippu was emphatically a war with a dynasty, not with a state; and it was necessitated by the plain fact that Tippu was in alliance with France for the purpose of destroying the British power. Tippu rejected the British ultimatum, and in 1799 the British troops stormed Seringapatam. The Sultan himself was killed. Mornington reinstated the representative of the previous Hindu dynasty as lord of the old Mysore territory, and annexed the rest of Tippu's dominion, though a

portion was restored to the Nizam. These districts, however, were retroceded by him for the permanent maintenance of the protecting British contingent.

The fall of Alexandria was the last phase of the active hostilities. The British were ready enough for peace if they could have it with security; Napoleon wanted it, we are entitled to believe, in order to organise the isolation and coercion of the British, since it was clear enough that as matters stood coercion was not likely to be effective. The preliminaries of peace were agreed upon in October, but the British Government was no longer that of Pitt, who had resigned office in March. The battle of the Baltic was actually fought under the auspices of the Addington administration. Pitt had carried the Treaty of Union with Ireland, but the king's flat refusal to agree to Catholic Emancipation, to which Pitt and some of his colleagues were absolutely pledged as an accompaniment of the Union, compelled the minister and some of his supporters to resign. The change of ministry did not involve transfer of power to the Opposition; it merely meant that Pitt and the colleagues who were pledged to Catholic Emancipation gave a qualified support from outside to their former colleagues, who remained in office with some new associates. The authority and capacity of the new ministry was seriously diminished by the withdrawals; but as the Rockinghams thirty-five years before would have preferred to remain under the leadership of the elder Pitt, so the Addington ministry now would have preferred to remain under the leadership of the younger. The Addington ministry made the peace which became definitive as the Treaty of Amiens in March 1802, but barely two years elapsed before Pitt was recalled to the helm.

The treaty embodied the belief of Pitt himself and of some but by no means all of his former colleagues that the need for war was over, that France and Europe had learnt their lesson, and that a time of general peace and recuperation was at hand. Concession, therefore, was carried so far that Britain agreed to restore all her conquests with the exception of Ceylon and Trinidad. In these restitutions was included that of Cape Colony to the Dutch; it had been ceded by the Stadtholder to prevent its seizure by the French, after his retreat from Holland, but before his government had been technically set aside, and the British had taken possession after a formal show of resistance on the part of the Dutch colonists. It was to be re-occupied later and to remain a permanent British possession. But even before the Treaty of Amiens was signed, it was becoming evident that the peace had in it no element of permanence. The joy with which it was hailed in England was premature.

III

IRELAND AND THE UNION

Ireland had achieved legislative independence with the constitution of 1782, confirmed by the Renunciatory Act of the following year. She had refused to surrender any portion of that independence even as the price of the final removal of hampering commercial restrictions. She had asserted it again very emphatically at the time of the Regency Bill, when the Irish parliament, led by Grattan, refused to recognise the right of the parliament at Westminster to control the regency for Ireland, and sent a deputation to London to offer the regency to the Prince of Wales on its own account—a proceeding of which the effectiveness was somewhat damaged by the fact that by the time the deputation reached London the king had been restored to health and there was no regency to offer. The prosperity of the country advanced rapidly during the years of peace, since the concessions already made greatly extended Irish commerce; the paralysis of the Catholic population had at least been diminished by the relaxation of the Penal Code; the spirit of hopefulness stimulated enterprise, and agriculture assumed a new activity.

But an independent parliament could be regarded only as a first step towards the reform of flagrant abuses which powerful interests were still energetic in preserving. The executive was still responsible to the Crown, not to parliament; parliament itself was infinitely less representative of the actual electorate and more subject to the control of corrupt influences than even the parliament at Westminster; and on religious grounds the electorate itself was restricted to the Protestant community, who formed less than a fourth of the population, while the Protestant dissenters were in a worse position than their brethren in England.

The Irish parliament then was in effect controlled by the group whose interest it was to preserve an unreformed representation, while those who desired reform were in disagreement on the Catholic question. This controlling majority was thoroughly loyal to the British connection; but the guarantee of their loyalty was their firm conviction that the Protestant ascendancy, their own ascendancy, rested upon British support. Had Grattan been the leader of a majority the loyalty of the parliament would hardly have been less, for Grattan had a splendid faith in mutual trust and honour as the curative for misunderstandings. For such mutual trust he pleaded earnestly, and on the same principles he desired to place his Catholic fellow-countrymen on the same footing as the Protestants, and to trust in the loyalty which the Catholic gentry had already displayed so conspicuously. Had the Catholic gentry been freely admitted to public life, it is certain that they would have proved themselves worthy of the confi-

dence reposed in them. In short, a reformed Irish parliament would in all probability have been a loyal parliament. But the one reform which was conceded, pressed upon the ascendancy party by Pitt, and accepted by it not without reluctance, was not calculated to improve the position. In 1792 the franchise was extended so as to admit Catholics to the electorate, but they were still excluded from parliament and from office. In other words, the leaders were kept out of active public life and distrusted, while the rank and file were admitted to the franchise.

This measure came just before the declaration of war between France and Great Britain, when the Revolution in France was already unmistakably triumphant, and the French Revolution, following upon the American Revolution, had sown dangerous seed in Ireland. For there a fruitful soil was provided among the Protestant dissenters with their Puritan tradition, the Catholic proletariat with its ill-defined but acute consciousness of oppression, and an agrarian population which, whether Protestant or Catholic, had a lively sense of hostility to the landlords and still more to the middlemen—a chain of whom was generally interposed between the absentee landlords and tenantry. It was to this community of interests hostile to the existing order that the young lawyer Wolfe Tone appealed when he started the Society of the United Irishmen in 1791.

Wolfe Tone himself was imbued with many of the ideas of the French Revolution, and his own ultimate aim was to create an Irish republic. But these aims were not yet to be acknowledged. The first thing was to get rid of dissension and unite the Irish people in a demand for the redress of grievances. The time had not yet come for treating the British connection as the root cause of the grievances. The Protestant population were to combine with the Catholics in a demand for full political rights irrespective of religion, and the Society of the United Irishmen, with its starting-point among the Protestants of Ulster, virtually leagued itself with the "Catholic Committee," which had been in existence for more than thirty years. That committee had already changed its character, having become democratised by the secession from it of many Catholics who had taken alarm at the anti-clerical aspects of the French Revolution. On the other hand, while the active propaganda of the new movement was accompanied by an increase of agrarian disturbance, it intensified also the repressive activities of the ascendancy party which dominated both parliament and the executive.

In 1795 a new viceroy, Lord Fitzwilliam, realised the essential justice of the Catholic demands, and reform seemed to be at hand; but the ascendancy group, led by the Chancellor Fitzgibbon, proved too strong for him. Fitzwilliam was recalled, Fitzgibbon was made Earl of Clare, and in his hands the new viceroy, Lord Camden, virtually placed himself. And now a fresh element of chaos was introduced by a revival of religious animosities. The Protestants associated with the United Irish Movement were in the main, though not exclusively, Presbyterians. But in the

popular terminology of the day, Protestants meant the preponderant body who belonged to the Established Church and were free from political disabilities. These Ulster Protestants formed the opposition societies called the "Peep o' Day Boys," a name which gave place to that of "Orangemen" in commemoration of William of Orange. For the past four years the Peep o' Day Boys had been in frequent collision with the supporters of the United Irishmen; and now the Orange society developed a sort of crusade against the Catholic peasantry, with the result that large numbers all over Ireland began to enroll themselves in the Society of United Irishmen, which welcomed them with open arms.

Nevertheless, Catholic Ireland was not at this time ripe for rebellion, though Wolfe Tone imagined that it was. He betook himself to France, dropped the mask, and had no difficulty in persuading the French government to despatch a large expedition under the command of Hoche to land in Ireland. It was the moment when British naval ascendancy was still in the balance, just before Jervis's victory at Cape St. Vincent. The expedition did not land; it was driven off by tempests. But it is remarkable that when its arrival was hourly expected there was no sign of a rising in Ireland itself.

Still, through 1797, while the religious strife raged chiefly in Ulster, the organisers of rebellion were arming and drilling constantly increasing numbers of the Catholic peasantry. On the other hand, the Government adopted vigorous repressive measures for the seizure of arms and the insurrectionary ringleaders; and this work was done chiefly by the Ulster yeomanry, who were in fact Orange volunteers imbued with the passions of the religious strife. All the progress towards harmony, of which there had seemed to be such high promise when Grattan's parliament was created, was done away with, and all the old animosities were again raised to their highest pitch. The unrestrained brutalities of the government soldiery were answered by deeds of corresponding savagery. There was no one to control, to organise, or to restrain the insurrectionary movement, because the Government had seized its chiefs; and in May 1798 a desperate but abortive rebellion blazed out in the counties of Wicklow and Wexford, where the struggle was practically between Catholics and Protestants without qualification.

The suppression of the insurrection was secured by the decisive defeat of the insurgents at Vinegar Hill; and the fortunate appointment of Cornwallis, the former Governor-General of India, as Lord-Lieutenant, insured that so far as lay in his power the final suppression of the rebellion would be conducted as leniently as possible. But the whole episode was made hideous by barbarous conduct on both sides, though it was accompanied by redeeming deeds of heroic courage. Nor was it possible even for Cornwallis to prevent continued excesses on the part of the side which had won. And Grattan's parliament had failed so utterly to fulfil Grattan's own hopes, it had become so completely the instrument of the oligarchy, that Grattan himself had seceded from it in despair.

One more incident of the rebellion is to be noted. France did not repeat the attempt of 1796, and Bonaparte was absorbed in the Egyptian expedition. Nevertheless a small French force was landed in the west; its leader, General Humbert, scattered a large force of militia which was despatched against him, at what was called the "Race of Castlebar," and he was able to give a good deal of trouble before he was finally forced to surrender. But practically outside the counties of Wicklow and Wexford the insurrection never made head.

The conclusion forced upon Cornwallis in Ireland and upon Pitt in England was that the sister island would never have a healthy government except through an incorporating union with Great Britain. The complete absorption of power by the Irish oligarchy, their provocative oppression before the rebellion, and their tyrannous abuse of their position when it was over, were condemned by Cornwallis in the strongest terms, though perhaps his condemnation was more inclusive and more sweeping than the circumstances altogether warranted. But the outstanding fact remained that government by the oligarchy was intolerable, and would inevitably keep the country in a state of seething sedition. On the other hand, if the very much larger subject population were admitted to political equality, they in their turn would be overwhelmingly predominant, and would show very little mercy in penalising their former rulers for all the misdeeds of the past. An incorporating union would give the control to the parliament at Westminster, which could deal out even-handed justice, since it would be dominated by neither of the Irish parties; and at the same time there would be no Nationalist grievance, because Ireland would stand on the same footing in the Imperial parliament as England and Scotland—a very different thing from the state of affairs before 1782, when a British parliament in which Ireland was unrepresented actively controlled the government of Ireland. An incorporating union therefore was the condition without which it was vain to hope for a loyal and peaceful Ireland.

But neither Pitt nor Cornwallis imagined that a union would of itself suffice to make Ireland peaceful and loyal. There was in any case the initial difficulty that the Irish Nationalist sentiment was as strong as it had been in Scotland at the beginning of the century. The majority of Irishmen from Grattan himself down believed that the country could work out its own salvation under a reformed government; that is, the leaders of Irish opinion believed that if the grievances of the Catholic population were removed and the parliament were made truly representative, the vengeful spirit would fade, animosities would die down, and Ireland would justify the confidence that had been reposed in her. The mere fact that these leaders resented the loss of independence made it all the more imperative, if Irish loyalty was to be attained, that a union should be accompanied by the decisive removal of grievances. The fatal defect of the Union was that Pitt, aware of this necessity, allowed it to be understood in Ireland that the Act of Union would be accompanied by the removal of the acknowledged

grievances, without himself taking steps to make the reforms an integral part of the Union. And when the Union had been carried, the English minister found himself brought up against the blank wall of the king's absolute refusal to remedy the grievances of the Catholics. Pitt and others salved their consciences by resignation, but that was the end. Pitt gave the king his promise not to raise the question again, and he returned to office when his presence was again imperatively needed at the helm, without making the fulfilment of his pledges a condition.

The proposal for an incorporating union was approved by large majorities at Westminster, but was virtually defeated—that is, it was passed by a majority of only one—in the Irish House of Commons when introduced in 1799 by Lord Castlereagh, who was chief secretary to Cornwallis. But Pitt, bent on the measure, decided that the assent of the Irish parliament must be obtained at whatever cost. Cornwallis, the most straightforward of statesmen, certainly believed that he had authority to obtain the support of Catholic opinion by at least implying that the religious grievance would be removed. But the vital matter was to procure a majority in parliament. Pitt and his most effective agent, Castlereagh, were entirely opposed to testing public opinion by a general election. The simpler plan was followed of applying a vigorous and unqualified corruption to convert opponents of the measure into friends. Peerages, places, and pensions were lavishly promised or scattered; there may not have been bribery in the most literal sense, but every man who had his price obtained it. In the year 1800 the Acts of Union were passed both by the British and Irish parliaments, and in 1801 the first parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland met at Westminster.

The Act united the legislatures, giving Ireland one hundred representatives; the Irish peers elected twenty-eight representatives of their number to sit in the House of Lords, while those who were excluded from that chamber were eligible to the House of Commons for any English or Scottish constituencies; and Ireland was to contribute two-seventeenths to the imperial revenue. But she still remained with a separate administration and a separate judicial system, with her effective government controlled by the viceroy, who himself continued to be influenced mainly by the ascendancy party; and if she was at last and decisively freed from all commercial restrictions and placed on the same footing as the sister island, the pledges to the Catholics were ignored, and their grievances, with those of the Protestant dissenters, remained unremedied. As for the reform of representation, that could hardly have been carried out without corresponding reforms in England, where the fear of the French Revolution, of Jacobinism and anarchy, deferred any such measure for a generation.

CHAPTER XXXI

THE STRUGGLE WITH NAPOLEON

I

THE BLACK SHADOW AND TRAFALGAR

THE British people were anxious for peace, anxious to believe that a durable peace was possible. It accepted the Treaty of Amiens with satisfaction, willing to surrender very much for the sake of a general pacification. But Grenville and others of Pitt's former colleagues looked askance, mistrusting the First Consul, who, they believed, would merely make use of the peace in order to strengthen his own position and that of France, and then turn upon Great Britain. The omens which had even preceded the ratification of the treaty were verified by the further consolidation of the French ascendancy in the lately created republics outside the French frontiers, and in the First Consul's assumption of authority in dealing with the minor German states. The French ascendancy was used to enforce the exclusion of British goods from the ports of the dependents of France. French agents for commercial purposes visited Ireland and made themselves familiar with British ports; the commercial character of the agents was more than dubious. An official "commercial" report regarding Egypt was much more concerned with the facilities for reconquest than with its ostensible subject.

Protest on the part of Great Britain as to the actions of the Republic on the Continent were in effect met by saying that they were none of England's business; and by angry complaints that the French émigrés were allowed scandalously to traduce the First Consul in the British Press, and that the British were abstaining from their obligation under the Treaty of Amiens to evacuate Malta. There was some technical warrant for Napoleon's attitude, but it was no less evident that he was violating the understandings upon which the treaty had been made. In plain terms



George III.

[After the painting by Sir William Beechey.]

it was soon impossible to doubt that Napoleon was determined to rule Britain out of all voice in European affairs, to ruin her commerce by a policy of exclusion, and to enforce her submission by war if she refused it on any other terms. The price was more than she chose to pay. Reluctantly but with grim resolution the country made up its mind to a combat *à outrance*, in which it very soon felt itself to be fighting not only for its own existence but for the liberties of Europe dominated by the will of a military despot. Fourteen months after the Treaty of Amiens war was once more declared between France and the British Empire, a war in which there was no longer any pretence that France was the champion of liberty, equality, and fraternity; it was a war for the destruction of the British Empire, and its vindictive character was signalled at the outset by the First Consul's decree for the immediate arrest and detention as prisoners of war of all British subjects then travelling in France.

Now there was only one possible method by which Great Britain, single-handed, could strike at France, and that was by crippling her marine and destroying her seaborne commerce. The invasion of France by a British army was unthinkable. There were two methods by which France with or without allies could seek to strike at Britain, invasion and the destruction of her commerce by its exclusion from Europe. For two years and a half both plans were in operation, until invasion was made once for all impossible by Nelson's last victory of Trafalgar, which therefore terminates the first phase of the war. But Napoleon had not yet learnt, nor did he ever learn, the inherent futility of attempting to annihilate British commerce without destroying the British naval supremacy; because that supremacy gave her in effect a complete monopoly of the seaborne trade of the world. Europe could not do without goods which could only be brought to her by British ships. Even if European governments were willing, European ports could not be closed so as to block the entry of commodities which Europe could not and would not do without. The fact had been illustrated during the nine years of the first war, when, as in the Seven Years' War, British commerce had persistently expanded. It was to be proved to demonstration in the second war, when British commerce continued to expand and Europe continued to be flooded with British goods, even after there was scarcely a port on the whole European seaboard which was not theoretically closed to British merchandise.

During the first phase of the war then, while the French control of ports outside the French dominion was limited, it was palpable that British commerce could at the worst be only hampered. The British fleets swept the seas with none to say them nay; and they continued to assert the right of search and the inclusive doctrines as to contraband of war which had been protested against by the Armed Neutrality in 1780 and in 1801 as destructive of the legitimate trade of neutrals. Napoleon's grand object during this time was to effect an invasion of England, and for two years and a half that black shadow hung over the country. Across the

Channel troops were collected, and flotillas were gathered, to be in readiness to embark the troops at a moment's notice and hurl them upon the English shore. The project did not alarm the British Admiralty, which was satisfied that its own dispositions made invasion impossible. The mastery of the sea was secure. Even if the incredible should occur and for a few days there should be no force in the Channel to repel invasion, so that the French flotillas might succeed in effecting a crossing unmolested, their communications would at once be cut and the invading force would soon find itself helpless. Napoleon seems to have believed in the possibility of making the army of invasion live upon the invaded country. But England would not have been easily conquered at a blow; for besides the regular troops who were within the four seas and the partly trained militia, vast numbers of the civil population were under arms drilling and training as volunteers, while it does not appear that Napoleon ever had more than a hundred thousand men, if so many, ready for embarkation. So while there was no little popular alarm, and the coming of "Boney" was awaited with nervous anticipation, the Admiralty were under no apprehensions. The fleet in home waters was a more than sufficient guard. It was Napoleon's dream that the rest of the British fleet might be enticed away, and that in its absence French fleets might be so combined as to secure the mastery of the Channel at least for a time; but the dream was chimerical, as the event demonstrated. For two

years French and British lay facing each other on the Channel watching and waiting before any further attempt could be made to carry out Napoleon's plan, and then it broke down utterly and ruinously.

Within a few months after the declaration of war, an abortive insurrection in Ireland stirred up by the enthusiast, Robert Emmet, was easily suppressed. But the Addington ministry was tottering, and Pitt's resumption of the leadership was imperatively called for. It was his own wish to emphasise the national character of the struggle by forming not a party but a national ministry, which should include both Fox, who had persistently opposed the first war, and Grenville, who had opposed the peace. Fox, although the king flatly refused to admit him to the ministry, urged his own followers to support the Government. Grenville himself refused to take office, and after all the strength of Pitt's Cabinet lay entirely in Pitt himself. But if his leadership inspired the country with confidence, it was nevertheless not to him but to the admirable strategical arrangements for which the chief credit at the finish was due to Lord Barham at the Admiralty, that Great Britain owed her security. The French ports were blockaded not in the sense that an attempt was made to keep them sealed up, but in the sense that it was hardly possible for any squadron to



The Double-Headed Government.

[A caricature of the alliance of Pitt and Fox, from Jaime's "Musée de la Caricature."]

put to sea without being detected and overpowered ; and at the same time there were complete arrangements for a concentration of forces in case any accident should render such a step necessary. Nelson was in charge in the Mediterranean ; Admiral Cornwallis, the brother of the Marquess, kept watch over Brest ; and it was unlikely that a fleet would get out from either Brest or Toulon without being forced to one of the decisive actions which were the constant desire of British admirals.

Pitt, however, was not satisfied with watching and waiting. As before, he bent his efforts to the formation of a new coalition. Almost at the moment of Pitt's return to office, Europe was standing aghast at the murder of the Duc d'Enghien, the representative of the junior branch of the Bourbons, who had been trapped on German soil, carried over the French frontier, and shot after a mock trial by a military commission. Two months after the murder Napoleon was proclaimed Emperor, and the French Republic was at an end, as it had been in fact if not in name ever since Napoleon became First Consul. The crime excited the deep indignation of the Russian Tsar ; while the proclamation of the new Empire was alarming to the head of the historic Holy Roman Empire. The Powers began to arm, though Russia was the only one of them which as yet was thoroughly determined upon war. Napoleon's ambitions were emphasised when the North Italian Republic invited him to become its king and he accepted the invitation. The dependent republics were forced to re-organise themselves at his dictation. But it was not till April of 1805 that Russia and Great Britain formed a definite league to which Austria was immediately added ; while Prussia, which hoped to get Hanover from Napoleon (who had taken possession of it) as a reward of neutrality, still held aloof. On the other hand, Napoleon forced upon Spain a new treaty which placed her fleet at his disposal. To all appearance he paid little attention to the new coalition, but was engaged upon preparing the stroke which was to clear the way for the invasion of England.

The plan was that Admiral Villeneuve should sail from Toulon, pick up Spanish reinforcements, decoy Nelson away to the West Indies and leave him there, and then return to co-operate with the Brest fleet in crushing Cornwallis and clearing the Channel. Villeneuve succeeded in carrying out a part of his programme. He slipped out of Toulon, evaded Nelson, attached a Spanish squadron at Cadiz, and made for the West Indies. Nelson, after starting on a false scent, went in pursuit, leaving Collingwood behind to keep ward over Cadiz. The quarry escaped him, but a swift brig carried warning to England ; the Channel fleet was concentrated at the west of the Channel, and Calder was detached from Ferrol with thirteen ships of the line to deal with Villeneuve, who had twenty. Nelson, meanwhile, was on his way back to join Collingwood's squadron at Cadiz. Calder found Villeneuve off Cape Finisterre and engaged him. The battle itself was not of a decisive character, but was decisive in its effects, since Villeneuve ran for Corunna, and Calder returned to the main fleet, to be

court-martialled for having been contented with the capture of two ships. By this time Nelson had already joined Collingwood; and Napoleon's great naval *coup* was completely brought to nought. Nelson himself returned home for a few weeks, while Villeneuve gave up all idea of raising the blockade of Brest, and turned his attentions towards Cadiz. Calder's action was fought on July 22nd. On August 15th Villeneuve sailed



Lord Nelson.

[From the painting by Sir William Beechey, R.A.]

from Corunna for Cadiz, and on September 29th Nelson rejoined Collingwood.

Stirred by bitter taunts flung at him by the Emperor, Villeneuve put to sea with thirty-three ships of the line, French and Spanish, and five frigates. Nelson, with twenty-seven ships, caught him on October 21st off Trafalgar between Cadiz and Gibraltar. Nelson was to windward, with a north-west wind to carry him down on the enemy's line, which was heading from south to north. As at the Nile, he resolved to use his opportunity to annihilate the Franco-Spanish fleet in spite of its superior numbers. The

method of the attack was unusual but decisive. Nelson's fleet bore down in two parallel lines, headed by Nelson himself and by Collingwood, almost at right angles to the French line, which was pierced at two points. The van was cut off and kept out of action, while the centre and rear were shattered by Nelson and Collingwood, every ship being taken or destroyed. Even the van could not escape completely, since four of them were taken



Admiral Lord Collingwood.


besides the eighteen prizes secured in the main action. The victory was absolutely overwhelming. The British supremacy had never in fact been seriously endangered for a moment since the battle of Camperdown; the work had been completed by Nelson in the bay of Aboukir. Trafalgar made an end of all serious resistance to the British monopoly of the seas. It was the last real naval action of the war, because after it there was no navy to fight. Nevertheless the victory was dearly bought at the price of the death of him who by universal assent is accounted the greatest sea-captain that the world has known. Nelson's career of glory had reached its glorious close.

The triumph of Trafalgar dispersed once for all that shadow of invasion which had hung over England. But Napoleon, the world at large, even perhaps Britain herself, were made blind to its decisiveness by the crushing of the

European coalition at Austerlitz. When Villeneuve sailed from Corunna for Cadiz instead of for Brest, the Emperor of the French saw that his dream of an invasion of England had melted into air. With characteristic promptitude he turned upon the foes who were slowly gathering against him in the east. The Austrians had massed an advance army at Ulm. The Russian armies were still far away. The German principalities which lay between the French frontier and Ulm were already virtually under Napoleon's heel. He poured his armies through their territories, swooped upon Ulm, and compelled the whole Austrian force there to capitulate on the day before Trafalgar was fought.

The way lay open to Vienna, which was soon occupied; but the

Russians were now advancing, and the rest of the Austrian army, which had fallen back, moved to join them. On December 2nd, at Austerlitz, Napoleon won what was perhaps the most brilliant of all his victories over the combination of Russians and Austrians. The Russians retreated; the Austrian resistance was annihilated. Prussia, which had just resolved to join the coalition, returned to its attitude of neutrality, and Napoleon's triumph on the Continent was complete. "Roll up that map of Europe," said Pitt; "it will not be wanted again for ten years." His own end was



The Battle of Trafalgar, October 21, 1805.

very near. On January 23, 1806, three months and two days after Trafalgar, the great English statesman, whose last years had been devoted to the struggle with France, followed to the grave the great English sailor who had struck for Britain the decisive blow in the struggle.

II

THE CONTINENTAL SYSTEM

The death of Pitt necessitated the formation of a new ministry on the lines which Pitt himself had desired when he took office for the last time.

The king himself could no longer resist the inclusion of Fox in a National government. Grenville was the head of the "Ministry of all the Talents." But eight months after his great rival Fox too died. In these last months of his life he saw secured one great reform upon which his heart had long been set. The resolutions demanding the abolition of the slave trade were at last carried in both Houses, though the consequent Act was not passed until Fox had disappeared from the scene. But Fox learnt in office the vanity of his persistent hope and belief that a durable peace could be made with Napoleon. The Emperor had no objection to negotiations, but he had no intention of being balked or hampered in carrying out the smallest fragment of his ambitious designs. From Austerlitz onwards, through 1806 at least, Napoleon's career was one of steady and successful aggression with only one unimportant check. Prussia very soon accepted his conditions and closed her ports to British trade, getting Hanover as her reward. The Bourbon dynasty was again driven out of Naples and retained only the island of Sicily under British protection. The mainland was made a kingdom for Napoleon's brother Joseph; Holland with enlarged borders was made a kingdom for another brother, Louis. The Rhine states of the Empire were formed into the Confederation of the Rhine, with duchies and principalities distributed among Napoleon's marshals. The Holy Roman Empire was formally dissolved; the Austrian Emperor was the Austrian Emperor and nothing more. The king of Prussia at last awoke to the fact that the French Emperor was playing with him; too late he challenged his mighty adversary, and in October Prussia was brought completely under Napoleon's heel by the victories of Jena and Auerstadt. Frederick William had to fall back upon Russian support.

The negotiations with Fox broke down over the English minister's refusal to cede Sicily or to desert the Tsar. But the Ministry of all the Talents, failing through no fault of its own to procure an honourable peace, did not understand the conduct of war. It clung to the old tradition of sending here and there desultory expeditions with no chance of accomplishing permanent results. Thus it sent to Southern Italy a force under General Stuart, who won at Maida a victory over a superior force of French veterans, which somewhat raised the prestige of British troops and lowered that of the French; but the success was not followed up and the expedition was withdrawn. Another expedition sent to Buenos Ayres by way of striking a blow at the Spanish government in South America ended in ignominious disaster in 1807. The one distinctive gain to the British Empire in 1806 was the effective re-occupation of Cape Colony, which Fox refused to surrender.


Six months after Fox's death the Grenville ministry resigned, in March 1807, on a constitutional question. Defeated by the king's rejection of a proposal to admit Roman Catholics to commissions in the Army and Navy, it formally refused the king's demand that it should pledge itself not to raise the question again. Resolutions declaring the right of the

ministry to tender advice at its own discretion were shelved, the ministry resigned, and reactionary Toryism was established in power for twenty years. During those twenty years the strifes and divisions, as under the long Whig ascendancy of the last century, were not strifes of party principle but of antagonistic personalities. But the events of 1806 had the effect of removing the last shred of doubt that the struggle with Napoleon would have to be fought out to the bitter end, and also of bringing home a new conviction that Napoleon was not to be defeated by the old system of alliances with continental dynasties. Pitt had grasped the fact before his death. Dynastic interests would never form a solid ground for a combination which could hold Napoleon permanently in check. Napoleon meant to be master of Europe, and only when nations, not dynasties, rose against the oppressor would combinations be effective. To national uprisings Britain would give her hearty support, but she would no longer devote herself to forming coalitions of the old type.

Already, in 1806, Napoleon struck the first blow which was intended to bring the "nation of shopkeepers" to its knees. When after Jena Napoleon conducted his triumphal progress through Prussia to Berlin, he issued from the Prussian capital the Berlin Decree which was to annihilate British commerce. Every port in every dependent state and in every state in alliance with France was to be closed to British goods. It was tolerably apparent that every state which did not so close its ports would very soon be treated by France as an enemy. The British Government responded with the Orders in Council, declaring all ports so closed to be in a state of blockade, and therefore not open to any commerce at all. Further Napoleonic decrees were met by further Orders in Council of the same drastic type. British action was of course represented as having for its purpose the destruction of all neutral commerce and the appropriation of the trade of the world. That was very nearly the effect, but it was not the intention. The Orders in Council were measures of war. The conquest was a plain trial of strength. If Europe could preserve her commerce while excluding the British at the dictation of Napoleon, the British Empire would be ruined; if she could not, the British Empire would not be ruined; but European commerce would, and Europe would feel that she owed her woes to the dictatorship of Napoleon. The commercial war would be a means to excite Europe to shake itself free from the Napoleonic yoke.

Early in 1807 Napoleon received a check from the Russians in alliance with the Prussian king at the battle of Eylau; but four months later he won a decisive victory at Friedland, which, with other circumstances, caused the Tsar to change his policy. Alexander was angry with Britain, which, owing chiefly to inefficiency in the administration, had failed to send him the support he expected. His alliance with Prussia, now absolutely at Napoleon's mercy, was of no use to him. The two Emperors met and held a secret conclave on a raft in midstream at Tilsit, where they made a compact under which the Tsar was to unite with his new ally in com-

PELLING the still neutral minor states to close their ports, while his own were also to be closed, to the British. Prussia was shorn of its western territories, out of which a kingdom of Westphalia was patched up for still another of Napoleon's brothers, Jerome, while her annexations in Poland were taken away and converted into the grand duchy of Warsaw.



The Emperor Napoleon.

[From the painting by Delaroche.]

George Canning, however, received information of the secret articles of the treaty; he had become Foreign Secretary on the fall of the Grenville ministry. Although it was impossible to produce any public justification, he promptly despatched an expedition to Denmark, offering her the British alliance, and demanding as on the previous occasion that she should surrender her fleet into British keeping. It was the obvious intention of the new alliance to absorb all the European fleets; and, in view of the danger, Canning had no hesitation in ignoring customary rules. Denmark refused. Copenhagen was bombarded; Denmark yielded, and her fleet was carried off. It may be doubted whether Britain had anything serious to fear from any possible combination of foreign navies, and whether she did not rather lose by making Danish sentiment bitterly hostile and by violating the accepted conventions which are called the Public Law of Europe. But the danger was there, and Canning's action put an end to it.

Napoleon, like Canning himself, certainly believed that the high-handed action of the British minister had gone far to foil his plans; for his indignation was genuine, and was certainly not in fact based, as he professed, on his respect for the Public Law of Europe, which he only recognised himself when it suited him. His denunciations were made scarcely more convincing by the coercion which he applied to Portugal to bring it within the ring-fence of his Continental System, the name he gave to the scheme for the exclusion of British commerce. A French army under Junot marched into Portugal; but the royal family, instead of submitting to Napoleon, embarked upon British ships and betook itself to the great Portuguese colony of Brazil. Canning's coercion of Denmark, though it failed to bring about the alliance with the Northern Powers for which he had hoped, had the very clear justification that it might at least be regarded

as a necessary act of self-defence. It was not possible to apply a similar defence to Napoleon's seizure of Portugal.

Before the end of the year, then, Russia had declared war upon Britain, and there was scarcely a free port left along the whole European coastline from which British goods were not excluded. It is an ironical commentary on Napoleon's programme that he found himself obliged to grant licences to purchase and sell British goods, both manufactures and raw materials, which the Continent could not produce out of its own resources; while smuggling, if a dangerous business, became both a very extensive and a very lucrative one.

The seizure of Portugal, where Junot very soon set aside the Portuguese government and took over the administration, was the first step towards the opening of an entirely new phase in the war. It is probable that Napoleon was already resolved to annex Spain as well as Portugal to the French Empire. The royal family of Spain played into his hands. The king, Charles IV., the queen, the heir-apparent Ferdinand, and the minister Godoy, formed perhaps a group as despicable as any which ever held in its hands the government of a great nation. The Crown Prince and the minister, the queen's favourite, were very much at feud. Both parties intrigued with the French Emperor, who found in the Portuguese troubles a sufficient excuse for throwing French troops into Spain. These were at first rather welcomed by the populace, who imagined that they had come to take the part of Ferdinand, who was popular simply for the reason that Godoy was detested. But Napoleon enticed both the king and his son over the border to Bayonne, where both became parties to a compact by which both king and prince abdicated the Spanish throne; whereupon Napoleon proclaimed his own brother Joseph king of Spain, transferring him thither from Naples, while he passed on the crown of Naples to his brother-in-law, Joachim Murat.

It was a simple and easy bargain, but it left out of count the possibility that the Spanish people might have something to say. They had. They regarded Joseph Bonaparte as a usurper and Ferdinand's abdication as having been extorted from him by force. In every province the people rose in arms, and committees called juntas were formed to conduct resistance to the usurper. Before the end of July a considerable French force was compelled to capitulate to the insurgents at Baylen. Napoleon discovered that Spain would have to be conquered before his brother could occupy the throne. He did not anticipate much difficulty in the task; but he had never before had to overcome a fiercely hostile people, and he had never before had to do battle with an efficient British army. Both those experiences were before him now and made havoc of his calculations.

III


THE PENINSULA WAR

Portugal had palpably and unmistakably been coerced; the national government had in no sense accepted the French supremacy, it had merely submitted to irresistibly superior force. As Portugal's ally, Britain had full warrant for intervening. Technically the case was different with Spain. Formally the Bourbon dynasty had abdicated of its own free will, and the new king had been elected by a body masquerading as a national assembly. Technically therefore the Spanish insurgents were rebels. But this did not prevent the British Government from recognising its opportunity and espousing their cause. The capitulation of Baylen gave promise that the Spaniards would not collapse, that they were embarking on an adventure which was not altogether desperate; and the rising of the Spaniards encouraged the idea of helping Portugal to break from the bonds which had just been imposed upon her. The country would be entirely friendly, and the British command of the sea secured free entry and uninterrupted communication, whereas French armies could only get to Portugal through hostile Spanish territory. If Portugal were secured it would become a base whence the Spanish insurgents could be supported and helped to eject the French. The Peninsula War, which began with the landing of British troops in Portugal on August 13, 1808, was a new departure. For the first time a British army under a British general was about to take the lead in a land war against a European power. Even in Marlborough's day that great general's achievements were only in part due to the British army. The British did not fight their battles single-handed; but in the Peninsula, although invaluable service was rendered in the war by the Spanish guerillas, Wellington's own battles were fought and won by British troops who received practically no assistance from the Spanish regulars who were acting with them. Hitherto throughout the great struggle with France, at any rate for a hundred years, nearly all the British honours had fallen to British seamen. Now that there were no honours left for British seamen to win, British soldiers took their share, not in India and America only but in Europe.

The British force of twelve thousand men was under the immediate command of Sir Arthur Wellesley, as yet known only as a "sepoy general," on account of his brilliant services in India during his brother's Governor-Generalship, to which we shall presently revert. Reinforcements were following under Sir John Moore, but the two commanders were to be subordinate to two senior officers, Sir Harry Burrard and Sir Hew Dalrymple, when they should arrive in the Peninsula. Wellesley landed at the mouth of the Mondego, marched towards Lisbon, and was met by Junot at Vimiero.

Junot attacked and was repulsed. Wellesley was confident that, left to himself, he could have crushed him. But the pursuit was stopped by the arrival of Burrard and Dalrymple in succession. Reinforced by Moore, the army continued its march upon Lisbon, and the senior generals agreed to the convention of Cintra, which permitted the whole French force to evacuate Portugal and to be simply carried back by sea to France in British ships; at the same time a Russian fleet, blockaded in the Tagus, was compelled to surrender. British public opinion was enraged at the easy terms granted to the French. Dalrymple, Burrard, and Wellesley were all recalled for an enquiry, and the command in Portugal, now clear of the French, was left to Sir John Moore. Happily the enquiry completely cleared Wellesley of responsibility for the convention itself and for the failure to make the victory of Vimiero complete, and he returned to take up the command again in the following spring.

Meanwhile Napoleon, who was as angry with Junot as the British were with their generals, resolved to carry out the conquest of Spain in person. The trouble in Spain, in his eyes, was merely an interruption to his scheme for dominating the rest of Europe, for which one decisive campaign would set



Sir John Moore.

[From an engraving after a sketch portrait.]

him free. He seemed likely to carry out his programme, for the armies of the Spanish insurgents were quickly scattered, and by the end of November Joseph Bonaparte was restored to the throne in Madrid. But the Emperor's apparently easy triumph was made vain by Sir John Moore's brilliant diversion in the North. Marching with twenty thousand men from Portugal, he struck at the French line of communication with the Pyrenees. Napoleon would not himself wait to crush the audacious Scot, but hurried back to France, leaving the operations in Spain to Soult. As Soult advanced, Moore retreated. His one object had been to draw off a large French army in pursuit, whereby it would become impossible for the French to secure their mastery in the South. The move was entirely successful. The retreat to the coast, where a British flotilla was to take off the army at Corunna, was an operation of extreme difficulty and danger carried out with great skill. At the last moment Sir John had to turn at bay at Corunna, where Soult was decisively beaten off, and the embarkation was effected. But the battle cost England the life of the great soldier, who was buried on the field of victory.

Moore's diversion had made it necessary for the French to do the business of suppressing Spain all over again. Sundry of Napoleon's marshals and a quarter of a million soldiers were left in the Peninsula, but Napoleon himself was taken up with other affairs. Austria, calculating that any successes would lead to a general German uprising, declared war, and the first movements seemed to promise well. But before the anticipated uprising took place Napoleon himself was in the field. By the middle of May he was in Vienna, and in the first week of July his victory at Wagram, although very far from being a crushing one, induced Austria to change her policy and in effect to submit. The Treaty of Vienna in October deprived her of extensive districts, cutting her off completely from the sea, and rewarding Bavaria at her expense. It was followed by a further humiliation, since Napoleon demanded and obtained the hand of an Austrian princess, Marie Louise, in marriage, divorcing his wife Josephine for that purpose.

Napoleon also in this year, 1810, deposed his brother Louis from the throne of Holland, chiefly for resisting the order to exclude British commerce, whereby Holland was being ruined. Holland itself and with it or after it all the coastal districts of North Germany were incorporated with France. But this involved the annexation of Oldenburg, which, for personal reasons, deeply offended the Russian Tsar, who had for some time past been increasingly irritated by Napoleon's proceedings. In December 1810 the Tsar expressed his displeasure by withdrawing from the Continental System and opening his ports to British commerce. From that time the coercion of Russia became Napoleon's great object, because his whole policy for the destruction of England depended upon making the Continental System complete. The coercion of Russia took final shape in that terrible Moscow expedition of 1812, which was the beginning of the end of Napoleon's power. This sketch has been necessary, in order to explain why Napoleon never himself took in hand the business of annihilating the British in the Peninsula, but left the work to his marshals—every one of whom found Wellington fully his match—while, on the other hand, the fact that a quarter of a million men were permanently locked up in Spain enormously increased his difficulties when he found himself fighting for life after the Moscow disaster. We may now turn to the continuous history of the Peninsula War.

Sir Arthur Wellesley, whom we may for the future refer to by the familiar title of Wellington, since he was made Viscount Wellington after the battle of Talavera in July of this year, 1809, returned to take the supreme command in Portugal in April. He was satisfied that Portugal with her mountainous borders could be defended against invaders, while his own communications with England were assured by sea. Portugal was to be made the base for invading Spain and co-operating with the insurgent armies. The northern line for invasion was commanded on the Spanish frontier by the fortress of Ciudad Rodrigo, the southern by that

of Badajoz. The first business was to drive Soult with his army out of Northern Portugal, and this was effected in May. The next was to co-operate with the Spaniards by invading Spain and marching upon Madrid.

The Spanish forces were badly directed and badly handled. The British general met the French under the command of the Marshals Jourdan and Victor at Talavera, and routed them after a hot engagement. The victory won Wellington his peerage; defeat might have wrought the annihilation of the British army, as Soult had already reorganised the northern force and was threatening the communications with Portugal. But even this



The Spanish Peninsula showing the area and centres of the War of 1808-1813.

victory proved only the immense danger of a further advance, and the inefficiency of the Spanish troops. Wellington fell back into Portugal, where he spent his time for the next year in organising his army and the great system of defence against which the French legions were to be rolled in vain. For Wagram set Napoleon free to flood Spain with additional troops, and offensive operations were out of the question for Wellington.

In the eyes of the public, Talavera was the one redeeming feature among the events of the year, and that appeared small enough. A great battle and a glorious victory are not expected to be the prelude to a retreat, and there were not wanting those who clamoured against the whole idea of the Peninsula campaign. Men were inclined to believe that on

land Napoleon was invincible, and hitherto the British record had not suggested that British armies and British generals were capable of defying him. It was to the credit of the strongest members of the Government, and of some of the Whigs who were by no means friendly to the Government, that they held doggedly to the war and to the support of Wellington, the Whigs being actuated mainly by the principle that we were fighting in the Peninsula for the liberty of a nation rightly struggling to be free.

Public uneasiness too was intensified by the mismanagement in other fields. The Government having taken upon itself the heroic burden of Portugal also took upon itself to attack France in Holland. The idea in itself was perhaps not unsound. The Walcheren expedition, if despatched in time, ought to have created a diversion which would have seriously complicated the Wagram campaign for Napoleon. But it was hopelessly mismanaged. It ought to have been a sudden stroke at Antwerp, but its start was delayed, so that the French had time to prepare. The army was placed under the incompetent Earl of Chatham, the elder brother of William Pitt. The naval force was under Sir Richard Strachan. More time was wasted on the quite unnecessary capture of Flushing; the commanders failed to co-operate, and their blundering is commemorated in the popular rhyme—

“Lord Chatham with his sword drawn
Was waiting for Sir Richard Strachan.
Sir Richard, longing to be at 'em,
Was waiting for the Earl of Chatham.”

Having captured Flushing the force found that Antwerp had been made impregnable. It settled down in the Isle of Walcheren without medical supplies, and there fell a prey to malaria. The men died like flies, and before the end of the year the shattered remnant of a much vaunted expedition had to be brought home again.

At the end of this year the Duke of Portland, the titular head of the ministry, resigned, and shortly afterwards died. His resignation had been preceded by those of George Canning and Castlereagh, who had quarrelled so bitterly over a misunderstanding that they fought a duel, after which it was practically impossible for either of them to remain in office. Canning's place in the new ministry headed by Perceval was taken by the Marquess Wellesley, and young Lord Palmerston joined the government as Secretary at War, though without a seat in the Cabinet—an office which he retained for the next eighteen years. The changes involved no alteration of policy; even Wellesley's presence in the Cabinet was hardly a stronger guarantee of support for his brother at the seat of war than Canning's had been. At the end of 1810 the king's brain-malady returned, and consequently a Regency Bill appointing the Prince of Wales regent with unlimited powers was passed in the following year. The situation was practically unaffected thereby, for the heir-apparent was no longer, as in

1788, intimately associated with the leaders of the Whig party, which was now in a hopeless minority.

In 1810 Napoleon, annoyed by the continuation of the Peninsula War, resolved to sweep away the obstructing British, and sent Masséna with a Grand Army to carry out the task. Soult mastered the whole of the southern province of Spain, Andalusia, with the exception of Cadiz, which defied him. Suchet mastered Aragon, and Wellington, with some thirty thousand British troops, was intended to be the prey of perhaps the ablest of the French marshals with seventy thousand men. Inadequately supported with men and money from home in consequence of the Walcheren fiasco, the British general could only stand on the defensive, with the additional danger before him that Soult from the South might co-operate with Masséna. From this the jealousies of the French marshals delivered him. Masséna's advance at first was unchecked. He secured Ciudad Rodrigo and Almeida, a strong fortress within the Portuguese frontier. He intended to sweep the British into the sea, but Wellington had perfected his defensive preparations. At the end of September he met and repulsed at Busaco the attack of Masséna, who was disappointed by finding that the Portuguese troops with his adversary were by no means to be despised. But Busaco was merely a check. Wellington fell back into the peninsula whereon Lisbon stands.

Then Masséna suddenly found himself confronted by the lines of Torres Vedras, and realised that Wellington's engineers had made them completely impregnable. Also he found that Wellington had very carefully denuded the whole surrounding country of supplies which, with the rural population, had been collected within his lines. For nearly five months, from the middle of November, Masséna lay powerless to strike, with an army gradually famishing and perpetually harassed by the Portuguese guerillas. In March he began his retreat, while Soult confined himself to capturing Badajoz on the south. Wellington followed and laid siege to Almeida. Masséna, with his weakened army, attempted a relief, but was beaten after two days of critical fighting at Fuentes d'Oñoro, and Almeida was taken, though the garrison broke its way out.

Within a fortnight Beresford had fought and won the sanguinary battle of Albuera in the south. He was attempting to recover Badajoz, when Soult attacked him with twenty-three thousand men. Of Beresford's force only some ten thousand were British troops, and upon them fell nearly the whole of the fighting. More than a third of their number fell, but Soult was driven off with a loss of six thousand. Wellington, having cleared the North, hastened to join Beresford; but Marmont, who had taken Masséna's place, combined forces with Soult, and the siege of Badajoz had to be abandoned. Wellington made a dash upon Ciudad Rodrigo, but Marmont foiled the movement and he had to fall back again into Portugal. Apparently he had achieved little enough; it was still only within Portugal that he was master. Nevertheless his operations had

served perpetually to relieve the pressure upon the Spanish guerillas, who, throughout the war, showed a resourcefulness and a fighting capacity in marked contrast to that of the official Spanish troops; while their activities at the same time helped the jealousies of the French marshals to prevent the overwhelming concentrations of French troops which might have pinned Wellington to Torres Vedras.

So, at the end of 1811, Wellington had not been driven into the sea, though it was still possible to argue with honest conviction that the war in the Peninsula was producing no results commensurate with the heavy expenditure of blood and treasure. But its justification was near at hand. Napoleon was planning his Russian expedition, and, instead of reinforcing the army in the Peninsula, he was reducing its numbers in the winter and spring in order to strengthen his Grand Army for Moscow. He may have been misled too by the successful operations of Suchet in the east of Spain.

Thus at last the time was ripe for Wellington to begin a series of more



Badajoz and its Citadel from the north bank of the River Guadiana.

[From a view taken in 1813.]

actively offensive operations. Suddenly in January he sprang upon Ciudad Rodrigo; Marmont began a movement for its rescue, but not in time to prevent Wellington from carrying it by assault. Unsuspecting of Wellington's designs, Marmont again retired to winter quarters. Again the British general struck and struck hard, this time to the southward, falling upon Badajoz, which was carried by escalade after furious fighting, in which the most desperate courage and determination were displayed both by defenders and assailants; although both here and at Ciudad Rodrigo the splendid valour of the British soldiery was marred by the brutal excesses in which the troops, which got utterly out of hand, indulged after the victory. Ciudad Rodrigo and Badajoz were the gates of Spain.

Badajoz fell in April. Wellington would probably have been glad to tempt Soult into an immediate engagement while his own men were in the full tide of confidence gained by their last triumph. But Soult was not to be tempted, and Wellington could not leave Badajoz till the fortifications had been reinstated. By that time it was becoming imperative that he should deal with Marmont in the North, for the Spaniards had failed to

carry out the advice given them by the British commander and the country was still open. Northward, therefore, he turned, despatching General Hill to secure the passage of the Tagus at Almaraz—the only line by which it was possible to effect a junction with the Northern army. Hill's work was admirably done. The position was strongly held by the French, but the movement for its capture was skilfully concealed; it was rushed by a brilliant attack, the pontoon bridge was demolished, the magazine and stores were destroyed, and the communications between Soult and Marmont were completely severed.

In June the Salamanca campaign opened. The combatants were not unequally matched in point either of numbers or of the military genius of the commanders. Neither was willing to fight an indecisive battle. It was not till the middle of July that the movements of the two armies, each endeavouring to secure a decisively superior position in which it could compel the other to fight on its own terms, brought on the crisis and the actual battle of Salamanca, which was fought on July 22nd. The decisive moment came when Marmont attempted to carry out an enveloping movement on Wellington's flank, which, if it had been accomplished successfully, would have given him a decisive victory. But there was a moment when the extending of Marmont's lines opened a gap, and the moment was seized by his adversary. Wellington broke the line, cut off the centre and the left from the right wing, and rolled them up. Fifteen thousand of the French army were killed, wounded, or prisoners. Three weeks later Wellington was in Madrid, hailed with frantic joy as their saviour by the enthusiastic populace. But even Salamanca did not mean that Spain was won; a concentration of the French armies would still bring a greatly superior force against the British. Before the end of the year Wellington was once more behind the Portuguese frontier. The decisive blow was still deferred.

Meanwhile, the ministry at home had again been modified. Early in the year Wellesley, dissatisfied with the treatment meted out both to himself and to his brother, resigned, and Castlereagh took his place as Foreign Secretary. Then in May the Prime Minister Perceval was assassinated by a lunatic, and his place at the head of the ministry was taken by Lord Liverpool, a man somewhat of the Pelham type, not a distinguished statesman but endowed with an abnormal capacity for reconciling hostile elements. Wellesley would not return to the ministry, and there was not room in one Cabinet for George Canning as well as Castlereagh. Castlereagh, however, was no less determined than Wellesley himself to carry the struggle with Napoleon in general, and in the Peninsula in particular, to a decisive conclusion.

While Wellington and Marmont were manœuvring for the mastery before Salamanca, Napoleon was launching his expedition against Russia. Both Prussia and Austria found discretion the better part of valour and stood nominally as his allies, his troops being given free passage through

the Prussian territories. At the end of June the Grand Army entered Russian Poland, where it was generally welcomed by the Poles. But the Russians played the Fabian game, retreating before the half million men whom Napoleon was leading. Not till September did they stay to give battle, when they faced the Emperor at Borodino. The slaughter on both sides was terrific, but, though the Russians left the French masters of the field, they were not routed but continued their retreat. On the 14th, a week after Borodino, Napoleon reached Moscow. He found the city deserted and empty; the next day it was in flames. For five weeks the Emperor remained at Moscow—though half the town was a charred ruin—vainly hoping that the Tsar would come to terms. Then he began his retreat by a different route, for on the line of his advance his army must have perished of sheer starvation. The Russians gave him one fierce battle, in which the victory lay with the French, but by this time the Grand Army was already shattered. It was not worth while for the Russians to accept another general engagement; they were content to cut off supplies and perpetually harass the retreat of the starving army. Then the severities of a Russian winter came to their aid. At the crossing of the Beresina the French escaped annihilation and no more. Napoleon deserted his force, leaving Murat to conduct the retreat; it was a mere remnant of the Grand Army that re-entered Prussia in December. The effect of the disaster was tremendous. Within three months the King of Prussia, swept away by the uprising of the national spirit, formally allied himself with Russia, declared war against France, and issued an appeal to all Germany to join in a war of liberation. Austria for the time held aloof. But meanwhile the amazing energy of Napoleon had produced a new army with which he twice defeated the allies before the end of May. Then an armistice proved fatal, for it enabled the allies to improve their organisation and to bring Austria into the coalition. Even then Napoleon won a great battle at Dresden in August, but in the middle of October the gathered nations overwhelmed him at Leipzig. Napoleon was no longer fighting to dominate Europe. The question now was whether Europe would crush Napoleon. And Europe was only just beginning to believe that in fighting against Napoleon it was not fighting against Fate.

But Britain's particular concern was with the Peninsula. The Moscow disaster compelled Napoleon to withdraw more troops from Spain, and Wellington prepared for a decisive campaign. In May he crossed the Portuguese frontier, and on June 21st he met Marshal Jourdan and King Joseph at Vittoria. The French army was shattered, and fled in rout to the Pyrenees, leaving behind the whole of its artillery and stores, a million of money, and the accumulated spoils of many years. Except in the extreme north, the Peninsula was practically clear of the enemy by the end of June. The British army in Spain was now to become the invader of France. Nevertheless, it was only after a long series of stubborn

engagements with Soult that Wellington made good a footing on French soil. The last fierce battle, itself an indecisive one, was fought at Toulouse on April 10, 1814. And that battle itself was a sheer waste of life; for the allies had taken heart of grace, poured into France, and taken possession of Paris; and on April 6th Napoleon had abdicated. Louis XVIII. was proclaimed King of France, and Europe permitted Napoleon to retire to the principality of the island of Elba in the Mediterranean.

IV

INDIA AND AMERICA

In 1812 Britain had become involved on her own account in a separate war with the United States, and throughout the whole period of the contest with Napoleon she had been establishing and extending her dominion in India. To these two fields we shall now turn our attention before proceeding with the events in Europe during the fifteen months which elapsed between Napoleon's abdication and his final overthrow.

At the close of the century Lord Mornington, who had just been created Marquess Wellesley, was Governor-General of India, had completed the overthrow of Tippu Sultan, and had annexed the greater portion of his territories to the British dominion. Wellesley was the first British Governor-General who deliberately and of set purpose sought to add to the realms under direct British administration. Clive, after the conquest of Bengal, which had not been designed, desired no further expansion; Warren Hastings had had enough to do in organising and maintaining what was already secured, and the acquisitions of territory under Cornwallis had been forced upon the Governor-General. His successor, Shore, had pursued a policy of non-intervention to a point which had aroused in native potentates new hopes of overthrowing the British dominion. Wellesley was the first to recognise that an actual paramount power was a necessity in India, where each native potentate desired supremacy for himself. It was clear to Wellesley that if the British were to remain in India at all it must be in the character of paramount power. The overthrow of Tippu was a palpable necessity which would have been as patent to Cornwallis as to Wellesley himself; it could not properly be called an act of aggression. But to Wellesley it was not an inconvenient but a welcome necessity.

His great instrument in establishing British ascendancy was the system of subsidiary alliances, the system under which the country powers were guaranteed British protection against aggressors by virtually surrendering the control of their military force to the British. Their main standing army at least became under these conditions a British contingent; an army, that is, of sepoy's disciplined and commanded by British officers. The payment of the force could not be left to the potentates; it must be

maintained by the British, and therefore the potentate must guarantee the cost to the British. The one secure guarantee was the cession of territories, which provided a sufficient revenue for the purpose. Thus a double end was served. The potentate, while he was secured against aggression, could by no means defy the advice of the power which controlled his soldiery; he had in effect become a dependant, and at the same time the British had become the effective possessors and administrators of new territories. On these lines subsidiary alliances were made, and districts were ceded by the Nizam and the Nawab of Oudh. The persistent misrule and the extensive debts of the Nawab of the Carnatic provided a sufficient ground for pensioning off the dynasty, annexing the province, and placing it under direct British administration. Dynastic questions at Tanjur and Surat were settled when the British took over the control of administration as a condition of recognising the technical succession of the respective claimants.

Rivalries and hostilities between the heads of the different branches of the Maratha confederacy gave Wellesley another opportunity. Each of them had stoutly refused the British proffer of a subsidiary alliance until the Peishwa at Puna accepted a treaty as a lesser evil than subjection to Holkar. The result was that Sindhia and the Bhonsla tried to bring about a combined Maratha resistance, and so brought on the Maratha war, from which at first the jealous Holkar stood aloof. Sindhia, the most northerly of the Maratha chiefs, from his position at Gwalior generally held control of the Mogul. He had organised his forces upon the European model under French officers. When war was declared in August 1803 this force was in the north, but Sindhia himself with a second army was on the borders of the Deccan to co-operate with the Bhonsla. It was in this southern war that the Governor-General's brother, Arthur Wellesley, won the laurels to which chiefly he owed his subsequent appointment to the command in the Peninsula. His small force completely routed Sindhia and the Bhonsla, first at Assaye and then at Argaon. Meanwhile, in the north Lake had defeated Sindhia's French general at Delhi, captured the person of the Mogul, and then crushed the Marathas at Laswari. By the end of the year both Sindhia and the Bhonsla had made peace, surrendering their claims to *chauth* from other princes, and ceding considerable districts, some of which were handed over to the Nizam. Incidentally Sindhia agreed to dismiss his French officers, and both agreed to accept British arbitration in disputes with native powers. The treaty completed the line of British territory along the whole seaboard from Calcutta to Madras, but it also in effect transferred the guardianship of the Mogul from Sindhia to the British, so simplifying their recognition as the sovereign power.

It was unfortunate that Holkar now chose to rise on his own account, and that Colonel Monson, who was sent to deal with him, was obliged to beat a hasty and disorderly retreat, which brought much discredit on the British arms. Holkar ventured to attack Delhi, but was beaten off and

driven out of the northern territory by General Fraser. It was at this time that Wellesley was recalled, owing to the alarm which his expansive policy had aroused among the directors. Cornwallis returned once more to the scene of his former labours, but only to die; and the Governor-Generalship devolved upon Sir George Barlow. The appointment was not a happy one, for Holkar was granted peace upon terms which excited general derision and contempt for the British.

Barlow, however, was superseded in 1807 by Lord Minto, who very soon realised that the policy of non-intervention was impracticable, and also that when the British did intervene they must do so in a decisive fashion. Minto's Governor-Generalship was marked by the establishment of friendly relations between the British Government and the astute statesman and warrior, Ranjit Singh, who was now consolidating into a very powerful kingdom the confederacy of the Sikhs in the Punjab. Not very happily also began the opening of diplomatic relations with Persia and with Afghanistan, in both cases owing to the first symptoms of the nervousness which Russia was to inspire throughout the century. It was just after the Tsar had made the Treaty of Tilsit with Napoleon, and the fear of Russian expansion towards the Indian border was never from that time forward absent from the mind of the British government in India. For the time, however, the alarm was allayed by the rapidity with which the sudden friendship between the Tsar and the Emperor cooled down and changed into hostility. Otherwise the most notable ventures of Minto's rule were the capture of Java from the Dutch and of Mauritius from the French. This latter was a stroke of importance, since the French station at Mauritius lay on the flank of the communications with the Cape; and a squadron from the Mauritius was generally a possible danger whenever native powers were embroiled with the British.

But Minto also was too aggressive for the authorities at home, and he in his turn was superseded by Lord Moira, who was shortly afterwards created Marquess of Hastings. The new Governor-General, like Minto and Wellesley, was no sooner in India than he found himself obliged to throw over the policy of non-intervention, although he had arrived fully determined to carry it out. By the beginning of 1814 he found himself forced into a war with a new enemy, the Ghurkas of Nepal—a very valiant race of mountaineers, who, in spite of their small numbers, began to prey upon the people in the plains below the Himalayas. The first expedition sent against them was so disastrous that half of India was again on the alert for the breakdown of the British ascendancy, but the stubborn hill-men were presently mastered in spite of a most courageous defence by the skill and persistence of Ochterlony. The treaty which ended the war in 1815 as a matter of course transferred a great belt of territory from Nepal to the British; but it also had the unusual effect of establishing a particularly loyal and enduring friendship between the Nepal government and the Ghurka race on the one side and the British on the other, a friendship

of inestimable value in the darkest hours of the history of the British dominion in India. The rest of the rule of Lord Hastings belongs to our next chapter.

The war with the United States arose out of Britain's use of her maritime supremacy and the injury to American trade caused by the Continental System, the British Orders in Council, and the virtual suppression of neutral traffic which the Americans attributed to the high-handed tyranny of the nation from which they had separated themselves. The utility of the Orders in Council was always somewhat doubtful, even from the purely British point of view; they fell into abeyance after the death of their most determined advocate Perceval, and in 1812 they were withdrawn. But the mischief was done; the United States had already declared war. As a matter of fact there had never been any reconciliation between the two nations, which still felt towards each other the bitterness engendered by a fratricidal struggle; and in such cases a cool enquiry into grievances is not to be looked for.

When the war began, just as Wellington and Marmont were facing each other and Napoleon was starting for Moscow, the British Government gave very insufficient attention to the minor contest with the United States, with the somewhat astonishing result that for some time the Americans were uniformly successful at sea. On the other hand, their reversion to the old attempt to capture Canada brought to them complete disaster, since the United Empire Loyalists fought against them with all the animus inspired by the events which had driven them across the St. Lawrence from their homes in the south. Canadians remember with a just pride the courage and skill with which their ancestors repelled the invader. In the course of time British naval supremacy re-asserted itself; but the only memorably creditable performance of British sailors was the famous duel between the *Shannon* and the *Chesapeake*, when the *Chesapeake* was forced to surrender after fifteen minutes of fighting, although the two ships were equally matched. A British expedition under General Ross won a battle at Bladensburg and burnt Washington; and another British expedition, mainly of veteran troops from the Peninsula, was smashed up at New Orleans in the attempt to storm impregnable entrenchments. Like the battle of Toulouse, this last engagement was a sheer waste, because a treaty of peace between the belligerents had been signed at Ghent a fortnight earlier, on Christmas Eve, 1814.

The war was a particularly evil one, first, because it could have been easily averted by a little mutual common-sense and good temper; secondly, because it served no good purpose for either side; thirdly, because it failed to bring out on either side those virtues which are supposed to decay unless stimulated by hard fighting; and, fourthly, because it left an inheritance of extraordinary bitterness between the two great nations of British race, a tradition of hostility and distrust which was scarcely allayed even when the nineteenth century was drawing to its close. In one single

respect, however, the British Empire may be held to have benefited, because that war made impossible any such *rapprochement* between the Canadians and their southern neighbours as might have tended to sever Canada from the British Empire.

V

WATERLOO

After the abdication of Napoleon the Powers proceeded to settle the affairs of Europe. The Bourbon monarchy was restored in France, though modified by constitutional limitations. The Tsar, and Castlereagh for the British, insisted upon generous treatment for France on the principle that it was not monarchical France but the Republic and Napoleon that had been responsible for the twenty years of war. Both also insisted on the limitation of the powers of the restored monarchy; Castlereagh because of the pressure of British public opinion, the Tsar because he was at this time an ardent believer in theoretical doctrines of liberty. It was the honest wish of the British nation and of the British Government to set aside selfish considerations, and to strive for a general settlement whose permanence would be guaranteed by its fairness and justice. For herself Britain claimed little, and was willing to surrender much that she might legitimately have claimed; it is noteworthy that her most persistent demand was for a humanitarian agreement for the suppression of the slave trade. But European affairs could not be settled merely upon broad principles of justice when pledges had to be taken into consideration which had nothing to do with broad principles but only with particular interests. After a preliminary settlement a Congress of the Powers was appointed to meet at Vienna in the winter, to arrange outstanding questions which were far too complicated and involved too many antagonistic interests to be settled in haste.

We need not here follow the intricacies of diplomacy at the Vienna Congress during the winter of 1814-15. Suspicions and jealousies made it no easy matter to re-arrange the distribution of European territories in a manner satisfactory to the great Powers, to say nothing of the minor states; and at one time, in January 1815, matters had gone so far that France, Austria, and Britain made a secret treaty for united action in case the obstinacy of Russia and Prussia should rekindle a European conflagration. Still compromises were being achieved, and a general agreement seemed to be approaching, when all bickerings and quarrels were silenced by the startling news that Napoleon had slipped away from Elba, landed at Cannes on March 1st, and was appealing once more to the French nation to rally to his standard.

The Bourbon restoration was not popular in France, since the attitude of the royalists on their return from exile showed that they had learnt

nothing from the Revolution. Napoleon proclaimed that he was coming to restore not a despotism but a constitutional system; not to embroil Europe but to preserve the principles of the Revolution. The French troops in the south which were marched out against him answered his appeal and hailed him emperor. Most of the marshals had accepted the Bourbon restoration; those who were true to the monarchy had to take



The Duke of Wellington

[After the painting by Sir Thomas Lawrence, P.R.A.]

flight precipitately. Napoleon's progress towards Paris became a triumphal march; Ney, who advanced against him with loud and probably sincere protestations of loyalty to the Bourbons, fell under the spell and joined his old master. On March 13th the Powers at Vienna proclaimed Napoleon the public enemy of Europe; on the 19th King Louis fled from Paris to Ghent; on the 20th Napoleon himself was in Paris. On the 25th the four great Powers bound themselves to place a hundred and fifty


thousand men apiece in the field. They were unanimous in the conviction that to make terms with Napoleon would be futile; that his promises were insincere, and that in any case Napoleon, once more at the head of the French Empire, could not, even if he would, resist the temptation to resume aggression.

During the following weeks the Powers were engaged in a somewhat feverish endeavour to bring their disbanded armies into the field. Austria and Russia, remote and slow-moving, could not hope to hurry their forces to the front; Napoleon had the enormous advantage enjoyed by a dictator who holds all the strings in his own hands. At the beginning of June Wellington, created a duke in 1814, was in command of the allied forces in the Netherlands, numbering ninety thousand men; a heterogeneous

force, of which some thirty thousand were British—mostly raw recruits, since the Peninsula veterans were not yet back from America. Some twenty thousand Brunswickers and Hanoverians and the troops of the king's German legion, which had distinguished itself in the Peninsula, were also thoroughly to be relied upon; the rest, chiefly Belgians and Dutch, did not inspire confidence.

The Prussian forces under Blücher, numbering a hundred and twenty thousand, were extended a little to the eastward between Liège and Charleroi. Meanwhile, behind the French border Napoleon's energy was concentrating a force of a hundred and twenty-five thousand men, a large proportion of them veterans, at Valenciennes. Incidentally a diversion in Napoleon's favour by Joachim Murat, King of Naples, collapsed completely; Murat had to fly to France, and the Bourbon Ferdinand was once more proclaimed king of the Two Sicilies.


Napoleon's strength lay in the extraordinary rapidity with which his organisation worked. The longer the time allowed to the allies, the greater would be the forces massed against him; and his great aim was to be able to strike at them in detail and



The Waterloo Campaign.

destroy them separately instead of allowing them to be massed together at all. The first object, therefore, was to strike between Blücher and Wellington before they could concentrate for united action. Napoleon delivered his first blow before his enemies' preparations were completed. On June 12th he left Paris to join the army. On June 15th he was over the frontier and swept the Prussian advanced corps out of Charleroi, driving it back on the main body. This was the famous night of the Duchess of Richmond's ball at Brussels. The concentration had not yet begun; it appears still to have been Wellington's conviction that Napoleon's intention was to turn his left and cut him off from the sea. Blücher hurried up his forces to Ligny; Wellington promised him support if he were not himself attacked. Napoleon, however, despatched Ney to seize the cross-roads at Quatre Bras, while he himself flung his main attack upon Blücher at Ligny. Ney would thus be able to hold a British advance in check and to turn Blücher's left flank.

The plan miscarried, but only in part. Some of the allies under the Duke of Saxe-Weimar occupied Quatre Bras before Ney's arrival. Ney did not attack at once, British regiments were hurried to the front one after another, Ney's attacks were beaten off, and before the end of the day the British were in superior force. A corps under D'Erlon wavered all day between Ligny and Quatre Bras, and failed to render any help in either engagement. The result was that although the Prussians suffered very heavy losses and were driven from the field, they were not routed but made good an orderly retreat under cover of night; and Blücher, instead of



Waterloo: the opposing armies.

falling back upon his own base at Namur as the French expected, wheeled north to Wavre in order if possible to effect a junction with Wellington.

Now, if Ney and D'Erlon had carried out their task without a hitch, Blücher, at Ligny, would have been not only defeated but routed; the Prussian army would have ceased to count. As it was, Napoleon was perfectly satisfied that Blücher had fallen back in accordance with all orthodox rules of war upon Namur. He anticipated no difficulty in preventing his reappearance on the field, and to this end he despatched a containing force under Grouchy on the 17th, while he prepared with his main army to annihilate Wellington.

The Duke, who was informed of Blücher's movements, drew in the

forces from Quatre Bras and established himself on the ridge of Mont St. Jean covering the way to Brussels. Blücher had promised to give his support—if he could; and it was Wellington's business—if he could—to hold on to the position he had chosen until Blücher arrived. The event of the battle depended upon the Prussian's ability to carry out his provisional promise; that is, Wellington was bound to fight with a view to winning a decisive victory if Blücher arrived, although there was an exceedingly strong presumption that if Blücher did not arrive at all he would find the task of holding his ground extremely difficult, especially in view of the character of his troops. As a matter of fact, both Wellington and Blücher succeeded in carrying out the rôles appropriated to them respectively. If Blücher had failed, Wellington would probably have been forced to retreat. If Wellington had failed, a worse disaster than Ligny would probably have awaited Blücher. Neither of them failed, and the result was that the French army was shattered to pieces. It was Wellington's battle because, unbeaten, he bore the burden and heat of the day. It was the Prussians' battle, because they weakened the attack upon Wellington, and, having first ensured the defeat, turned it into an overwhelming rout.

Two facts combined to bring about Napoleon's overthrow by making possible the concerted action of British and Prussians. The cause of both was in part at least Napoleon's misleading information as to the line of Blücher's retreat. The first regiments falling back from Ligny had made for Namur. Grouchy followed on a wrong trail, and therefore on the 18th he failed to contain the Prussian army. Napoleon was satisfied that the Prussians could not arrive, and therefore waited till the 18th before attacking Wellington. It is conceivable that if Napoleon had opened his attack even three or four hours sooner than he did the Prussians would not have arrived in time to prevent him from carrying Wellington's position. But it is by no means clear that he would in any case have carried it. He relied upon tactics which had proved successful against every army in Europe except a British army; but the peculiar British method had been employed with success against one after another of his best marshals. Broadly speaking, Napoleon's method was to hurl heavy masses of troops in column against the weak point in the extended line of the enemy, and so to break it and roll it up. But Soult knew by experience that the thin extended British line would stand up against heavy masses hurled against it without flinching. The column against the line had broken the troops of every other nation, but it could not be employed with confidence against the troops of Britain. Napoleon, it must be observed, had never yet met the British in battle himself; and had not learnt by personal experience the lessons which had been brought home to some of his marshals.

In the early morning, then, of Sunday June 18 Wellington knew that Blücher would move with the object of attacking Napoleon's right flank; Blücher knew that Wellington was going to give battle at Waterloo.

Napoleon believed that there could be no dangerous movement on the part of the Prussians. Of Wellington's sixty-seven thousand men scarcely one-third were British troops, another third could be thoroughly depended upon, but the balance could not. Napoleon had seventy-four thousand men, and was very much better provided with artillery and cavalry. The left of the allied army was difficult to attack. On the centre and right the slope was not sufficiently steep to be a serious obstacle. The centre, however, was covered by the farm of La Haye Sainte, the right by the Château of Hougoumont. A dip behind the crest of the ridge to a great extent concealed the disposition of Wellington's troops. The leading feature of Napoleon's plan was to clear the way by a storm of artillery fire for hurling cavalry charges on the centre and piercing it; but the capture of La



The Château of Hougoumont after the battle.


[From a drawing by S. Wharton made in 1815.]

Haye Sainte, occupied by a portion of the king's German legion, was of material importance to the execution of this design.

The two arms, then, upon which Napoleon chiefly relied were the artillery and the cavalry. He delayed opening the attack until noon in order that the surface of the ground might recover, as its soaked condition interfered with cavalry operations. The firing began, to cover an attack upon Hougoumont, with the object not so much of capturing the château itself as of securing a position in the surrounding wood which would prevent the movement of troops on Wellington's right. Jerome Bonaparte, however, wasted much blood and energy in a fruitless attempt to storm the château, which was held with invincible resolution by a detachment of Guards. This was the prelude to the main attack on the centre, which was opened about 1.30, just when it had been ascertained that a Prussian corps was approaching from Wavre. D'Erlon's corps was launched against La Haye Sainte, where the Germans held on with the same stubborn valour which

was displayed at Hougoumont. But the French columns rolled up the slope, and the Dutch regiments which held the ridge at that point broke and fled. As the French topped the ridge, it seemed for a moment that the day was won ; but their columns were shattered and swept back down the slope by a furious charge of Ponsonby's Union Brigade—Royal Dragoons, Inniskillings, and Scots Greys. The brigade crashed up the slope on the other side of the valley, disabled a number of the French guns, and was then almost cut to pieces itself by a fresh force of French Lancers and Dragoons. But the attack had been repulsed, and the Germans still held La Haye Sainte.

The time, however, had now come for Napoleon to launch the cavalry



Waterloo: the crisis.

charges upon the British centre ; but charge after charge was rolled back. The gunners on the front of the ridge worked their guns to the last moment possible, and then raced for shelter to the hollow squares into which the infantry were formed behind the ridge. Against the squares the cavalry broke in vain. The British and German horse charged upon the broken columns, and swept them back and down the hill again. The squares were repeatedly enveloped by cavalry, but were never pierced ; and the French charges were not supported by infantry, in part at least because these were now being drawn off on Napoleon's right to hold back the approaching Prussians. It was not till seven o'clock that Napoleon struck his last blow, sending the masses of his Old Guard in the wake of the cavalry charges.

But the invincible veterans had met their match. The British centre was strengthened by regiments called in from the wings whose movements were concealed from the enemy. On their right the British line was wheeled forward so as to pour in a heavy flank fire upon the mass of the advancing columns. Nevertheless they surged over the ridge; then the word was given to the Guards who were lying under cover to stand up and fire. Even the Old Guard staggered before the withering volley, reeled and rolled down the slope again as the order was given for the whole British line to advance. The Prussians had swept the stubborn defenders out of Planchenoit on the French right, and were thundering in upon Napoleon's flank. The last desperate effort had failed, the defeat became a rout, and the rout a headlong *sauve qui peut*. The exhausted British halted, but far into the night the furious Prussian horse took their revenge for Jena. Three weeks later Napoleon surrendered himself to the captain of H.M.S. *Bellerophon*.

CHAPTER XXXII

FROM WATERLOO TO THE REFORM BILL

I

CASTLEREAGH

THE custodianship of the fallen Emperor was deputed by the European Powers to Britain. The dread he inspired could be allayed only by caging him in the remote island of St. Helena in the South Atlantic, whence escape was impossible. So closed the Titanic tragedy of Napoleon's career. The Emperor being disposed of, the Powers turned to the settlement of Europe. Britain, the one Power which from beginning to end had fought against French aggression, had never been forced to make terms, had never withdrawn from a coalition, and had finally borne the whole stress of the great fight by which Napoleon was ultimately overthrown, claimed no very great share of the spoils. Malta and the Ionian Islands in the Mediterranean, the Mauritius and Ceylon in the Indian Ocean, some islands in the West Indies, and the Dutch colony at the Cape, she was fully entitled to claim by right of conquest; and these she took, although for Cape Colony she paid solid compensation in cash to William of Orange, on whom was bestowed the crown of a new kingdom of Holland, which included Belgium. She did not succeed in her efforts to persuade the Powers to unite in suppressing the slave trade, though a general declaration condemning it was issued. What she had won was sufficient to secure her supremacy in the Mediterranean and the complete command of the ocean route to India, which could always have been threatened on the flank by a Power possessing the Cape or Mauritius. It may safely be claimed that no other Power entitled to so much would have been content with so little; but it was enough, for it



Lord Castlereagh.

[After the portrait by Lawrence.]

assured the maritime supremacy which made her further expansion certain. Moreover, apart from the treaty, the war itself had not only confirmed her commercial supremacy but had bestowed upon her an immense lead in the new industrialism of which she was the creator. Great as the strain had been, it had borne less heavily upon her than upon any other nation in Europe. In these islands alone the tramp of hostile legions had been unheard. Great as the waste of British lives had been, in every other country the waste had been far greater. Great as had been her expenditure of treasure, her commerce alone had expanded, while that of other countries had been almost destroyed. These were results of the war worth more than any other claims she might have endeavoured to enforce.

In the general settlement of Europe she took prominent part mainly as a restraining influence. But for Wellington, France would have suffered more severely. The Duke, however, supported by Alexander of Russia, insisted that the country must not connect the Bourbon restoration with its own dismemberment, and it was given back its boundaries as they stood in 1791. British influence was exerted also to check vindictive action on the part of Ferdinand of the Two Sicilies. Britain and Russia also favoured the concession of constitutions, in other words, limitations of absolutism, which were promised by several rulers, since there was some disposition to attribute the comparative success of the United Kingdom in the great struggle to the superiority of its political system, or rather to infer the superiority of its system from its success. But these promises remained unfulfilled. The Tsar's enthusiasm was diverted into a new channel by a new conception of his imperial duties; the claims of authority superseded those of liberty, and though Britain declined to enter the Holy Alliance which was conceived and shaped by Alexander, she offered no effective opposition to its activities.

The Holy Alliance was a very curious phenomenon, which compels us to some further consideration of the European programme at this period. There were two movements fundamentally associated, the first with French Revolution, and the second with the downfall of Napoleon—the democratic movement and the nationalist movement. Before the French Revolution the whole political and social system of very nearly every country in Europe rested upon privilege, upon the conception that certain members of the community were entitled by hereditary or by ecclesiastical right to rule over the rest and to rule in their own interest. In Great Britain, in Holland, and in Switzerland a very much larger proportion of the community at large was permitted to exercise political rights than in other countries; the pressure of privilege there, though sufficiently heavy, was very much less than elsewhere. The French Revolution was primarily on its political side the issue of the demand of the masses of the people for the abolition of political privileges and for their own admission to political rights. The early triumph of the French democracy had merged in Cæsarism, but Cæsarism had not restored the old system of aristocratic

and ecclesiastical privilege. Within limits it confirmed instead of reversing the democratic movement. And it did so outside of France as well as within it. It had had this permanent effect—that it awakened the craving for political liberty throughout the classes hitherto excluded, and especially in those classes which had not been universally excluded.

The Nationalist Movement, on the other hand, was not the cause but the outcome of the long war. For centuries past nationalism had played a strong part in the histories of Britain, France, Spain, and Holland; and the same spirit had been awakened in Prussia comparatively recently by Frederick the Great. Even the French doctrine of natural boundaries had a nationalist basis, because the people within those boundaries were both by race and by language French rather than German or Italian. But outside these countries politicians paid no attention to nationalism; their consideration was bestowed not on nationality but on territory. If one half of the Netherlands had achieved national freedom, the other half had fallen first under the dominion of the Spanish Hapsburgs, then under that of the Austrian Hapsburgs, then under that of France, and finally was transferred by the Congress of Vienna to the newly erected kingdom of Holland. German territories were tossed from one German prince to another. In Germany itself there was no solidarity, no sense of a community of German interests. In Italy principalities and dukedoms had been transferred from one to another of the great Powers in almost every treaty signed during the last three hundred years; there, nationality was simply ignored. But it had been ignored more flagrantly than ever before by Napoleon, and his treatment of Spain, Germany, and Italy had kindled national sentiment to a flame. Hence the phase of the war which followed upon the Moscow expedition was a nationalist uprising, an uprising of the peoples against a foreign tyrant. Throughout Europe the events between 1789 and 1815 had set in motion these two movements, the democratic and the nationalist, which, acting sometimes but not always in combination, were at the root of half the political complications of the nineteenth century.

Now the Holy Alliance was the embodiment of the principle of resistance to both these movements. It was born in the brain of Alexander I., who had hitherto been an ardent advocate of liberal ideas. But behind the liberal ideas lay a rooted conviction of the divine authority which rests in kings. The king is responsible to God but not to his people for the righteous government of his realm. It is good for the people to participate in their own government; therefore the king will do well to allow his people as large a share in the government as they are fit for; but the share must be greater or less or non-existent as the king judges best, and the people have no right to call his judgment to account. They have no right to rise against the divinely constituted authority, or to question it; they have to accept it. Let the kings therefore enter into a Holy Alliance, forming a brotherhood pledged individually to act righteously towards

their own subjects and mutually to support each other's authority and to act in concert. As the divine authority of the king has nothing to do with nationalism, it followed that the Holy Alliance became practically an instrument for enforcing absolutism without regard either to popular rights or to nationalism. Territories were defined by international compact between kings who were pledged to support each other's authority in those territories.

The princes of Europe all joined the league or expressed their sympathy, with the exception of the Sultan of Turkey, who, not being a Christian, was so to speak not eligible. Britain however stood aloof. Neither the king nor the prince regent in his place could join, because such an action would have been absurd on any basis except an absolutist theory which the British constitution expressly rejected. The British people soon saw with displeasure that if, as it boasted, it had by its example saved Europe from the Napoleonic despotism, its victory was going to be turned to account in order to keep Europe under the heel of minor despotisms. It increasingly resented the acquiescence of its Government in the policy of European monarchists ; and it attributed that acquiescence to the absolutist sympathies of the Foreign Minister Castlereagh. For, however strong the reaction had been in England itself, the whole history of the country compelled it to sympathise both with constitutionalism as against absolutism, and with nationalism. What Britons had won for themselves they were willing to see other peoples win.

Nevertheless, in those classes at least which controlled the government the reaction still predominated. They would have resented a curtailment of their own powers, but they continued to be afraid of any extension of political liberty. The spectre of the French Revolution was not laid. Every reformer was assumed to be a covert Jacobin, and it was held that the safety of the state demanded the severe repression of all complaints. Such, too, was the attitude of the Government in an exaggerated degree. Criticism was an offence against order, and discontent a proof of the revolutionary spirit, and again Castlereagh was popularly fixed upon as the moving spirit in the repressive policy of the Government.

The war had caused distress, the price of food had risen to a very high point, and wages had fallen because the supply of labour was greater than the demand ; the more so because the output of the new machinery was very much greater than that of the old hand labour, so that fewer hands were needed, and at the same time the population was increasing at a rapid rate. Expansion of the area of cultivation had, however, hitherto provided some compensation. But the peace increased distress instead of diminishing it. On the Continent industrial occupations revived, while the completeness of the British monopoly of maritime commerce disappeared. The market being overstocked with British goods, British production was checked. In the natural order of events the price of food-stuffs in Britain would have fallen, and the purchasing power of a stationary money wage

would have increased, so that distress should have been reduced. Here, however, the Agricultural Interest in parliament intervened, and the Corn Law of 1815 prohibited the importation of corn whenever the price in the home market was less than eighty shillings a quarter. Thus the high price of food was maintained, while the other conditions were tending to a diminution of wages ; and even the corn tax was insufficient to keep under cultivation much of the land which had been brought under the plough only when the country was compelled to depend wholly upon the supply of food raised within the four seas.

Here, then, is a sufficient indication for immediate purposes of the economic causes of unrest and discontent. And these were aggravated by the wasteful finance of the Government, which continued after the peace the extravagant and ill-irregulated expenditure which the country had borne with during the time of the war. Parliamentary criticism, however, was concentrated upon the better regulation of the civil list, and the abolition of the income tax which had been introduced by Pitt expressly as a war tax. The Government proposed to appropriate the tax to the maintenance of an army of a hundred and fifty thousand men, which, from the point of view of the economists, was an unnecessary extravagance in time of peace ; besides which, expenditure on the army was made the more unpopular by the suspicion that it would be used in the interests of the Holy Alliance. The abolition of the income tax was carried against the Government mainly owing to the energetic agitation of Henry Brougham.

In the country the agricultural and industrial depression brought about disorders and riots, while the Government held fast to its conviction that the remedy for these was to be found in severe repression, not in any attempt to investigate and deal with economic causes. Again the result was to intensify in the sufferers the belief first that relief could be obtained only by their own acquisition of political power, and, secondly, that the acquisition of political power would bring relief as a matter of course. Agitators clamoured against the monarchy and the constitution, and the Government failed to distinguish between agitators and sober reformers. The Spafields riot in December 1816 led in the following year to sharp measures, for the suppression of "seditious meetings" and the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. Nor was the temper of the ministry improved by a serious rebuff, when a bookseller named Hone was acquitted on three several charges of publishing "blasphemous and seditious libels."

A lull during 1818 was followed by renewed agitation during the next year, culminating in the affair called the Peterloo Massacre, when a large assembly in the neighbourhood of Manchester was dispersed by soldiery, certainly with insufficient reason. Half-a-dozen persons were killed, large numbers who had assembled without any sort of seditious intent were injured, and a feeling of bitter indignation was aroused. Unfortunately the Government identified itself with the action of the magistrates—which might reasonably have been condoned as an error of judgment in a difficult

exigency—and it proceeded to pass a further series of repressive measures known as the Six Acts. Of the six, three were at least justifiable on the hypothesis that there was an appreciable danger of armed insurrection. Two, directed to the suppression of seditious publications, were at best liable to interpretation as a tyrannical interference with the right of free criticism; while the sixth, virtually suppressing all public meetings unless summoned by the principal local authorities, was a wholly inexcusable encroachment upon acknowledged liberties. The general soreness, it may be remarked, was increased by the persistent neglect of the Government to



Cato Street, the scene of the conspiracy of 1820.

[From a contemporary drawing.]

accompany its repressive measures by any recognition of the necessity for remedial legislation.

In 1820 died the old king, who for the last eight years of his life had been entirely incapacitated by brain disease, to which total blindness was added. The Prince Regent became King George IV., but no change was thereby effected. The event of interest which followed immediately upon his accession to the throne was the formation of a wild plot known as the Cato Street Conspiracy. The plotters, who were persons of no importance and no influence, designed to murder the whole ministry at a Cabinet dinner. Information was conveyed to the authorities, and the conspirators, who offered a fierce resistance, were seized in a room in Cato Street. Four of them were executed, five were transported, and the incident was used by the Government as a proof of the anarchical spirit abroad which had made their repressive measures a necessity.

Public uneasiness was made the greater by the absence of any general

sentiment of loyalty to the royal family, for which that family was itself responsible. The old king was held in respect, even in honour and in affection, by many of his subjects who could appreciate his sterling qualities and forgive, if they did not approve, his obstinacy and occasional wrong-headedness. His consort had been a pattern of domestic virtue. But none of the sons of George III. were distinguished by similar characteristics. For a long time the nation's hopes were fixed upon the Princess Charlotte, the daughter of the Prince of Wales, whose premature death in 1817 was generally lamented as a national misfortune. But when she died the old king had no legitimate grandchild living, and of his seven sons and five daughters the youngest was forty. The Prince Regent was held in general contempt as a bad husband and a bad father. The Duke of York had been notoriously mixed up with grave scandals. William, Duke of Clarence, and Edward, Duke of Kent, were at least comparatively respected, but they as well as the youngest brother, Adolphus, Duke of Cambridge, were unmarried. The fifth brother, Ernest, Duke of Cumberland, was the object of universal detestation, so much so that his accession to the throne might have sufficed to bring about a revolution, while the sixth brother had contracted a morganatic marriage; so that the future of the monarchy was a subject of grave apprehension. The year after the Princess Charlotte's death the three unmarried brothers took wives, and the birth of the Duke of Kent's daughter, Princess Victoria, in 1819, provided a new object for the hopes of the nation to centre upon, since it was felt that the child's life alone stood in the way of a serious crisis in the early future.

Almost the first proceedings of the new reign brought the Crown into fresh contempt. George IV., when Prince of Wales, though already secretly married morganatically, had taken to wife the Princess Caroline of Brunswick. The two had long lived apart, and the princess had behaved at least with flagrant indiscretion for which George had given her as good excuse as any husband could. On her husband's accession to the throne she returned to England to demand formal recognition as queen, giving her due status in the Courts of Europe. The Government replied by introducing in the House of Lords a bill to deprive her of her title and to dissolve the marriage. Popular feeling ran exceedingly high during the investigation of the charges on which the bill was based. The bill was carried on its second reading in the House of Lords by a majority of twenty-eight; four days later the majority for the third reading was only nine. The Government, now certain to be defeated in the House of Commons, withdrew the bill. Not contented with this effective victory, she attempted in the next year, of course unsuccessfully, to enforce her own coronation along with that of the king, an undignified performance by which she lost most of the popularity which the bill had procured for her. Within three weeks of the coronation she was dead; but the whole of the proceedings had given birth to unlimited scandal, and had displayed the king's character in a singularly odious and contemptible

light which destroyed almost the last shreds of popular respect for the monarchy.

Of more political importance than the elevation of the Prince Regent to the throne were the changes in the ministry which took place at the close of 1821 and during 1822. Lord Sidmouth—formerly Addington, the head of the ministry which had been responsible for the Peace of Amiens—who had been the author of the Six Acts, retired from the Home Secretaryship, in which he was succeeded by Robert Peel. The Marquess Wellesley again joined the Government as Viceroy of Ireland. Then in August 1822 Castlereagh, who was just on the point of setting out to represent Britain at a European Congress assembled at Verona, committed suicide, and was succeeded at the Foreign Office by George Canning. Few ministers have been so intensely unpopular in the country as Castlereagh, and his death was hailed with unseemly acclamations of joy. Posterity has been more just to him than were his contemporaries. To him more than any other man, at least after 1811 if not after 1808, was due the dogged persistence with which the French war was maintained; he, more than any other man, through good and evil report stood by Wellington in the Peninsula War. Less of the responsibility for repressive measures at home belonged to him than was popularly believed; and some at least of the discredit attaching to the foreign policy of the country must be attributed to the popularity achieved by his rival and successor at the Foreign Office, George Canning, and to misrepresentations of Castlereagh's own action.

II

CANNING AND HUSKISSON


The return of Canning to the Foreign Office changed British foreign policy not in theory but in practice. Since 1820 the monarchs of the four greater European Powers had been alarmed by revolutionary movements in the Spanish, Italian, and Greek Peninsulas. In Spain and Portugal and in the Two Sicilies the movements were constitutional; that is, they were directed to the establishment of constitutional instead of absolute monarchies. That in Greece was nationalist, and was directed to the liberation of a Christian community from subjection to a Mohammedan power. The Russian, Prussian, and Austrian monarchs were all in favour of common intervention, in arms if necessary, in the former cases. Castlereagh, on the other hand, discouraged this view of the duties of the monarchs of Europe, and clearly declined to make Britain a party to such joint action. Canning adopted Castlereagh's principles, and maintained that every country should be left to settle its own constitution for itself. But Castlereagh had restricted himself to abstention from interference; Canning carried the principle further, and let it be understood that the interference



GEORGE IV AND HIS TRAIN AT HIS CORONATION IN 1821
From one of a series of paintings by Stephanoff made by the king's order.

of other Powers on behalf of the absolutist monarchs might compel British intervention on the other side. He repudiated both the doctrine that the Powers were bound to act in concert and the doctrine that they had a right to interfere in the private concerns of their neighbours. His action had at least the effect of preventing other Powers from helping Spain in the reduction of her American colonies which were in revolt; with the result that South America was separated from the Spanish dominion. Castlereagh had in effect permitted the voice of England to be neglected in European affairs. Canning reasserted her right to maintain actively as well as passively the principles of non-intervention. The firmness of Canning's attitude revived British prestige on the Continent, and served as an effective check on the self-appointed champions of absolutism. At the same time he refused to intervene except to prevent intervention.

Modern party terminology makes it difficult to employ necessary words and phrases without conveying misapprehensions. Two great parties have appropriated to themselves respectively the complimentary epithets Liberal and Conservative, although there is no sort of opposition between Conservatism and Liberalism. Leaders of the Liberal party have been men of essentially conservative mind; leaders of the Conservative party have been men of the broadest sympathies. It is not therefore in a party sense that we speak of the administration after Castlereagh's death as a distinctly Liberal one. In the party sense, an administration whose chiefs were solidly opposed to Parliamentary reform could by no means be described as Liberal. Peel, one of its most active members, was for some twenty years the recognised leader in the House of Commons of the party which began to appropriate the name of Conservatives. Canning had entered public life as the enemy of the French Revolution and all its works, and was an opponent of Parliamentary reform to the day of his death. But Canning was the disciple of Burke and of Pitt, both of whom, until the French Revolution, were conspicuously men of liberal mind, opponents of innovation but especially of reactionary innovation. Canning's sympathies were freely extended to constitutionalist and nationalist movements, as Burke's and Pitt's would have been. Peel does not present himself as the disciple either of Pitt or of Burke. But he was a man who, starting politically with an exceedingly narrow outlook, spent the whole of his life in gradually extending his vision and adopting new views as he slowly realised the force of arguments which ran counter to the postulates with



George Canning.
[After the portrait by Lawrence.]

which he had started. Therefore every administration of which Peel was a member after 1822 was distinguished by liberal measures at least in some particulars.

To Canning and Peel in the Liverpool administration was added William Huskisson, who joined it as President of the Board of Trade early in 1823. We have seen how the Liberalism of Canning displayed itself. That of Peel at the Home Office was shown chiefly in the revision and co-ordination of the Criminal Code. Great Britain in this respect lagged far behind most of the nations of Europe. There were some two hundred offences in the Statute Book to which the death penalty was attached, from petty larceny up to murder. The system defeated itself, as Thomas More had demonstrated three hundred years before. It offered a direct inducement to the petty offender to shield himself by committing murder if murder gave him a chance of escape, since the penalty was the same. It offered an inducement to juries to acquit wherever there was a shadow of excuse for acquittal, because the sentence following upon an adverse verdict was an outrage on their humanity. Under Peel's auspices more than a hundred capital offences were struck off the list. Incidentally London also owed to him the institution of an efficient police force, popularly nicknamed in consequence "Peelers" or "Bobbies," who took the place of the wholly inefficient watchmen or "Charlies," to whose incompetent guardianship the protection of property and the maintenance of order had hitherto been entrusted.

Pitt in his early days had been the pioneer of Free Trade. But further advance in that direction had been stopped by the war, and, when the war closed, the protection of the agricultural interest had been carried to an unprecedented length by the Corn Law of 1815. In a Parliament consisting mainly of landed proprietors or their nominees, the protection of the agricultural interest was ensured, not because it was consciously selfish but because it conscientiously believed that the nation could prosper only if agriculture prospered and that agriculture could not prosper unprotected. The doctrines of Adam Smith, however, had made their way among the commercial community. In 1820 the merchants of London and of Edinburgh presented petitions urging that restrictions on commerce should be limited to taxation for purposes of revenue. It was maintained that free imports did not diminish production, except of goods which cannot compete with those of the foreigner in the open market; that the energy devoted to the production of such goods under a protective system is merely diverted from the production of other goods for which the free-trading country has superior facilities; that in the stress of competition the free-trading country will discover improved methods of production which will still give it an equality if not a superiority in the rivalry. Production will be greater if left to flow along its natural channels than if it is artificially directed by protection into other channels; checks on imports therefore are injurious to trade, and should be admitted only in order to

provide the revenue required for the government of the country. Such was the view of the merchants, though obviously it was not the view of the protected trades, each of which profited individually from the protection extended to itself, while it only shared with the general consumer the burden of higher prices imposed by the protection of other trades.

A sudden and complete reversal of the existing system in accordance with the principles laid down by the mercantile community was obviously not practicable. Free Trade could only be introduced by degrees, giving the producers time to adapt themselves to the changing conditions. But the principles of Free Trade were made the basis of Huskisson's régime. Like Walpole, Huskisson believed in attracting trade and making London the world's central mart. The most effective barrier to doing so was found in the Navigation Acts, which had already served their purpose of securing an immense British maritime preponderance, a preponderance so great that the protection and encouragement once looked upon as a national necessity had become entirely superfluous. The Act now operated only so as to diminish the volume of trade by the partial exclusion of foreign shipping, without providing anything like an equivalent in the expansion of British shipping. Now, moreover, there was a serious danger that foreign countries would retaliate by excluding British shipping from their ports, a process which had proved futile enough in time of war when the British Navy could be brought into play, but would not necessarily be so futile in time of peace. Huskisson's Reciprocity of Duties Act authorised the conclusion of treaties removing the existing restrictions wherever reciprocity was guaranteed. Fifteen such treaties were made between 1824 and 1829. The ruin of the British marine was of course prophesied, but in fact the tonnage of mercantile shipping increased nearly fifty per cent. during the first twenty years after Huskisson's Act was passed, whereas in the preceding twenty years it had increased only ten per cent. The Navigation Laws, however, were not actually deleted from the Statute Book until 1849.

Having dealt with the Navigation Acts, Huskisson proceeded with the reduction of duties. Between 1824 and 1826 several such reductions were made on minor articles. The duties on bar-iron and on cotton goods were lowered seventy per cent., but the most important changes were made with regard to silk and wool. In the case of wool there was hot opposition between the wool-growers and the manufacturers, for the former desired at the same time to have the existing duties on the export of wool abolished and those on its import retained, whereby they would have procured a monopoly of the home market and an extension of their markets abroad. The woollen manufacturers, on the other hand, wanted the export duty increased and the import duties removed, so that they might get their raw material as cheaply as possible. Huskisson compromised by retaining a low duty both on the exports and on the imports. The result was an enormous increase in the imports, but while there was no increase in the

exports the British wool-grower still found an entirely adequate market among the British manufacturers.

Very much the same thing happened with silk. Here there were no objections to the removal of duties on the raw material. The manufacturers wanted to have heavy duties on French silken manufactures but not upon the spun silk which was their raw material; whereas the silk spinners saw ruin staring them in the face if spun silk came in from abroad duty free. Huskisson faced the problem by reducing first the duty on raw silk by about ninety-five per cent., and then that upon spun silk by about fifty per cent. French silks had hitherto been prohibited, consequently they had found their way into England by smuggling. Now a duty was put upon them of thirty per cent. of their value. Thereupon, the demand for silks, which had been checked by the high price and by the vast increase of the cotton manufacture, was greatly augmented, the manufacturers adopted improved and more economical methods, and English silks not only almost drove those of France out of the home market, but were very soon competing successfully with them in the markets of the Continent.

The last year of Liverpool's administration, 1826, was marked by a demonstration of vigour in Canning's foreign policy. His action at an earlier stage had prevented foreign intervention in Portugal, where a constitutional government had been established. Spain was occupied with a civil war of its own, but the royalists there now attempted also to interfere in Portugal. An appeal from the Regent was answered by the mobilisation of a British force and a warning that it would be despatched to Portugal unless the Spanish interference ceased. The measure was effective, and Portugal was left alone.

A new parliament had just met at the beginning of 1827 when a paralytic stroke compelled the retirement of Lord Liverpool. To his exceptional capacities it was due that a Cabinet which contained so many irreconcilables had held together for so long. Peel continued to associate himself with the old Tory element, which was exceedingly distrustful of both Canning and Huskisson, men who belonged to no aristocratic connection and represented ideas which were alarming to the old Toryism. Both were impressed with the evils resulting from the high price of corn maintained by the law of 1815. Both were strong advocates of Catholic Emancipation, which was now becoming a burning question. A Catholic Relief Bill was passed by the House of Commons in 1826, but rejected by the Lords. The substitution of a "sliding scale" for the prohibitive Corn Law was carried and rejected in a like manner early in 1827. About the same time a resolution in favour of Catholic relief was defeated; and now, with a Cabinet whose members held irreconcilable views on leading questions of the day, a new ministry had to be formed. Canning was invited to form it, and a number of the leading Tories who had supported Liverpool immediately withdrew.

Canning was obliged to enter on a virtual alliance with the Whigs, with whom he was in fact by this time very much more in sympathy than with the Tories. But he was not destined to prove whether or no his brilliant talents fitted him for the supreme office. Within four months of his acceptance of the position of Chief Minister, George Canning was dead, leaving to posterity an elusive impression of brilliant but erratic genius, splendid audacity, fiery patriotism, and a puzzling combination of apparently contradictory political principles. For Canning, the advocate of political liberties abroad, was, like Castlereagh and Peel, the determined opponent of political reform at home. The consistent supporter of Catholic Emancipation would have nothing to say to the repeal of the Test Act. The enemy of the Holy Alliance defended the Six Acts and similar measures. In his own day he inspired affection, repulsion, admiration, enthusiasm, but never real confidence. He began public life with the reputation of a political adventurer; he ended it at the moment when the helm of the state had at last been placed in his hands. But he never had the opportunity of showing how he would have used his power.

III

REFORM

On Canning's death he was succeeded as Prime Minister by Lord Goderich who, as Frederick Robinson, had been one of his colleagues for the last four years. There was little change in the ministry, but its strength had lain in the personality of Canning. Goderich was inefficient, and resigned after six months, when the Duke of Wellington was persuaded to undertake the Premiership in spite of his own consciousness that the position was one for which he was thoroughly unfitted. No man was ever more absolutely sincere, more patriotic, more thoroughly disinterested. In certain emergencies, as when he had to deal with the Spaniards or when the victorious allies entered Paris, no man could have shown a cooler brain, a firmer hand, a stronger grasp of the situation. But party politics were entirely outside his range, and he was wholly out of touch with popular feeling; in an independent position his words, his counsels, and his judgment always carried a very great weight, but as the leader of a party he invariably found himself conducting retreats from positions which, very much against his own will, he had learnt to recognise as practically untenable.

Goderich resigned precisely five months after Canning's death. His tenure of office was signalled by only one remarkable event, the battle of Navarino. For some years past the Greeks had been engaged in the struggle for liberation from Turkish rule, for which Lord Byron gave his life. Russia had found it not inconsistent with the principles of the Holy Alliance to encourage the Greeks, with the expectation that by acting on

their behalf she would make her own profit. Canning, also sympathising with Greece, had endeavoured to prevent separate action on the part of Russia, and to work by bringing to bear on the Porte the combined pressure of Britain, Russia, and France. Canning's efforts had culminated in his last public act, the signing of a treaty between the three Powers in July 1827. The Porte remained obdurate, refused a suspension of hostilities against the Greeks, and summoned to its assistance the fleet of its great nominal vassal, Ibrahim Pasha of Egypt. Ibrahim's fleet was lying in the bay of Navarino. In spite of warning from Admiral Codrington, who was in command of the allied French and British squadrons, Ibrahim continued

to take part in the war on the mainland. The allied fleets in October entered the bay of Navarino. The Turco-Egyptian fleet fired upon them and was then annihilated in an action which lasted for four hours, although there had been no declaration of war. Public opinion endorsed the action of the Admirals; but in January Wellington had become Prime Minister, and the King's speech at the opening of Parliament referred to the battle as an "untoward event," a phrase which excited great indignation among the Whigs and the disciples of Canning.



George IV.

[From a sketch made at Ascot Races, 1828.]

In fact it very soon became evident that Wellington's attempt to reconstruct the Liverpool ministry of combined Tories and Canningites was doomed to failure; in a very short time the Canningites, Huskisson and Palmerston, resigned, and Wellington's ministry became an exclusively Tory one, with Robert Peel leading the House of Commons.

In effect the result of Wellington's accession to power was a reversion to the extreme policy of non-intervention, which left Russia very nearly a free hand in settling the Greek question, though the actual terms of settlement were finally arranged by Russia, France, and Britain in concert, and imposed upon both the Greeks and the Turks. The Greek frontier was defined, and Greece was erected into an independent monarchy, with Prince Otho of Bavaria as its king, in 1832.

The Government was Tory, but it spent its time mainly in beating a series of reluctant retreats. Finding that the sense of the House of Commons had at last become strongly in favour of the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, it accepted a bill abolishing the Sacramental test and substituting a very mild form of declaration that officers would do nothing to the injury of the Church, although Wellington and Peel, like Canning, had hitherto resolutely opposed any change. Again, the Duke had wrecked

Huskisson's previous proposal to substitute a sliding scale for the Corn Law of 1815. Now he accepted a sliding scale; that is to say, instead of prohibiting the importation of corn when the price was below eighty shillings, a duty of twenty-three shillings was imposed when the home price was below sixty-four shillings, diminishing as the price rose till it was reduced to one shilling when the price was seventy-three shillings or more.

But the great surrender was on the question of Catholic Emancipation, upon which George III. had taken so obstinate a stand in 1801, and in regard to which George IV. and his brothers had endorsed their father's attitude. The grievance in England was a minor one, chiefly because the Roman Catholics in that country, as in Scotland, were only a fraction of the population, and of these a considerable proportion enjoyed a wealth and a social position which enabled them to exercise a degree even of political influence. But in Ireland more than three-fourths of the population were Catholics, by whom the Protestant ascendancy was felt as an intolerable burden and a monstrous injustice. The refusal of Catholic Emancipation at the time of the Union perpetuated the hostility between Irish Catholics and Protestants, and afforded a just ground for complaint that Irish consent to the Union had been obtained upon false pretences. In course of time the leadership in the Catholic agitation had devolved upon Daniel O'Connell, an orator of extraordinary power, an opponent of the doctrines of the French Revolution, who insisted upon the principles of constitutional agitation and habitually repudiated all appeals to violence and force, though his own fervid appeals to the emotions of an emotional race were not without an inflammatory influence. O'Connell had organised the great Catholic Association, which in theory at least restricted itself to legal forms of agitation and owned no connection with secret societies. Alarmed by its influence, Parliament had in 1825 pronounced it illegal and endeavoured to suppress it; but it had only been reconstituted under forms which brought it again within the law, though its activities were restrained. Now the landlords had endeavoured to extend their own influence by nominally converting numbers of their tenants into "forty-shilling freeholders," who were entitled to exercise the franchise and on whose unfailing support they hastily counted. Their blunder was decisively demonstrated when, in 1828 the Catholic Daniel O'Connell was returned at the head of the poll in an election for County Clare, although his religion disqualified him from sitting in Parliament. The triumph was the greater because the election had been conducted in a perfectly orderly manner. It was easy to understand the meaning of the election, the intensity of the feeling to which it pointed, and the grave dangers which threatened if that feeling were persistently ignored. The Duke and Peel were converted to a belief not that Catholic Emancipation was in itself a desirable thing, but that a worse thing, armed rebellion, was the probable alternative. They chose the lesser of two evils, and in 1829 a bill removing nearly all the

Catholic disabilities was brought in by the Government and carried ; and O'Connell took his seat at Westminster.

In 1830 George IV. died. His influence on political life had not been prominent since the early days when the regency question nearly suspended Pitt's career. But his personal character had lowered the monarchy in public estimation to an unparalleled degree. The country had not become republican in sentiment, but if it had not been able to feel some respect for George's successor the permanence of the monarchy

would at best have become exceedingly doubtful. Happily the heir to the throne was William, Duke of Clarence, since the Duke of York had preceded his brother to the grave ; and William was at least an honest man, not unpopular in his character of the Sailor Prince, who had abstained from flagrant offences against the sense of public decency. He was already sixty-five years of age, and during his brief reign the Crown recovered something of its lost prestige, which was to be completely restored by the young girl who was his heir presumptive. It was generally understood that the new king was at least comparatively in sympathy with Liberal ideas.



William IV.

The cause of Catholic Emancipation had been won by Ireland, not by England, where it excited no enthusiasm. Not so was it with the great question which now confronted the ministry. Half a century before, the popular demand for Parliamentary reform had been gradually forcing its way to the front, though still held back by the antagonism of the governing classes and the private interests vested in rotten boroughs. Both Chatham and his son had advocated it ; but the French Revolution came and swept it out of the sphere of practical politics. There was no room for questions of reform when the guillotine was at work in Paris or while Britain was at grips with her great antagonist. But with the peace came a change. If ministers brought up in the atmosphere of reaction against Jacobinism remained persistently opposed to any extension of political power to the masses who were still shut out from it, or to a diminution of the control exercised by the dominant class, there were still Whigs who had gone out into the wilderness with Fox, and there was a new generation of Whigs who saw no advantages in a system which was calculated to keep them permanently out of office. Moreover, as the

memories of the French Revolution faded, the pre-revolution doctrines of William Pitt began to resume their sway over intelligent minds, while the masses who were still shut outside the gates had learnt to believe that the remedy for their grievances lay in the acquisition of political power, for which their demands grew daily more insistent. Year after year since 1820 Lord John Russell had brought forward in the House of Commons resolutions or proposals for disfranchising rotten boroughs and increasing the representation of the counties, and for the enfranchisement of the towns which were rapidly expanding in consequence of the new industrial system. Russell was regularly defeated, and, while Canning lived, the Canningites held by their leader in opposing reform, although that attitude was not easy to reconcile with some of their avowed principles. With his death their opposition weakened. Then in 1830, within a few weeks of the accession of William IV., the cause of constitutional reform received a new impulse from outside. In France a practically bloodless revolution was accomplished; the absolutist king, Charles X., was forced to abdicate, and the "citizen king," Louis Philippe of Orleans, was raised to the throne. The manner in which the revolution was accomplished served in no small degree to allay the alarms of those who anticipated excesses of the old type as the inevitable concomitants of any departure from the existing system, any shifting of the centre of political gravity. Apart from what was called the "July Revolution," it had already become clear that the demand for reform could not long be ignored, and by that revolution much latent antagonism to it was removed.

The battle began at once. Before the meeting of Parliament in November every one believed that some measure of reform was inevitable. The King's Speech, however, made no mention of the subject. Lord Grey, the leader of the Whigs in the House of Peers, who had been prominent among the advanced Whigs ever since the days of Pitt's first administration, referred to reform as a measure of prime necessity for diminishing public discontent. The Duke in reply declared in effect that the existing system could not by any possibility be improved upon, that the country had entire confidence in it, and that he himself should at all times feel it his duty to oppose any measure of reform. But even this declaration did not suffice to rally to the support of the Government the extreme Tories, who considered that they had been betrayed over Catholic Emancipation. The Government was defeated on a side issue, whereupon the Duke and Peel both resigned, and Grey was invited to form a ministry.

It is curious to observe that the statesman who ultimately carried the Reform Bill was himself of an intensely aristocratic temperament. Of the new administration four members only were in the House of Commons, and of those four one, Lord Palmerston, was an Irish peer, and another, Lord Althorp, the heir to an English earldom. The Lord Chancellor, however, Henry Brougham, was a peer only because he was

made Lord Chancellor. It is to be remarked that the Marquess Wellesley was now in political opposition to his brother, and was associated with the new Government, although not in the Cabinet. A full half of the new ministry were Canningites.

The change of government appears to have given to agitators the impression that the administration would be too weak or too sympathetic to punish disturbances, which broke out in several of the southern counties. They were, however, promptly disillusioned by its vigorous action, and by the prosecution and punishment of the ringleaders. It was unfortunate that the Whigs were seriously weakened by the want of any capable finance minister, since Huskisson was unhappily killed in the summer of 1830 at the opening of the pioneer railway line between Manchester and Liverpool.

In the course of centuries the system of representation had become very much changed. Originally the boroughs returning members had been the substantial towns whose members had been in the main returned by the burgesses. But whether they decayed or progressed these boroughs returned the same number of members as of yore. In many of them the election had been monopolised by the corporations; in others, where the population had fallen off, the few electors had passed completely under the control of some magnate who could secure the return of his own nominee. Under the Tudors, and especially under the Stuarts, many additions had been made to the number of the boroughs, but these were "pocket boroughs" specially created by the Crown not because they were substantial towns but because they were under the Crown's control. Many of these also had since passed into the hands of magnates. New towns had grown up with large populations, especially since the development of machinery and the factory system had compelled the congregating of workers together; these towns remained unrepresented. The general effect was that in 1830 there were one hundred and fifty-seven members of Parliament who were the direct nominees of eighty-four persons, and another hundred and fifty whose election was practically controlled by seventy persons. In Scotland and Ireland the proportion of nominees was still greater. The enormous power exercised by landed magnates in returning members to the House of Commons obviously went a long way towards ensuring a tolerable harmony between the Representative Chamber and the House of Lords. That power a reformed system could not fail to destroy, and with it the effective supremacy of the oligarchical families in the government of the country.

But it was not the intention of the Whig leader to introduce a democracy, a government controlled by the masses of the people. A rational extension of the franchise to substantial citizens, a system which gave a real representation to the electors bearing some proportion to their numbers and their fitness for the exercise of political power, was the object aimed at by the author of the Reform Bill of 1831. The ten-

pound householder in the boroughs, the ten-pound copyholder and the fifty-pound leaseholder in the counties, were to have the franchise. Corresponding changes were to be made in Scotland and Ireland. Boroughs with less than two thousand inhabitants were to be disfranchised altogether; those with less than four thousand were to return only one member. Out of some hundred and seventy seats thus abolished something over a hundred were to be re-allotted to counties, to great towns, or to Scotland or Ireland, the total number of seats being thus considerably diminished.

The king before his accession had kept himself politically in the background, but had been on the whole associated with the Whigs rather than the Tories. He was now definitely in favour of a moderate reform, and was well satisfied to find that Grey's bill made no concession to the extremists, as they were then considered, who demanded manhood suffrage, annual Parliaments, and the ballot. The bill was passed in the House of Commons on the first reading without a division; but on the second reading the Government were able to secure a majority of only one in a very full house. A few days later an amendment to which they were opposed was carried, whereupon the king immediately dissolved Parliament, and at the general election, when the whole country rang with the cry of "The bill, the whole bill, and nothing but the bill," Government was so strongly supported that its majority on the second reading was in the proportion of five to three. Though the Opposition fought stubbornly, the only material amendment was one which extended the franchise in the counties to £50 tenants-at-will, such men having a very strong tendency to vote with their landlords. The majority on the third reading was not substantially reduced.

The king, however, was very much afraid of a collision between the two Houses, and though he approved the bill himself, urged Grey to modify it with a view to ensuring its acceptance by the peers. Grey stood firm, and the king's anxiety was justified. After a brilliant debate the Lords rejected the bill in October by a majority of forty-one. In the weeks following the rejection of the bill, public excitement was roused to a very high pitch. In many parts of the country and especially at Bristol there were serious riots. Grey was determined to bring the bill in again with little modification. Negotiations with a view to compromise came to nothing. When the new session was opened in December there were changes, but not of principle. A slight variation in the basis of disfranchisement, and the preservation of the existing number of seats without diminution, reduced the number of seats cancelled to about a hundred and forty and further increased the representation of the counties and of new boroughs. The bill was carried on the second reading in the Commons, this time by a majority of two to one, and on the third reading the majority was again larger than in the case of the previous bill.

The king was intensely opposed to coercing the peers by a creation

which would swamp their majority. Grey, with his aristocratic instincts, was extremely anxious to avoid such a step, but still held to it as a power to be used in the last resort ; and he was authorised to say that in the last resort the power might be exercised. The peers were induced to pass the second reading, though by a majority of only nine. The king was taking alarm at the temper which was being displayed in the country, and his own most conservative instincts were being disturbed. The Opposition felt emboldened, and three weeks later carried an amendment which in effect shelved the bill. Grey thereupon advised the creation of a number of peers sufficient to ensure the passing of the bill, with the resignation of the ministry as the alternative. The king accepted their resignation, and called upon Wellington to form an administration for the purpose of carrying a modified Reform Bill. The Duke, who considered it his duty to suppress his personal views and to carry out the king's wishes, tried to do so, but Peel refused to join him. A week was long enough to prove that the attempt was hopeless, and the king recalled Grey. Wellington was informed that the necessities of the case would be met by the abstention of a sufficient number of peers to allow the passage of the bill. Accepting this course as preferable to the creation of fifty new peers, the Duke persuaded some hundred of the lords to withdraw, and the bill was carried, receiving the royal assent on June 7th.

Limited as the franchise still was, so that the manual labourers, conventionally described as the "working classes," continued to be excluded from it, the great Reform Bill nevertheless destroyed the old oligarchy and transferred the political centre of gravity to the middle class. Corresponding changes were made in Scotland and Ireland, where the representation of the former was increased by eight members and of the latter by five.

IV

INDIA AND THE COLONIES

In India Lord Hastings, like his predecessors, continued after the war with Nepal to find it impossible to avoid native wars and the expansion of British dominion. The treatment of the Marathas after the removal of Lord Wellesley had in fact encouraged them to watch for opportunities of further aggression. Sheltered by the Maratha chiefs, large bodies of lawless soldiery known as Pindáris or Patháns established themselves within Maratha territory and carried their devastations all over Central India. British protests were met by promises which were left carefully unfulfilled, and it was impossible to doubt that it was the intention of the confederacy to foster and encourage the Pindáris as allies, by whose aid the British authority could be set at defiance. It became clear to Hastings that the

preservation of order and security in India imperatively demanded the suppression of these robber bands which held the whole peaceful population in terror. In 1816 George Canning had become President of the Board of Control, and, realising the nature of the emergency and the appalling character of the Pindári raids, he gave Hastings a free hand.

Accordingly in 1817 Hastings opened his campaign for the suppression of the Pindáris, the

operations being on a scale very much larger than had ever before been undertaken in India; for as matters stood, it was practically certain that unless an overwhelming force were employed the entire Maratha confederacy would take part with the robber hordes. Sindhia, fortunately for himself, was isolated and paralysed for action by the disposition of the British troops. Elsewhere, however, although the Pindári chiefs were quickly forced to a formal submission, both the Peishwa and the Bhonsla attacked the British, and the Pindári campaign was converted into a Maratha war. The general results were as



India in the early nineteenth century.

concerned Sindhia that the British extended their protection to the Rajput states, over which he had usurped an ascendancy which the Rajputs abominated. At Nagpur a new Bhonsla was set up, who was a minor, and the administration was temporarily taken over by the British. The Patháns and Pindáris were completely broken up and many of them were absorbed into the British sepoy army. The young Holkar accepted a subsidiary alliance of the normal type which was already in force with the Gaekwar. But the whole of the territories of the Peishwa, with the exception of the state of Satara, were annexed, and the Peishwa himself was removed to an estate on the Ganges basin with the enjoyment of an exceedingly substantial pension. Satara was reserved to the puppet


“royal” family of the Marathas, the descendants of Sivaji, the founder of the Maratha power.

By way of contrast to the penalties of increased formal dependence imposed upon the Maratha states, a more dignified status was offered to the two great Mohammedan princes, the Nizam and the Wazir of Oudh, as the reward of their loyalty. Both were officially lieutenants of the Mogul, whose legal dignity Wellesley had made a point of upholding. Hastings now offered to both the title of king or “Padishah,” implying an independent monarchy. Behind the offer lay the intention of diminishing the prestige of the titular sovereign of India, a step viewed with extreme suspicion by the Mussulman population, though not with any special disfavour by the Hindus. The Nizam disdained the proffered honour as being inconsistent with his loyalty to the Mogul; the Wazir of Oudh was less scrupulous, and became henceforth the king of Oudh. It must be remarked at the same time, with regard to the treatment of the Marathas, that the Peishwa had for the last century been the nominal head of the Maratha confederacy which, when united, had hitherto been the one great Hindu power in the Peninsula. There was now no Peishwa, no one with a traditional title to be regarded as the head of the Marathas. Thus the total result in 1819 was not merely the addition of extensive territory to the British dominion, but a marked step towards the formal assertion of actual British sovereignty.

Three years later Lord Hastings resigned; but for the suicide of Castle-reagh George Canning would have succeeded him as Governor-General. But Canning was needed at the Foreign Office, and the Indian appointment was given to Lord Amherst. Once more expansion was forced upon the Governor-General, but not in the peninsula itself. This time the challenge came from Burmah, which lay beyond the sphere of operations of the various empires which had dominated India. The Burmese were racially distinct from the peoples of India, being more nearly akin to the Chinese; moreover they were Buddhists, a religion which had taken its rise in Hindustan but had failed to retain its hold there, while it established its ascendancy among the peoples beyond the mountains on the east and north. The Burmese empire was extensive, but it was in a great degree isolated from India by the barrier of the mountains and the sea; and the Burmese emperor suffered from illusions as to his own power and that of the British. Before Lord Hastings left India the Burmese monarch demanded from him the “restoration” of that part of Bengal which lay on the north-east of the Ganges Delta, which, of course, had never belonged to Burmah at all. Hastings had treated this communication as a forgery. But when Amherst arrived he found that the Burmese were taking aggressive action on the frontier. His warnings were treated with contempt as impertinences, and it at once became obvious that an appeal must be made to force. In May 1824 an expedition was despatched to Pegu, which occupied Rangoon; but the character of the climate and the country

delayed further operations till the winter. It was not till the autumn of the next year that the progress of the British forces impressed upon the Burmese the fact that they had aroused a dangerous enemy; and it was only after some more severe defeats that the Burmese monarch was induced to accept the British terms. Assam, Arakan, and Tenasserim were annexed, and a British Resident was admitted to the Burmese capital at Ava. The nearest equivalent in the West of the term Resident as employed in Indian politics is Ambassador.

Unfortunately, there had been much mismanagement in the conduct of the Burmese war, so that what ought to have been a short and sharp campaign was dragged out over a couple of years. A bad impression was produced in India itself, and the principality of Bhartpur lying on the west of the river Jumna tried the experiment of defying British intervention.



Bombay Fort in the early nineteenth century.

[From a drawing by William Westall, A.R.A.]

The result was that the citadel of Bhartpur, which had been regarded as impregnable, was captured, and British invincibility was decisively reasserted. The fall of Bhartpur impressed the native mind more strikingly than the operations of the Pindári war, and sixteen years passed before any other attempt was made to challenge British authority. In the Punjab, beyond the Sutlej, Ranjit Singh had consolidated an exceedingly powerful monarchy since the beginning of the century; but that very shrewd ruler consistently through all his life realised that the British were not to be challenged; and in all his relations with them took very good care not to transgress those limits of his activities imposed by the danger of a direct collision with the Lords Paramount of India.

After Bhartpur, then, the interests of our Indian history for several years centre entirely in administrative reforms associated mainly with the Governor-Generalship of Lord William Bentinck.

Bentinck, who succeeded Amherst in 1828, may be taken as representing the more liberal spirit which was predominant in British politics after the

retirement of Lord Liverpool, a spirit in which the principal danger for India lay in the disposition of the government to assume the appropriateness of Western ideas to Eastern conditions. The gains effected in actual administration, in the increased security of life and property, the improvement of material conditions, and the spread of education, were enormous, though in some respects sufficient account was not taken of native traditions and native prejudices, which were not fully understood. But the wisdom of the main lines followed, and the great preponderance of beneficial results, are beyond dispute.

Four reforms in particular may be emphasised, the abolition of practices of an essentially barbarous character. The first of these was *sati*—the Hindu custom that when a man died his widow should sacrifice herself on his funeral pyre. In theory the action was voluntary, an act of self-dedication; in practice it was habitually forced upon reluctant victims. Bentinck ventured on the suppression, in spite of very great fears that it would be followed by an outburst of fanaticism; but the expectation happily proved to be without foundation. A very much more difficult affair was the suppression of *thuggee*. The thugs were a secret society with ramifications all over India devoted to robbery and murder, principally committed on the persons of lonely travellers who vanished and left no trace. The thugs were believed to work under the protection of a particularly powerful goddess, and so great were the material and superstitious terrors which they inspired that there was extraordinary difficulty in procuring any sort of evidence against them; nevertheless the work was accomplished, mainly by the persistent energy and skill of Colonel Sleeman. Even the existence of the organisation had been previously unsuspected by the authorities. Yet ten years after Sleeman commenced his operations, it had practically ceased to exist.

The third was the organised system of brigandage known as *dacoity*, in which large numbers of apparently respectable persons were found to be concerned. Here, again, the process of identification and the collection of evidence presented extraordinary difficulties, and several years elapsed before fear of the law overpowered fear of the dacoits. The fourth evil practice successfully put down was that of infanticide, the habitual murder of girl babies, a practice which had arisen out of the crushing cost of marriages, while the marrying of daughters was looked upon as an imperative religious duty. Here the suppression was effected by removing the main motive for the custom rather than by punishing the offence, for the difficulty of proving that an infant had been murdered was enormous. The matter therefore was dealt with by legal restrictions on the expenditure at marriages and the exclusion from the attendant ceremonies of the hordes of beggars on whom it was considered a religious duty to bestow alms on such occasions. Other reforms belong also to the period of Bentinck's administration, which have to be associated with the more decisive ascendancy of Whig doctrine that came into force after the carrying of the Reform Bill.

The history of Colonial Expansion during this period is not marked by striking events. In the Canadas certain family groups became established as a dominant political aristocracy which monopolised administrative appointments and administrative control, somewhat as the Undertakers had done in Ireland before the Union. There was therefore growing discontent, especially in Lower Canada, where the population was mainly French and Catholic, while the group leagued in what was called the Family Compact was British and Protestant. Matters however did not come to a head until about the time when Queen Victoria succeeded her uncle on the British throne. Another point to be observed, however, is that the pressure of industrial troubles in the British Isles, with other causes, brought about an increasing emigration especially from Scotland, which added a democratic element in the Canadas, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia.

In South Africa the British population began to accumulate beside the descendants of the Dutch and French Huguenot families which had been in possession for a couple of centuries. The new settlers were planted largely between Capetown and the Kaffir districts on the east, and this increased the risk of collisions with the natives. For some time, however, there was as little interference with or alteration in the Dutch laws and institutions as in the case of the French in Canada. But before 1830 the government, which was still in the hands of a Governor and a nominated Council, began to introduce changes in accordance with British ideas, very much to the offence of the extremely conservative and suspicious Dutch population. The changes in themselves were undoubtedly improvements; the objection to them lay in the fact that they were resented and misunderstood by the people upon whom they were forced in a manner which did not attempt to be tactful. It was particularly ominous of trouble that the British authorities were moved by prevalent humanitarian sentiments, and were inclined to go as much too far in crediting the native races with a capacity for the immediate development of the virtues of civilisation as the Dutch, in accordance with their own tradition, went too far in treating them as belonging to a lower and distinctly vicious order of creation. Again these effects were to make themselves more prominently felt after the passage of the Reform Bill in London.

Lastly, we have to record the slow progress of colonisation in Australia. The first colony of New South Wales with its nucleus at Sydney included Tasmania as well as the East Australian seaboard. Soldiers and convicts, when their term of service expired, were allowed to settle on the land under the control of a military governor. In 1812 Tasmania was separated from New South Wales. The arrival of other settlers was slow, the convict settlements having a repelling effect. But after the peace M'Quarrie, the Governor of New South Wales, made energetic efforts to encourage immigration, and received assistance both in the shape of expenditure by the imperial government and from the agricultural and industrial depression which was driving emigrants still more rapidly both to Canada and

to South Africa. By 1826 there were thirty thousand inhabitants in New South Wales, and the free settlers from home considerably outnumbered the convict group. Between 1813 and 1831 a good deal of exploration was carried out, and vast areas were taken up for sheep farming. The new colony of Western Australia was started in 1829, and marked the beginning of a new movement towards expansion, having its sources in England.

CHAPTER XXXIII

THE ERA

I

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

AT the moment when the younger Pitt came into power in 1784, England and Scotland were beginning to feel the first effects of the impulses and the inventions which in the course of fifty years revolutionised the industrial system and changed the bases of the whole social structure. The tools worked by hand were already largely displaced by machinery driven by water-power; already the initial difficulties which James Watt had found in making his steam-engine workable had been mastered, and steam-power was being applied to mills. Already the development of a canal system had provided new facilities of transport and immensely increased traffic, and already the renewed process of enclosure was submerging the yeoman. Before the next fifty years were over, steam had become the driving power of the machinery which made Great Britain the world's workshop; steam had been at last applied to locomotion, so that as concerns traffic the changes brought about by the canals were on the verge of becoming relatively insignificant; and a few years were to see the steamship on its way to supersede the sailing vessel. The yeoman had disappeared altogether, and the main population of England was no longer rural but had become urban. A new phenomenon in the world's history, an industrial nation, had come into being, pregnant with new problems. And society was barely beginning to think of adjusting itself to the new conditions, barely beginning to realise that the conditions were new and unprecedented. It was still unable to distinguish between the social revolution born in France, a revolt against feudalism, a revolution of ideas, and the economic revolution born in England, a revolution in material conditions.

The application of water-power meant the setting up of machinery and the aggregation of workers where water-power was available. The application of steam-power meant the setting up of machinery and the aggregation of workers where coal was readily available. The demands of the new machinery for coal and iron gathered workers to the coal-fields and the iron-fields. These causes combined to shift the weight of population from the south to the north; it made the northern counties the most populous instead of the least populous area of the kingdom, and turned places which

had been unimportant villages into crowded towns. But the population multiplied more rapidly than the employment increased; and so long as the increased output of machinery outstripped the increased demand for goods which followed upon the lessened cost of production, the setting up of machinery diminished employment. Machinery appeared to the labourer to be a device to enable rich men to take the bread out of the mouths of the poor. They had no chance of realising that in the long run machinery would mean increased employment; and even if they had been able to realise it, the prospect of good wages in the remote future did not

compensate for low wages or none in the present. Therefore in the eyes of the working men machinery was an evil thing; and with low wages and short employment came outbreaks of machine-smashing and general violence, which kept alive the conviction that only by stern repression could the country be saved from a repetition of the horrors which had taken place in France.



The extended dress of 1789.
[From a print.]

The fear of Jacobinism, not the desire to control labour in the interests of capital, was the reason of the laws which in 1799 and 1800 prohibited combinations and unions whether of masters or of workmen. The Government looked upon associations as in themselves dangerous, as instruments which would be unscrupulously directed to the subversion of the political and social order. But in fact under the new conditions the prohibition of unions placed the employed at the mercy of the employers. Concerted

action on the part of employers as well as concerted action on the part of the men was made illegal, but it did not practically affect them. Unless the men acted in concert, the individual master could always get as many individual men as he required on his own terms. In effect, therefore, the law intervened on behalf of the masters against the men, while in theory it was applying one rule to both. The obvious conclusion for the labouring man was that the law was made in the interest of the employer by the governing class to which the employer belonged, and there would be no fair play for the working man until he got the making of the laws into his own hands.

Until the end of the eighteenth century our own history presents us with few signs of class hostility either widely spread or bitter, after the period of the great Peasant Revolt. Even Jack Cade's rebellion in the middle of the fifteenth century was not a revolt of the lower against the upper classes in the social scale; that character was attributed to it only by later writers; and for that view there was no better ground

than that the leaders made use of such discontent as survived among the peasantry to increase their following. The revolts in the Tudor period were not risings of class against class, of poor against rich, but were the outcome of quite specific grievances. The Great Rebellion was in no sense a war of classes. There was no widespread sense of antagonism between labour and capital. But that was precisely the new sense which was brought into being by the new manufacture. Until the new manufacture came into play the labourer himself possessed the tools of his trade. For the most part also his trade was not his sole means of livelihood. But with the new manufacture, accompanied by the new period of enclosure, his trade became his sole means of livelihood, and he was entirely dependent on the employer, who owned the whole machinery of production. The disappearance of the yeoman, and of the cottar who derived a part of his living from the plot of ground which he occupied, drew a sharper distinction between the capitalist class which paid wages for labour and the labouring class which gave labour for wages, between the wage payers and the wage earners. And precisely at the moment when the severance of classes was becoming more definite and marked came the French Revolution, the uprising of oppressed against oppressing classes, which, looked at from another point of view, was an anarchical revolt against all lawful authority. It was inevitable that the one point of view should be adopted by the dependent classes who had no share in the government and the other by the class on whom they were dependent, who monopolised the government. It was inevitable also that the two classes should conceive of their respective interests as mutually antagonistic. The employer, conscious of his own intention to be just, was indignant because the operative did not recognise his justice; the operative could see no justice in a system under which his wages were low and precarious while the employer grew rich, as he argued, upon the proceeds of his toil. The new manufacturing conditions, therefore, created an antagonism between labour and capital for which the old conditions had provided no basis.

In the agricultural districts, however, the effect was not quite the same; the cottar-holding, the small farm, and the open field, were absorbed into large farms, and the large fields partitioned by hedgerows came into existence, which we have learned to look upon as the characteristic of English landscape in all agricultural districts. The small farmer and the cottar were turned into wage-earning agricultural labourers; but the wage-payer was the large farmer, not the landowner. The large farmer could conduct his operations with a very much more economical distribution of labour than was possible under the old system; but the antagonism between the rural wage-payers and wage-earners was very much modified by the new application of the Poor Law. With a large overplus of labour on the market, wages were low and employment was insufficient. The powers bestowed upon the magistrates by Gilbert's Act were brought into play;

the Speenhamland Board led the disastrous way by supplementing wages out of rates, and other boards all over the country followed suit. Wherever wages were below a certain level an allowance was made to the labourer, and that allowance was increased according to the size of his family. Thus a subsistence was secured to the labourer, while he was encouraged to increase his family and replenish the earth, since the enlargement of the population was regarded as an object of national importance, emphasised by the war. But the system, while it preserved the labourer from destitution, at the same time deprived him of all sense of responsibility. It

destroyed the relation between work and wages, because whether wages were high or low, subsistence was secured; and the farmer did not realise that he was making up by the payment of high rates what he saved by the payment of low wages.



“Royal Affability.”

[A caricature by Gillray of George III.'s interest in Agriculture.]

The war too came to help the agricultural community in another way. While the rapid increase of the population necessitated an increased food supply, the war prevented that supply from being supplemented from abroad. The price of corn rose, and it became possible to bring under cultivation great areas of land which it had not before paid to put under the plough; thus employment was increased. The prices which made the cultivation of inferior land pay made the better land pay enormously; the landlords were able

to obtain very high rents, while the farmer still pocketed large profits. The price of corn was fixed at that which made the poorer land pay, because if it had been lowered the poorer land would have gone out of cultivation, the supply would have run short, and the price would have gone up again.

The war came to an end, and the agricultural interest, landlords, farmers, and labourers, were faced with the prospect of lowered prices. Land would go out of cultivation since the supply of food would be made good from abroad. Employment would diminish; the capital expended on extension would be thrown away. The farmers' profits would fall, the landlords' rents would fall. Both landlords and farmers had acquired the habit of living up to the large incomes which the war had brought them, and retrenchment would be exceedingly difficult; to many of them it would in effect mean ruin. And beyond their personal interests there were, it appeared, national interests at stake. The country would no

longer grow a supply of food sufficient for its own need ; it had only been able to do so during the war by bringing the poorer land under cultivation. If a new war came, that land could not be at once brought under cultivation again, and the country would be starved out. Without any consciousness of self-interested motives, the agricultural interest demanded that the price of corn must be maintained ; and it procured the enactment of the Corn Law of 1815, which kept up the high price of living for the population at large without securing to the agricultural interest the war rates of profit, while the steady multiplication of the mouths to be fed made it yearly more impossible that the country should continue even under the most favourable conditions to be self-sufficing in its food supply.

Here, then, we may note an essential difference in the nature of the opposition between classes in the France of the French Revolution and the England of the Industrial Revolution. In France the primary opposition was between classes which stood legally on a different footing ; the privileged class consisted of the hereditary lords both of the soil and of its occupants, a group which was exempted from burdens while enjoying the exclusive possession of political rights. In England the technical distinctions between classes recognised by the law were very few. The political privilege of sitting by hereditary right in one of the chambers of the legislature carried with it no exemptions from public burdens. The lords of the soil were in no sense lords of its occupants, and could not command their services ; while, instead of being exempt from public burdens, they provided through the land tax a very large proportion of the revenue. The self-made burgess and merchant had the same political rights as the landowner ; they and the landowners who were commoners were not even barred from the prospect of acquiring the additional political rights of Peers of the Realm ; the law recognised no aristocratic caste. Politically it drew the line between persons possessed of a certain amount of property and the rest, but in theory there was nothing to prevent any number of the rest from crossing the line by becoming possessed of the necessary amount of property. The antagonism was between wealth and poverty, and it only became acute when translated into terms of Capital and Labour. As often as not, the capitalist himself or his father had risen from the ranks by a combination of intelligence, energy, and good fortune, in which he probably allowed much less credit to the last element than his neighbours were inclined to do. If the law intervened between him and




“ Farmer ” George.
[From Gillray’s caricature.]

his workmen it was only to insist that neither should coerce the other by combination. It did not strike the employer that whereas the individual workman could by no possibility coerce him, there was no difficulty whatever in his coercing the individual workman. Nor did it strike him that while he could set the law in motion against the workman who broke it, the individual workman was quite incapable of reversing the process; whereby the law, nominally even-handed, could be called in to his support if he wanted it but not to that of the workman. Yet it was this fact which convinced the workman that the law was on the side of the capitalist, and would only cease to be so when the workman himself had the making of it. In short, the antagonism in France was between the peasant and the bourgeois on the one side and the aristocrat on the other; in England it was between the workman and the capitalist employer.

The interests of the employer and the interests of the workman were opposed on the broad principle that it was to the advantage of the former to procure labour at the lowest possible wage. If there were employers who realised that they could get better value by paying higher wages, they were rare. Nearly all of those who paid more than the lowest available rates did so from motives of humanity, believing that they were acting to the detriment of their own material interests. While the supply of labour exceeded the demand, and employers remained convinced that cheap labour served their interest, labour could hope for improved conditions only through legislation or combination. But it was vain to look to legislation unless it obtained control of the legislature. It was useless to look to combination; for even before the eighteenth century the judges were treating organisation as conspiracy under the common law, and in the last two years of the century the combination laws made concerted action on the part of men or masters a specific offence. The workmen were debarred even from combining to set the law in motion; and being able to act only as individuals, for practical purposes they could not act at all, even when masters acted illegally. Magistrates had power to impose a scale of wages on the masters, but if the men combined to compel the masters to pay according to the scale they were sent to prison; while obviously it would have been perfectly futile for individual workmen acting separately to claim at law the wage to which they were legally entitled.

The law, however, did not operate effectively against all combinations, but chiefly against those of unskilled workmen, who were suspected of being as a matter of course revolutionaries. It was recognised that the skilled workman had a stake in society and a consequent preference for the preservation of law and order. Action was taken against combinations only at the instance of masters, and in the skilled trades masters were rather favourably inclined to combinations among the men. Hence it came about that in the reign of George IV. a successful movement for the repeal of the Combination Laws was carried through, which took its rise in the

skilled, not in the unskilled trades. It was the belief of the prime mover, Francis Place, that freedom of combination would at once procure an adjustment of outstanding questions reasonably satisfactory both to masters and men, which would make the continued existence of combinations superfluous. Place procured the passage of the bills of 1824 and 1825 by exceedingly clever management, and there is not much doubt that he would have failed if Parliament had realised what it was doing. But the actual effect was to secure the legality of collective bargaining and of collective withdrawal from work—in other words, striking—though there still remained to the judges a large latitude for discovering conspiracy under the common law. The repeal of the Combination Acts, however, only for a moment diverted the workmen from their conviction that the remedy for their grievances lay in the acquisition of political power. The immediate




The first steamboat, the *Comet*, on the Clyde.

[From a print of 1812.]

effect was the birth of a large number of trade unions; but the moment was unfortunate. A period of trade depression set in, unemployment increased, and the new unions were unable to prevent the lowering of wages. Therefore the impression rapidly prevailed that combination was unable to procure the anticipated benefits. So when the Reform Bill came, the working classes were angry and disappointed, because they still remained shut out from political power; while the governing classes rejoiced that reform had been carried far enough to secure stability, but had stopped short of admitting the dangerous elements of the population to the franchise.

Long before the accession of King George IV. steam had taken complete possession of manufacture. Water-power had had its brief day as the predominant agent, and the old domestic industries had vanished completely. But there was still one more change to be effected by steam through its application to locomotion. Steam traction by land first began to appear practicable when iron rails were used to make an easy road for

trucks. The first railroad was not intended for steam traction; it was in fact a horse tramway between Wandsworth and Reigate. But the invention of a locomotive steam-engine was engaging the attention of engineers. In 1812 a boat propelled by steam was launched on the Clyde, and two years later George Stephenson had built his first locomotive engine. The first railway authorised by Act of Parliament to carry passengers was that between Darlington and Stockton, sanctioned in 1823. It was due to the persuasions of George Stephenson that the steam locomotive instead of horse haulage was permitted. The difficulties which faced these early attempts are illustrated by the fact that the first endeavours to get this line



Stephenson's locomotive, the "Rocket."

authorised were blocked by the Duke of Cleveland, because a portion of the line was required to pass through his estate. Without compulsory powers of purchase it was impossible to lay down a line of any length if any landowner chose to block the way. Moreover, superior persons scoffed at the engineers, and pointed out that the sane British public would most certainly refuse to allow itself to be carried over the ground at the terrific speed of sixteen miles an hour. Nevertheless, the Stockton

and Darlington railway soon had a successor in the line between Manchester and Liverpool, whose opening in 1830 was the decisive moment in the history of traffic during the nineteenth century. The complete success of that epoch-marking function was marred by the unfortunate accident which killed Huskisson. But it was no longer possible to doubt that steam traction would supersede all other forms of transport whether of passengers or of goods by land. In this, as in the creation of manufacturing machinery, Great Britain took the lead, which materially assisted in giving her an overwhelming advantage in commercial competition.

II

LITERATURE

The era of political and social revolution was the era also of a revolution in literature, or at least in poetical literature. The spirit which

gave birth to the French Revolution was one of revolt against conventions which society had come to regard as conditions of orderly existence. The same spirit revolted against the conventions which had made poetry as artificial as society. Poetry in England had been intellectualised, cut off from its emotional basis, severed from passion and from nature, cribbed, cabined, and confined by canons which restricted the subjects with which it was permitted to deal and the language in which it was permitted to express itself. Polite culture, however, had allowed a certain interest in a barbaric and uncultivated past. It had suffered itself to pay a tribute of admiration to the ballad literature collected by Allan Ramsay in Scotland and Bishop Percy in England. It had even indulged in a somewhat uncritical enthusiasm over James Macpherson's *Ossian*, which claimed to be an ancient Celtic Epic, though sceptical readers such as Dr. Johnson entirely declined to endorse its genuineness.

From these explorations into the past came one of the impulses which helped to bring a new poetical literature to birth. A second impulse came from the fact that outside the recognised literary world the lyric in its simplest form, song, had survived as a natural product among the Scottish people ever since the days of William Dunbar and the reign of James IV.; and Scottish song suddenly culminated in the genius of Robert Burns at the moment when England's last literary dictator was removed by the death of Samuel Johnson. In Scotland Burns was the last and the greatest of a long line of singers; to England he appeared as the originator of a new movement. All that was greatest in him completely traversed the recognised literary canons. In the language of his own countryside, not in the language of culture, he expressed the emotions, the passions of his own countryfolk, in verse of that magical rhythm which no art can acquire.

Burns himself was not in conscious rebellion against literary conventions, because those conventions had never been imposed upon him. Nevertheless the new spirit was incarnate in him, hating bondage of any sort for himself or others, often reckless and uncontrolled, but ardent, sincere, and full of a broad and deep human sympathy. Convention stifled him, and when, on occasion, he deliberately fettered the form of his writing, his individual characteristics disappeared and he became commonplace.



Robert Burns.

[From the painting by Nasmyth.]

For the true note of the Revolution was Individuality, and its strength lay in the free development of individual characteristics. The revolutionists were of no school; they pursued the most diverse methods and the most diverse aims. They acted upon irreconcilable theories; they were at one only in their rejection of the methods and theories and aims of the school which had dominated the eighteenth century. They were for the most part men to whom at the outset the French Revolution seemed to open out vistas of unlimited promise, in whom it aroused the passion of humanity and the passion for liberty; both passions are perfectly consistent with the instinct of conservatism, the love of order, an even exaggerated admiration of the past. Many of them became the more conservative when the events in France disappointed their first enthusiastic hopes. Typical conservatives as well as typical revolutionaries were numbered amongst them. But they all agreed in breaking away from the current literary ideals and in asserting their own individuality. Burns was the harbinger of the new day whose dawn was signalled by the publication in 1798 of the *Lyrical Ballads* by Wordsworth and Coleridge, which included Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner* and Wordsworth's *Tintern Abbey*, as well as many other pieces which exemplified a new theory of the poetic art.

Thus was founded the "Lake School," which was not a school at all. It was called a school and looked upon as a school because its members were associated together as friends; and it was called the Lake School because they settled for a time in proximity to each other in the Lake district, which Wordsworth made his permanent home. To realise that in doctrine and practice they were poles asunder, it is sufficient to compare the two master-pieces in the *Lyrical Ballads*. An imagination at once vivid and mystical and a haunting melody of expression were the primary characteristics of Coleridge. Wordsworth was above all else the prophet of Nature, as the expression

"Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean and the living air,
And the blue sky and in the mind of man,"


the poet of

"That blessed mood,
In which the burthen of the mystery,
In which the heavy and the weary weight
Of all this unintelligible world
Is lightened."

As unlike to both Wordsworth and Coleridge as to Pope and Johnson was the next star that appeared on the poetical firmament, Walter Scott. Scott was no prophet; he had no gift of spiritual insight; but with him

poetry resumed its function as the medium of the story-teller. Before long he was to desert poetry for prose and to raise the novel to a new place in literature. Scott, in his own eyes, was not at all a rebel against the existing order; he was merely reviving the conventions of the past, appropriating the ballad idea to new conditions. But for all that he in fact preached by his example a return to naturalism, to spontaneity, instead of submission to the canons of orthodoxy.

Upon Scott followed Byron, superficially the most rebellious and fundamentally the most conventional of the whole group; the most conventional, because he did not distinguish between poetry and rhetoric, and the great bulk of his verse is rhymed rhetoric, according therein with the eighteenth-century convention. But he too was insistent upon individuality. Two other great poets belong to this galaxy whose main poetical work was accomplished between 1785 and 1825, though three of them survived that date and Wordsworth's life was prolonged until 1850. These two, Shelley and Keats, again emphasise the wide diversity, the individualism which characterised the new era. Keats may be called the high priest of the religion of Beauty, but if any actual historical personage can be named as the archetype, the supreme expression, of all that is meant by the term "Poet," Shelley was that man.



Sir Walter Scott.

[After the painting by Raeburn.]

Poetry was re-born in the revolutionary era, and the nineteenth century learnt to regard it as a matter of course that there should be great poets living in England, regardless of the fact that great poets are not a normal and constant product of any country in the world. But apart from the poetic revival, the most striking literary features of the period were the creation of the Review and the establishment of the Novel as the most influential form of creative literature. The *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly* and *Blackwood* provided new media for criticism, and for the literary treatment of politics. When Sir Walter Scott turned from writing stories in verse to writing novels in prose it might almost be said that the novel stepped into the place which had once been occupied in literature by the drama. The literary aspirant came up to London with a novel in his bag instead of a tragedy in his pocket. For a full half century Scott continued to be acknowledged as the supreme master; others took their places beside him perhaps, but superiority was claimed for none. Later generations

have disputed his claims, but the fact remains that Scott was the master who taught the rest of the world the novelist's craft. George Stephenson's "Rocket" would not have travelled from London to Edinburgh at a speed of seventy miles in an hour, but as George Stephenson was the father of the modern locomotive, Walter Scott was the father of the modern novel.

BOOK VII

THE MODERN BRITISH EMPIRE

CHAPTER XXXIV

THE REFORMED PARLIAMENT

I

AFTER REFORM

THE more flagrant anomalies of the old Parliamentary system were destroyed by the great Reform Bill in response to a strong national demand. The effect was to put an end to the immense preponderance of political influence hitherto possessed by the landowners and to transfer the balance of power to the manufacturing and trading classes. The working man was still excluded from the franchise, and property, after its first extreme alarm, again began to breathe freely. The concession to the middle classes had in fact set up a new barrier against a wider democratic movement, and although the working classes were angry and dissatisfied, the middle classes in the main held the government of the country in their own hands for six-and-thirty years, during which the old party titles of Whig and Tory were generally displaced by the new labels of Liberal and Conservative.

During most of those years Liberals were in office, and the foreign policy of the Government was controlled by Lord Palmerston, an Irish peer who sat in the House of Commons as the representative of an English constituency. Palmerston stood for the Canning tradition and the Canning interpretation of non-intervention in the affairs of the European States; an interpretation which claimed for Britain the right of intervening to prevent intervention by others, and by no means permitted the voice of Britain to be ignored in the councils of Europe, though she was only once involved in a European war as a consequence. Palmerston also established the second tradition of Victorian foreign policy—of regarding Russian aggression as the great danger to be guarded against, with its corollary of preserving the integrity of the Turkish dominion.

One problem eternally vexed the souls of British statesmen, the problem of persistent discontent and disorder in Ireland, which broke up

more than one ministry and seemed no nearer settlement at the end of the period than at its beginning. A second problem, however, was to be so thoroughly settled that for half a century it practically disappeared from the field of political discussion. This was the question of Free Trade, which may be called the principle of *laissez faire* as applied to commerce. But in those questions which presented themselves as social there was no essential dividing line between parties; although the stronger hold which the *laissez faire* doctrine had taken upon Liberals than upon Conservatives, upon the manufacturing than upon the landed interests, made the latter rather than the former advocates of state intervention.

The general election which followed the Reform Bill brought back to Westminster a Parliament with a considerable Liberal majority. Lord Grey remained at the head of the ministry until the midsummer of 1834, when he and some of his colleagues resigned in connection with the Irish question, and a reconstructed Liberal ministry was led for some months by Lord Melbourne. That ministry was terminated by the last exercise of the king's right to dismiss ministers on his own responsibility. Peel took office, but a general election still gave the Opposition a Parliamentary majority; Peel resigned in April. Melbourne returned to office, and remained at the head of the Government, except for a brief *interregnum* during 1839, until 1841. In that year he was displaced by a Conservative administration under Sir Robert Peel, who at the end of 1845 broke up his party by proposing the repeal of the Corn Law, which was carried in the following year. Peel resigned, his Government having been defeated on an Irish question, and the Liberals, by whose aid the Corn Bill had been carried, returned to power under the leadership of Lord John Russell. Practically, therefore, during the twenty years which followed the Reform Bill Liberals were in office except during the five years of Peel's administration, and the most prominent feature of that administration was the gradual adoption by the Premier of a policy to which the bulk of his own party was opposed while its principles were in favour with the Liberals.

In the fifth year of the reformed Parliament there occurred an event of primary importance in the development of the British constitutional system. William IV. died, and was succeeded on the throne by a girl of eighteen. William had played his own part, it may be said, successfully, without attempting to exercise questionable constitutional influence, however strong his personal feelings might be. He was indubitably within his constitutional rights in his effort to avoid a creation of peers and in his dismissal of Melbourne's ministry; but it was a very grave question whether his successor would follow his example. Failing the young princess, the next heir to the throne was the Duke of Cumberland, notoriously a reactionary of a dangerous type, whose accession might have led to a repetition of 1688. But the young princess who succeeded to the throne had been trained to a very high sense of duty; she became at once the

political pupil of Lord Melbourne, who taught her the ideals of a constitutional monarch, and she was happy in marrying a German prince whose sense of duty was as high as her own, and who proved himself capable of learning to grasp constitutional conceptions remote enough from those known to any German court. A sentiment of chivalrous kindness toward a young girl placed in a very difficult position revived the latent loyalty of her people, which was fostered and developed by her own admirable character and conduct. And this girl was destined to reign for sixty-four years, during which the principles of British constitutionalism became too firmly established to be easily shaken whether by revolutionists or by reactionaries.

Another point, however, must be noted in connection with the accession of the queen to the throne. In Hanover, which, after 1815, had been erected into a kingdom instead of an electorate, there was a male succession, and the crown of Hanover on William's death passed not to the new queen but to the dead king's brother, the Duke of Cumberland. So ended the political link between Britain and Hanover, and British interests were no longer involved in essentially German problems as they had inevitably been during the period of the Union.

II

GREY AND MELBOURNE

Apart from Ireland Lord Grey's ministry found itself faced with the need for a considerable amount of legislation. The charter of the East India Company required renewal and modification; in 1833 the company was allowed to retain its political position, but was at last deprived of the old trading monopoly which it had hitherto retained as concerned China. But the great questions of which Parliament undertook the handling were of the social and humanitarian type. Grey's Government carried the Act for the Abolition of Slavery and what is commonly called the First Factory Act; and it introduced the Poor Law Amendment Act, which was carried by Melbourne's ministry after Grey's own retirement.

Of the first two measures it may be said that the public conscience recognised their necessity, though it made no very clamorous demand for them. As to the third, Poor Law Reform, every one knew that it was needed, but it was one of those subjects which no Government could take up without the certainty of diminishing its own popularity. The Reformed Parliament did not always take the course which appeared best after the event, but it was eminently conscientious and faced its problems with a sincere desire to achieve what was best for the public good.

The question of slavery was one which had long agitated the minds of Englishmen. In the last century it had been laid down by Lord Mansfield

that no one on the soil of these islands was a slave. By long and determined battling Wilberforce and his associates had at last driven home to the public conscience the iniquities of the slave trade and procured its prohibition. Great Britain had honourably distinguished itself by the zeal with which in 1815 it had urged the rest of the European Powers to follow its example. But the abolition of the slave trade did not carry with it the abolition of slavery; in the West Indies and in South Africa black slaves were extensively employed in the plantations and farms. Nearly all the hard labour was slave labour, and the slaves were valuable property. It was impossible to abolish slavery, an institution sanctioned by the state for two hundred years, without compensating the slave-owners. Nor could so vast a disorganisation of the existing system of labour be carried through at a blow without disastrous results. There were absolutely no interests served besides those of the slaves themselves by abolition, except on the theory that free labour for wages would in the long run turn out more economical than forced, a doctrine which did not readily appeal to those who owned the slaves and would have to pay the wages. Nevertheless, British public opinion completely endorsed the Act, which set a term to the time during which service was to remain compulsory, declared that there was thenceforth no property in the persons of slaves, and provided out of British pockets twenty millions sterling to compensate the owners, the largest sum that has ever been raised for a purely humanitarian object without any possibility of a financial return. Huge as the sum was, it by no means satisfied the slave-owners, especially among the Dutch in South Africa, who set an immensely higher value upon their slaves as property than the sum allotted to them by the British Government.

The demand for a Factory Act was also purely humanitarian in origin, and was viewed with extreme disfavour by many manufacturers and many also of the workmen. The development of factories during the last fifty years, accompanied by the Poor Law System, had brought about an immense amount of employment of children almost from the moment when they could walk and talk. In the depressed condition of labour the working-class parents saw only that the children brought grist to the family mill; they did not see that the cheap child labour diminished the employment and the wages of adults, besides utterly ruining the health, mental and moral as well as physical, of the children. And if the parents of working-class children were callous, so also were the administrators of the Poor Law who were responsible for the workhouse waifs. As a rule the main desire of the parish was to get the children off its hands, and to be free of the expense of maintaining them at the earliest possible moment.

Almost fifty years before, the Manchester magistrates and the Manchester doctors were already awake to the evils for which the factory system was even at that early stage beginning to be responsible. But their powers enabled them to do nothing more than to interfere with apprenticeship in the old standing trades scheduled in the old Statute of Apprentices, which in

effect hardly touched the factories. At the same time the Manchester Committees gave full credit to the many cotton mills whose proprietors were careful to observe regulations of their own for preserving the health of the children in their employment. It may here be remarked that Robert Owen in his mills at New Lanark worked on the most enlightened principles, paying good wages and providing for the education of the workmen's children without putting them to any employment.

As early as 1802 Sir Robert Peel the elder, the father of the famous statesman, had procured an Act which to a very slight extent improved the working conditions for apprentices in cotton and woollen factories. Some further infinitesimal restrictions were imposed in 1819 and 1825, but the manufacturers in general were already up in arms against breaches of the doctrine of *laissez faire*, and interference with them in the management of their own business. Still there were other manufacturers who were philanthropically anxious to procure better conditions for the children, but could not venture to go far on their own account, fearing that they would be too seriously handicapped in the competition with their less scrupulous neighbours. State regulation which imposed the same conditions on all would secure them against that handicap, and would insist upon no restrictions which they themselves would regard as objectionable.

The more vigorous movement was started in 1832 by Michael Sadler, with the proposal that the labour of children should be restricted to ten hours per diem. His place as the champion of philanthropic legislation was taken in the Reformed Parliament by Lord Ashley, better known to posterity by his later title as Lord Shaftesbury. Grey's Government, however, chose to make itself responsible for an official measure—taking the place of Ashley's bill—which not only created regulations and imposed pains and penalties, but appointed government inspectors to see that the law was carried out. The bill, which bears the name of Lord Althorp, forbade in textile factories the employment of children under nine, of children under thirteen for more than nine hours, and of young persons under eighteen for more than twelve hours. It is to be remarked that the employers as a whole did not oppose the Factory Act. There were among them the bad employers, who deliberately desired to exploit the labour of children for their own profit, regardless of the cost to the children. There were those who were possessed with a *doctrinaire* view that all state interference is a check on the natural course of trade, and therefore in



Lord Shaftesbury.
[From the portrait by Millais.]

the end does more harm than good. But in England the passionate devotees of abstract doctrines are rare. The employers themselves originated the proposal for state inspection, because they wanted to be secure that, if regulations were made, they would be enforced upon every one instead of being left to be carried out by the conscientious and ignored by the unscrupulous. There were, indeed, not a few of them who already went as far as the new law demanded, and to them it was entirely satisfactory that their neighbours should be compelled to follow suit.

The third great measure dealt with the amendment of the Poor Law. The Elizabethan Poor Law in effect served its purpose in a fairly satisfactory manner for a century and three-quarters with very little modification; but unemployment and the relief of destitution entered upon a new phase about the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Gilbert's Act was introduced to meet the new conditions, but in its practical application by magistrates it met them by virtually upsetting the principles on which the Poor Law was based. The old law gave relief only to those who were incapable of work, or who, being without employment, entered the workhouse and did the work which was provided for them. But the benevolent magistrates under Gilbert's Act provided relief as well for every able-bodied labourer who was earning an insufficient wage, and thereby unintentionally encouraged the payment of insufficient wages by the agricultural employer, while they destroyed the labourer's incentive to earn higher wages by better work, and encouraged him to enlarge his family without any regard to his own capacity for supporting his children by his own efforts.

The Poor Law Amendment Act, which was passed in 1834 after Lord Grey's resignation, abolished the relief which supplemented wages, and reinstated the workhouse test; that is, it gave relief only to those who entered the workhouse. At the same time it organised the combination of parishes into Unions, which at once made their management more efficient and more economical. It compelled the able-bodied labourer to earn by his own work the maintenance of himself and his family instead of depending upon extraneous relief, and as a consequence it forced the agricultural employer to pay the living wage which the labourer was forced to demand. But at the outset the only apparent benefit was the substantial one of greatly diminished rates. Wages did not immediately adjust themselves to the new conditions, and the labourer starved. The farmer, paying increased though still insufficient wages, did not feel the reduction in the rates as adequate compensation. To the needy the workhouse conditions were deliberately made as unattractive as possible, lest they should offer an inducement to "come on the parish"; and since no one sought relief who could possibly help it, to do so carried with it a stigma which often acted as a preventive precisely in the cases where relief was most needed and most deserved. In the long run the new Poor Law materially improved the position and conditions of the agricultural labourer; but in the beginning, during the process of readjustment, his lot was worsened. The

authors of the Act cast their bread upon the waters, and their immediate reward was of the usual kind in such circumstances.

The Poor Law Amendment Bill had already passed through several stages in Parliament when Lord Grey's ministry was broken up by differences upon Irish questions. The reconstruction was entrusted to Lord Melbourne, with a vain hope on the king's part that he would combine with Peel and Wellington. This project however was impracticable, and the new administration was as definitely Whig or Liberal as the last. King William, on the other hand, was waiting anxiously for an opportunity to bring in the Conservatives. Lord Althorp, who commanded an extraordinary degree of confidence in the House of Commons among all sections of Liberals, was transferred to the House of Lords, when he became Earl Spencer in succession to his father in November.

This event appeared so to weaken the party, or at least the Cabinet, that William felt justified in dismissing the ministry and calling upon Wellington and Peel to form a government. He undoubtedly thought that the country, like himself, wished to be rid of the Liberals, especially in view of the great outcry against the Poor Law Amendment Act and the present sufferings which that Act entailed. The dismissal of the Liberals made an appeal to the constituencies an obvious necessity, since in the Parliament which had begun its sessions in 1833 the Conservatives could not hope to command a majority. Peel announced his principles, of what was called Liberal Conservatism, in the "Tamworth Manifesto." At the general election the Conservatives were returned in considerably larger numbers than before; the curious may observe with some interest that there were two hundred and seventy of them, forming a minority larger perhaps than any other single group, but unable to resist a combination of orthodox Liberals, advanced Radicals, and Irish Repealers—a position singularly like that of the Unionists in 1910. They hoped, however, for support from a considerable number of the Conservative wing of the Liberals, so that for a while they attempted to carry on the government. But when the Liberals struck an unofficial compact with O'Connell, Peel's administration was doomed; and in April 1835 Melbourne returned to power with most of his old colleagues in the Cabinet.

The principal measure for which the new Government was responsible before the death of the old king was the Municipal Reform Act, a natural corollary of the Parliamentary Reform Bill. The old municipal government was in a state of chaos, and the new Act established a uniform system under which the governing body, the Council of the borough, was elected triennially by the rate-payers, and the mayor and aldermen were elected by the Council.

Of the permanent influences brought to bear upon the British constitution with the accession of Queen Victoria in 1837 we have already spoken; in the immediate problems of government it made no difference. The general election which followed very shortly kept the ministry with a

substantial if somewhat uncertain majority; and in the next four years Melbourne did good service to the country by the admirable manner in which he educated the young queen in the duties and responsibilities of her position. But a period of legislative stagnation followed upon the activity of the last four years. Distress and its usual accompaniment, discontent, were painfully prevalent, but no remedies were forthcoming from Parliament, which was satisfied that political reform had gone far enough. Two outside agitations however were now set on foot. The



Queen Victoria in 1837.

[From a painting by W. C. Ross.]

Anti-Corn-Law League fixed upon the high price of corn as the fundamental cause of the general distress, and in 1838 began its active propaganda for the abolition of the corn duties—a propaganda as little agreeable to Melbourne as to Peel and Wellington. But the originators of the League and its most vigorous advocates were of the manufacturer class; and while most of them were actuated by the sincere belief that the working classes would derive immense advantage from the reduction in the price of food, it was easy also to point out that the manufacturers anticipated benefits for themselves, since they would be able to pay a lower money wage when less money would buy more food. Among the working men themselves there were not a few who viewed the agitation with suspicion, believing that its real object was the curtailment of wages. They mistrusted gifts from the class whom they regarded as their natural enemies; moreover, they saw in the movement an insidious attempt to distract their energies from the per-

sistent pursuit of political power which was their own panacea for the depression of the working classes.

Therefore from them arose the second agitation whose objects were formulated in the series of six demands known as the People's Charter, the advocates of which became known in 1839 as Chartists. The demands which appeared so revolutionary in those days scarcely seem alarming now. Abolition of the property qualification for members of Parliament, payment of members, and the ballot were three of the points, all of which have since been conceded. Manhood suffrage is not far removed from the official proposals of the Government in 1912; and the objection to equal electoral districts rests more upon their impracticability than upon abstract conservatism. The sixth demand, for annual Parliaments, is the only one which finds no advocates among responsible politicians who are not looked

upon as extremists. But seventy years ago every one of the six points was regarded as revolutionary—by enthusiastic advocates as a straight road to the millennium, and by respectable but timorous persons at large as a straight road to anarchy. So the Government would have nothing to say either to Chartists or to Anti-Corn-Law Leaguers. The refusal of Parliament in 1839 to receive a huge Chartist petition was followed by several violent outbreaks which were sharply repressed, and the vigour of the agitation died down for the moment.

The Anti-Corn-Law League had little more success than the Chartist movement with the Government, whose financial difficulties nevertheless induced them in 1841 to make another movement in the direction of Free Trade. Disciples of Adam Smith could cite plenty of instances in the past of an increased revenue following upon a diminution of duties upon imported goods, due to the increased demand. The Government now proposed to lower the very heavy tax upon foreign imported sugar, and to establish a fixed duty of eight shillings on foreign corn in place of the existing sliding scale. But the budget was defeated by a substantial majority, and the defeat was followed by a resolution of "no confidence," which was carried by one vote. Parliament was dissolved, and the general election gave a strong majority to the party led in the House of Commons by Sir Robert Peel. Melbourne resigned and Peel became Prime Minister.

In 1839 there had arisen a curious domestic crisis which caused intense excitement at the time. The Government through these years was in a constant minority in the Lords, while its majority in the Commons was sufficiently insecure to warrant the Upper Chamber in an active opposition. After narrowly escaping defeat in the Commons on a colonial question, Lord Melbourne resigned and advised the queen to send for Sir Robert Peel. Peel undertook to construct a ministry; but he pointed out to the young queen that the ladies of the bedchamber who had been selected by Lord Melbourne belonged to the Whig families, and surrounded their mistress with an atmosphere which would prevent her working cordially with a ministry formed from the Conservative party; he therefore made the dismissal of certain of these ladies a condition of his taking office. The queen claimed that the appointment of the ladies was a personal not a political matter, and entirely declined to dismiss them. The question was one which could only arise when a queen occupied the throne. Both the monarch and the statesman stood firm, and consequently Lord Melbourne returned to office, considering that the queen's position was constitutionally sound, and that in the circumstances it would be an act of desertion to refuse her his services. It was very shortly after this event that the queen married her cousin, Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha—one of those unions rare enough in royal families in which both parties were lovers from the beginning and remained lovers to the end of their lives.

Probably the most popular feature of the Melbourne administration was its foreign policy as conducted by Lord Palmerston. That minister

acted very much as if he were an autocrat in whose doings his colleagues had no voice. His audacity might cause nervousness, but at least there was no fear that Britain would be ignored in the councils of Europe. It was from this time that suspicion of Russia and antagonism to her became prominent features of British policy. Like Canning before him, Palmerston was bent on preventing Russia from either acquiring Turkish territory or exercising a predominant influence at Constantinople. More than this, he succeeded in pushing his own country to the front as the champion of the integrity of the Turkish Empire, drawing France and Austria in his train, but keeping the leading position for himself. The notable stroke was effected in 1840. Mehemet Ali, the Pasha of Egypt, was evidently seeking to establish an independent sovereignty over Syria as well as Egypt, and his ambitions probably went considerably further. It was Palmerston's object to make the repression of Mehemet Ali an act of the European Powers in general, not merely of Russia. He succeeded in bringing about a concert of the Powers sufficient for his own purposes, while in effect it enabled him to accomplish the defeat of the Pasha by means mainly of British ships and men without effective participation either by Russia or by France; and Turkey began to learn to look upon Britain as her protector. The anti-Russian policy had also at this time begun to play a serious part in India; but with this as also with important events in the colonies we shall deal separately.

III

PEEL

The ministry formed by Sir Robert Peel in September 1841 was more Liberal in its elements than the Conservative party in Parliament; for the Duke of Wellington, who joined the Cabinet without taking office, was fully alive to the necessity for making concessions which he regarded as being in themselves undesirable. Lord Stanley and Sir James Graham had both been in the past associated with Melbourne. A minor office was found for Gladstone, a young man for whom a brilliant future was anticipated; but Benjamin Disraeli, in spite of the remarkable talents which he had already displayed, was too little trusted, consequently he nursed a grudge against Peel for refusing him the advancement to which he considered himself entitled. The bedchamber question, it should be remarked, was not revived. By the advice of Lord Melbourne the queen had already deprived her household of its partisan aspect by admitting some Opposition ladies, and it was not possible to assert the claim that ladies should be changed with changing ministries.

Peel had obtained a majority in the country not so much on the ground of positive objections to the Government policy as because ministers

had recently given a general impression of feebleness and incompetence, of endeavouring to face their difficulties by mere makeshifts. When Parliament met at the beginning of 1842 the new ministers had plenty of problems to solve. Chartism was again becoming active, trade was depressed, want was widespread, Ireland was disturbed, rumours of disaster had come from India. The country at least hoped that the financial ability with which Peel was credited would find some solution for the existing problems, so far, at least, as they sprang from economic causes. He was hardly committed to anything more than the maintenance of the principle of the sliding scale, as against the fixed duty on corn proposed by the Liberals. His first budget was, therefore, awaited with no little anxiety.

A very large amount of Peel's support inside and outside the House came from the landed interest, which was extremely averse from any tampering with the Corn Laws, which in their eyes gave too little rather than too much protection to the agricultural body on whose prosperity that of the nation depended. On the other hand, among the manufacturing class especially, the Anti-Corn-Law League had been developing the conviction that the high price of corn was the root cause of the general distress. Peel dealt with the Corn Law by providing a new sliding scale, of which the primary object was to prevent violent fluctuations of price while ensuring a tolerably remunerative minimum. With corn at fifty shillings a quarter or less there was to be a twenty shilling duty on the foreign import. With corn at seventy-five shillings or more there was to be no duty. Between these two points there was to be a graduated reduction of duty as the price rose. A preference was also given, in the form of lower duties, to colonial as against foreign corn. Amendments on the one side in favour of abolishing the duty, and of making it more stringent on the other, were defeated by overwhelming majorities, and the official Liberal amendment in favour of a fixed duty fared not very much better. But there were some who believed that Peel already in the bottom of his heart was a convert to the views of the League, though he was still trying to persuade himself that his convictions were unchanged.

The new sliding scale at any rate shelved the Corn Law question for a time. But the problem of providing public revenue was serious. Year after year the Liberal budgets had ended in deficits, which had not been removed by attempts to enlarge the revenue either by the increase or by the diminution of duties. Some fresh source of taxation must be found or some old source again called into play. In this fateful year Peel revived the Income Tax, which Pitt had introduced for the purpose of the great war, but which had been swept aside, as justified only by war, soon after the peace. Peel himself regarded it now only as an emergency tax which would cease to be necessary when trade revived. He anticipated its disappearance in five years' time. Many Chancellors of the Exchequer have indulged in similar anticipations and all have been doomed to a similar

disappointment. Not till the twentieth century did it come to be recognised in form as well as in fact as a permanent source of revenue, though it has never been remitted since 1842.

One purpose of the income tax was to tide over a period during which the revenue was to suffer immediate loss for the sake of future gain by the reduction of duties on imports. Out of twelve hundred articles on which a duty was at this time levied nearly two-thirds were to have the existing duty reduced; it was expected that after three years the return to the revenue would become greater instead of smaller, but that in the meanwhile the loss would amount to not much less than the receipts from the income tax, which was fixed at 7d. in the pound. The sugar duty was retained unaltered. The Opposition were able to point to the inconsistency of reducing a very large number of taxes for the benefit of the consumer with very little regard to the producer's interest, coupled with the retention of the heavy taxes on corn and sugar, which put money into the pockets of the landed interest, on whose political support the Government depended, and of the wealthy planters whose influence was of great value to them. There was also not a little grumbling on the part of the home producer of goods on which the duties were reduced. Peel, however, was strong enough to override the opposition both of opponents of the Corn Law and of the advocates of higher protective tariffs.

The next budget of importance came three years later in 1845. Meanwhile, apart from Ireland, which was a constant thorn in the side of every government, Chartism and legislation with regard to labour had again compelled attention. In 1842 the second great Chartist petition was presented demanding the "six points" and protesting against what it described as "class legislation." It was evident enough that the petitioners expected by the acquisition of political power, through the six points of the Charter, to be able to subvert the existing order of society in the supposed interests of the working class; and it was this expectation on their part which more than anything else inspired in the dominant classes a dread of any extension of popular power. As before, the House refused to give the petitioners a hearing. The result was that later in the same year there were serious Chartist riots which necessitated the intervention of the military; but the Government measures were effective, and the Chartists themselves became more and more definitely divided into Physical Force men and Moral Force men who relied upon constitutional agitation in preference to the methods of violence.

Althorp's Factory Act had been directed exclusively to the protection of children in textile factories. Now public sentiment was horrified by the report of a commission on the conditions of labour in the coalfields. An appalling state of things was revealed, in which large numbers of women were engaged in hard underground labour for which they were totally unfitted, and which could not but be ruinous not only to their own health, but to the physique of the next generation. No less intolerable was the

very extensive employment of quite young children in similar occupations, which to the present generation would be simply inconceivable. So intense was the public feeling aroused that, when Lord Ashley introduced his Collieries Bill to exclude all females and all boys under thirteen from underground work, it was carried in the House of Commons without a division.

The Act for the first time brought women as well as children within the scope of legislation. Arguments for the protection of children, it was seen, applied in principle to the protection of women. They were not free agents, and could make no terms for themselves. The question of their treatment affected not only themselves but that of the physical and mental degeneration of the race. Accordingly, after two abortive attempts a new amending Factory Act was passed in 1844, which reduced the working hours of children to half-time in a day of fifteen hours in factories, and restricted to twelve the working hours of women as well as of young persons.



Sir Robert Peel moving the repeal of the Corn Laws, January 1846.

[From a sketch made in the House of Commons.]

The budget of 1845 showed a marked advance in the direction of Free Trade, of which there had been some warning in the previous year. Export duties were to be abolished, as well as duties on the import of four hundred and thirty articles of raw material. The very considerable gain to the manufacturing interest did not make the budget satisfactory to the high Protectionists, and Disraeli denounced the Government as an "organised hypocrisy"; but the support which Peel lost from his own party he recovered from members of the Opposition, and the budget was carried by large majorities. At the same time a breach between the minister and many of his Conservative followers was widened by his Irish policy; and Ireland was now to be the decisive factor first in determining his complete conversion to the doctrines of the Anti-Corn-Law League and then in putting an end to his administration.

A tremendous visitation of the potato blight entirely ruined the potato crop in Ireland, and brought not merely destitution but starvation in its train. In November Peel proposed to his Cabinet the suspension, which every one knew must mean the abolition, of the duties on imported corn, since the provision of cheap food had become an absolute necessity. At

first only three of his colleagues supported his views ; by the end of the month Wellington and some other members of the Cabinet were prepared to side with Peel ; and in the meanwhile Lord John Russell, who was now the recognised leader of the Opposition, publicly announced his own conversion, and his advocacy of the total abolition of the Corn Laws in preference to the fixed duty to which his party had hitherto clung.

But a section of the Cabinet was obdurate. Peel in the circumstances hesitated to introduce a measure which involved an entire reversal of the principles he had maintained when he took office. The thing should be done by the Opposition, though with the support of himself and his followers. He resigned, but Russell failed to form a ministry. Peel resumed office with a Free Trade programme and with an opposition to that programme which was now confined to the extreme Protectionists, led nominally by Lord George Bentinck but in fact by Benjamin Disraeli. The duties on very nearly all raw materials were to be abolished, as well as on sundry articles of manufacture. On many others they were to be largely reduced. The corn duties were to disappear in three years' time except for a fixed registration charge of one shilling. In the interval, to soften the blow to the agricultural interest, there was to be a low sliding scale ranging from ten shillings when wheat was at forty-eight shillings a quarter or less to four shillings when it was at fifty-four shillings or more. In May the Corn Bill passed its third reading in the House of Commons ; the Lords followed the lead of the Duke of Wellington and passed the third reading on June 25th.

But on the same day a Coercion Bill for Ireland was defeated in the House of Commons by a combination of Liberals who were opposed to the bill in principle and Protectionists who had clamoured for it but were determined to wreck the administration. They succeeded. But the Corn Bill received the royal assent ; Peel's task was done ; he resigned, and Lord John Russell accepted the task of forming a ministry.

IV

AFTER PEEL

Lord John Russell's ministry was not fruitful of legislation. The Liberals were in a minority in the House of Commons and were in effect dependent upon the support of the Peelites, the members of the Conservative party who had followed their chief in becoming Free Traders. A general election during 1847 strengthened the party, but still left it without an actual majority. At the outset the domestic interests were absorbed by Ireland, where the potato blight reappeared with even increased virulence ; and the Government was very much hampered first by its efforts to provide

relief and then by the disturbances which followed upon the extreme distress.

The most notable legislative measure for England was the Factory Act which bears the name of Fielden, the outcome of the dissatisfaction left behind by the Factory Act of the last ministry. Its leading feature was the introduction of what was called the ten hours' day. The meaning of this was that the legal day as opposed to the night became the period of twelve hours from 6 A.M. to 6 P.M. Only between those hours therefore was the employment of women and young persons permitted, night work being prohibited. As it was required that two hours should be allowed for meal times, their actual working day became one of ten hours. In form, it was no part of the purpose of legislation to control the hours of adult male labour; but the practical effect was that the men's hours had to be adapted to the altered arrangements for women, and in effect the Act secured a ten hours' day for men. There was much vehement opposition at the time, accompanied by elaborate demonstrations that if the hours of work were reduced profits would vanish.



Lord John Russell.
[From the drawing by Maclise.]

The event proved that the demonstrations were fallacious, because it was very soon found that with the shorter hours the work was more efficient and the output of the ten hours was worth at least as much as the output of the longer period.

In 1848 the unrest of peoples and nationalities on the European Continent broke out in a series of revolutions or insurrections, initiated by the deposition of Louis Philippe in France and the proclamation of a republic in that country. In Germany the risings were popular, in Italy and throughout the heterogeneous Austrian Empire they were nationalist. But in these islands there was only a very mild reflex of the disturbances which agitated Europe—a singularly futile insurrection in Ireland and in England an equally futile demonstration on the part of the Chartists, which proved to be the death-blow of the movement.

Inspired by the bloodless but effective revolution in France, the more extreme among the Chartist leaders started a clamorous agitation throughout the country. Violent speeches were made, with some talk of the establishment of a republic. A monster meeting was to be held at Kennington Common on April 10th, when a monster procession was to carry a monster petition to the House of Commons. The alarm in London was extreme, but prompt measures were taken to establish security. A huge number of

special constables were enrolled, among whom was included the French exile Louis Napoleon, the nephew of the great Emperor. Under the direction of the Duke of Wellington London was thoroughly but not too ostentatiously prepared to deal with a desperate insurrection. The Chartist leaders were warned that their procession would not be permitted to pass the Thames. The monster meeting mustered only some thirty thousand, the leaders took to heart the polite but emphatic warnings they received, the procession did not march into London, and the petition was conveyed



The Monster Chartist Meeting on Kennington Common, April 10, 1848.

[From a print in the "Illustrated London News" of 1848 made after a daguerrotype.]

to the House in a cab. Inspection proved that an enormous proportion of the two million signatures were fictitious, and the terrifying spectre of Chartism as a revolutionary movement collapsed amid derision into utter insignificance.

The only other domestic event of political importance which needs to be recorded here was the death of Sir Robert Peel in 1850. His career had been unique, though that of his disciple Gladstone offers some resemblances. Born a Tory, a ministerialist in the days when the reaction was predominant, he passed his whole political life in gradually shedding his original political assumptions and adopting views to which he had once been antagonistic. Every definite measure with which his name is associ-

ated was one which had been advocated by his opponents ; to nearly every one he had himself long offered convinced opposition, from Catholic Emancipation to the abolition of the Corn Law. Each of those measures he carried when at the head or almost at the head of a Government representing a party which only accepted them with extreme reluctance ; but in every case he acted upon the clear conviction that the measure, whether popular or not, had become a necessity of state. Few men have the courage openly to declare themselves converts to views of which they have been open and prominent opponents. That rare courage Peel possessed ; and though in his own day it subjected him to sneers and jibes, to bitter criticism, and to the vitriolic denunciations of Disraeli, the master of bitter speech, in the hour of his death there was none who doubted that he had acted throughout with absolute sincerity of conviction, with a majestic disregard of his own interest and his own popularity, and with a single eye to the public good.

The Russell Government survived for eighteen months after Peel's death. Its end was hastened by the compulsory retirement of Lord Palmerston from the Foreign Office, where his autocratic disregard of the right of his sovereign and his colleagues to information and consultation on high matters of policy at last became intolerable both to the colleagues and to the sovereign. He got his revenge—"Tit for tat with Johnny Russell," as he said—a couple of months later by helping the Opposition to defeat the Government on a bill for constituting a militia. Lord Derby, formerly known in the House of Commons as Lord Stanley, accepted office as leader of the Conservative party, with Disraeli as his Chancellor of the Exchequer and leader in the House of Commons ; though the old Conservatives were still very far from trusting the man whom most of them regarded as an adventurer, though one who had rendered great services to the party and was conspicuously, beyond all comparison, its cleverest member.

The independence of Lord Palmerston at the Foreign Office, even in the last Liberal administration, had been a constant source of friction in the Cabinets. While always maintaining the Canningite position that each European state should be left to settle its own domestic affairs without the application of compulsion by other states, he had no compunction about tendering unmasked advice which often aroused irritation in foreign chancelleries. But if his activities seemed meddlesome and, on some occasions, dangerous, his buoyant assumption that Great Britain was entitled to express her own opinions with entire freedom and was quite capable of backing them by force of arms if she thought fit to do so was not unpopular. His self-assertiveness was the cause of Russell's failure to form a Liberal government at the end of 1845, since Lord Grey refused to join the Cabinet if Palmerston went to the Foreign Office. In 1846, however, Lord Grey withdrew his objection. The European convulsion of 1848 again gave Palmerston scope for his activities ; the sympathies of Britain with

the popular and nationalist movements were vigorously expressed, though without much actual influence on the course of events; and England became an asylum for many refugees from despotic governments and for revolutionary propagandists, while the monarchical governments were extremely indignant, because in their eyes Palmerston was fostering anarchy and revolution in their dominions.

In 1849 he was hotly attacked in Parliament both by the non-interventionists, who protested against his meddling policy, and by the Radical sympathisers with the revolutionary movements, who were of opinion that British intervention ought to have been carried much further. Palmerston, however, successfully vindicated his position on the ground that on the one hand it was the imperative duty of Britain to express her opinions emphatically and forcibly, but that on the other hand it was not her business to embark on hostilities in order to give those opinions effect. The attack, however, was renewed when Palmerston sent a British fleet to the Piræus to coerce the Greek government in connection with what was known as the Don Pacifico incident. The house of Don Pacifico, a British subject resident in Greece, had been sacked by a mob; there were other claims of British subjects against the Greek government which it persistently ignored. There was an unfortunate misunderstanding with France, which had endeavoured to mediate. Again Palmerston was attacked for the high-handed methods which he had adopted. Nevertheless, he again vindicated himself in a speech which won the warm admiration even of those who, like Sir Robert Peel, disapproved of his action. It was not his policy but his personal independence which caused his dismissal.

Shortly after the great debate just referred to, Lord Palmerston's interference on his own responsibility in the extremely complicated German question of Schleswig-Holstein, on lines which were by no means pleasing either to her Majesty or to the Prince Consort, caused the queen to send a memorandum to the Prime Minister protesting against the Foreign Secretary's arbitrary methods, and requiring that he should give distinct information to her as to his proposed action in any given case, and that when that action had been sanctioned it should not be modified without her knowledge. Palmerston formally accepted the rebuke, but made little alteration in his practice; and before the end of 1851 he sent despatches and instructions in connection with the *coup d'état* by which Louis Napoleon had just seized the supreme power in France, without informing either the queen or his colleagues. It was this which caused the queen and Lord John Russell to insist upon his resignation.

The newly formed ministry of Lord Derby held office only on sufferance; the Peelites refused to join them as they had refused to join the Liberals; and it was only by conciliating Peelites and moderate Liberals that the Government could remain in being. There was therefore no possibility of a return to Protection. The situation was not effectively changed by a slight increase in the numbers of the party at a general

election ; and although Disraeli pledged himself to the maintenance of Free Trade, the Government was defeated on its financial proposals. Lord Derby resigned, and a coalition was formed between the Liberals and the Peelites, with the Peelite Lord Aberdeen as the head of the ministry, in the last week of 1851.

A few weeks before, the old Duke of Wellington had passed away. A strong man whom his soldiers had trusted utterly but never loved, a statesman who might have been a great emperor but was wholly unfitted for party politics, a public servant who set his duty to the Crown and to the state above all other considerations, the Duke was in the ordinary sense of the term a political failure ; but his failure was more honourable than most other men's success. In his later years he won a popular esteem and even affection which had been denied him in his day of triumph. In the hour of his death all men of all parties united to honour and to mourn for the Great Duke as they had honoured and mourned for no other since the death of Chatham.

V

IRELAND

The long-deferred measure of Catholic Emancipation, while it remedied a very serious grievance, failed to bring peace to Ireland or adequately to solve the religious problem in that country. The preservation of the established Anglican Church had been an express part of the Treaty of Union, but the maintenance of the Church depended upon tithes which were paid by the occupants of the soil of whom the vast majority were Roman Catholics. To them, therefore, at least, it appeared a monstrous injustice that they should be compelled to contribute to the support of a Church to which they did not belong, while the Church to which they did belong was unsupported. Daniel O'Connell, the "Liberator," had as a very young man begun his public career as an opponent of the Union ; and when Catholic Emancipation had been won, mainly it might be said by the skill with which he had conducted the agitation in its favour, it was not long before he placed the Repeal of the Union in the forefront of his demands for Ireland.

But Repeal was forced into the background again by the much more acute agitation which developed into what was called the tithe war, the resistance of the peasantry to the payment of the obnoxious burden. That resistance, which in itself was obviously and manifestly justified in the eyes of one political school, had in the eyes of another "no semblance of justification in law or reason," and it was accompanied by all the familiar forms of outrage and violence, the persistent refusal of witnesses to give evidence, and the persistent refusal of juries to convict upon any evidence.

Lord Grey's Government, fronted by the usual dilemma, introduced one of those vigorous repressive measures which came to be known as Coercion Bills, which was successful enough in its immediate effect; but it was followed by the remedial proposals for the commutation of tithe into a charge not upon the occupants of the soil but upon the landowners, a redistribution of the funds appropriated to the Irish Church, and the appropriation of the surplus to educational purposes irrespective of creed. This proposal, in conjunction with that for the renewal of the Coercion Act, broke up the Grey Cabinet, and led to the formation of the first Melbourne ministry, which was in its turn displaced after a brief interval by that of Peel and Wellington.

Peel introduced a bill for the commutation of tithes, but the bill was defeated because it rejected the principle of appropriation. The Melbourne ministry returned to power, but its appropriation clause was rejected by the House of Lords; so in 1838 the Liberals accepted the situation and passed the bill for simple commutation. When the tax was no longer exacted from the tenants themselves but from the landlords it ceased to be felt as a pressing grievance.

The return of Melbourne was accompanied by that compact or understanding with O'Connell which was fiercely denounced by the Opposition, but had at least for the time being an undeniably pacificatory effect. The Liberator suspended his demand for repeal. Nevertheless the third or agrarian grievance, the antagonism between landlords and tenants, again rose into painful prominence. On the one side many landlords, often with excellent excuse from the economic point of view, evicted large numbers of tenants in order to put in their places more efficient and more satisfactory cultivators; on the other hand, the tenants resisted the payment of rent and subjected both the landlords and the new tenants to all manner of outrages. The indignation of the landlords was increased by the Under-Secretary, Thomas Drummond. Drummond, a vigorous administrator, was convinced of the necessity for a strong central control, and reorganised the magistracy and the police on lines which greatly strengthened the Castle government and did much for the preservation of law and order; but he was antagonistic to the landlords as a class, and his pronouncement that property had "rights as well as duties" at a moment when the popular turbulence had reached a very high pitch was regarded by them at least as an incentive to violence and disorder.

The Melbourne ministry sought to apply in Ireland principles analogous to those of the amended Poor Law in England and the English Municipal Government Act. But with its fall and the return to power of Sir Robert Peel at the end of 1841 the truce between the Irish leader and the imperial government came to an end. The demand for Repeal was immediately revived; and from this time forward it never ceased in one form or another to be pressed by popular leaders in Ireland as a necessary condition without which it was vain to hope that any policy of alternate or combined

coercion and conciliation could produce peace in that island. Unlike the demands arising directly from the religious and the agrarian questions, it found no sympathy either in England, or Scotland; and the fact that all other Irish demands were associated with it unfortunately tended to counteract much of the sympathy which they might otherwise have attracted.

At the outset the Repeal movement seemed languid; but O'Connell brought into play all his influence and all his great powers of organisation. The Irish priesthood rallied to him, a fervid group of younger men who became known as "Young Ireland" joined him, and the agitation was developed on lines which appeared to be exceedingly threatening, though O'Connell himself was, as always, persistent in the repudiation of any appeal to violence. Threats of coercive measures were met by the repeated assembly of huge meetings, and the agitation was accompanied by an increase of crimes and outrages. At last O'Connell and others were arrested, tried, and condemned to long terms of imprisonment on a charge of conspiracy. But the verdict was quashed by the House of Peers on the ground that Catholics had been improperly excluded from the jury panel.

O'Connell was set at liberty, but for whatever reason assumed a less aggressive attitude and lost that control which he had so long exercised in Ireland, and which now passed to the members of the Young Ireland group, who were very much more inclined to extreme and unconstitutional methods than their former leader. Peel, on the other hand, always ready to be impressed by demonstrations of popular feeling, evidently began to doubt the soundness of the position to which he had hitherto clung—to believe that there was more justification than he had supposed for the demand for remedial measures. The Devon Commission was appointed to investigate the land question. Just before the first potato famine in 1845 its report was issued, and revealed the extraordinarily unsatisfactory relations between landlords and tenants involved by the existing system. The peasant clung to the soil partly from sentimental reasons and partly because if he left his holding he had nowhere else to go. In order to stay he would agree to any terms, though he was by no means equally willing to keep to them. Consequently an immense proportion of the land was rack-rented far above its proper value. A vast quantity of the land was owned by absentee landlords



Daniel O'Connell.
[From the painting by T. Garrick.]

whose agents were concerned simply to get the best return they could for the landlord. In other and worse cases the effective proprietor was a mortgagee, more determined even than the landlord's agent to extort the uttermost farthing from the tenant. If the tenant improved his holding at his own expense he got no compensation, but was called upon to pay a higher rent, because a higher rent would be obtainable from another tenant on account of the improvements which he had made. Tenants were fast in the toils of money-lenders, and many of the landlords were hopelessly sunk in debt. There were many landlords who dealt justly enough with their tenants, many more who would have been willing to do so but for their own debts; but the law gave no protection to the tenants. Consequently the tenants took the law into their own hands and enrolled themselves in the secret societies, which enforced their own code with a severity more relentless than that of the law itself.

The report of the Devon Commission bore no fruit; for although a tentative measure was introduced in the House of Lords to deal with the problems which it had exposed, the bill was shelved. Legislative interference with the relations between landlord and tenant was objectionable in England to the landed interest, and was opposed to the *laissez faire* doctrines of commerce which were on the verge of achieving their triumph. Nothing therefore was done. At the same time Peel introduced measures which were intended to pacify religious hostilities, but actually had the opposite effect. A large grant was made to the College of the Maynooth, where candidates for the Catholic priesthood were trained; Protestants in England and Ireland denounced the endowment of Roman Catholicism. A number of colleges were set up on non-sectarian principles; Catholics joined Protestants in denouncing the "Godless colleges."

Then came the potato famine, with the misery, destitution, and starvation which followed in its train. Starving men do not stop to reason, and crime as well as famine stalked through the country. Peel strove to relieve the destitution, even while the extreme advocates of *laissez faire* proclaimed the vanity and the folly of interfering with the law of demand and supply; but at the same time he proceeded to introduce another Coercion Bill for the preservation of order, to the indignation of the advanced Liberals. With them the Protectionists united, bent on vengeance for the Corn Bill, and on the day when the Lords passed the Repeal of the Corn Law the Commons threw out the Government Coercion Bill. Peel resigned and Russell took office.

But for the second time the potato plague smote the land even more cruelly than before. The Government made immense efforts to meet the calamity. It started relief works, in themselves for the most part of no permanent utility. Private sympathy and charity came to its aid, and much was undeniably done to reduce the appalling effects of the catastrophe. But the rigid free-traders of those days recognised no difference between a working policy and an emergency policy; there was no relaxa-

tion of the principle that the supply of food must be left to the ordinary operations of trade, and the ordinary operations of trade did not reach the remotest and poorest districts. Relief, too, was granted only under extremely stringent conditions, and numbers of tenants were practically obliged to surrender their holdings in order to qualify for obtaining it. Crowds of emigrants flocked out of the country, and the census of 1851 showed that the population of Ireland had been reduced by not less than two millions. And if many of the Irish landlords behaved, as undoubtedly they did, with a splendid generosity, there were others who used the law mercilessly to effect on their estates clearances which they hoped would enable them to plant the soil with a more efficient tenantry and to turn their land to a more profitable account. The actual effect was that both agrarian antagonisms between tenants and landlords and national antagonisms between Irish and English were embittered and intensified. Outrages multiplied again, and in 1848 desperation produced a futile insurrection headed by Smith O'Brien. It was suppressed without difficulty, but increased the general soreness, which also inevitably resulted from the inevitable Coercion Bill. Nor did the Government attempt to meet the problem by treating the system of land tenure as the root of the evil; it contented itself instead with passing the Encumbered Estates Act, which removed indeed a large number of the poverty-stricken landlords whose existence as landlords made improvement impossible, but at the same time left their places to be taken by a new class of landlords generally disposed to treat their estates on strict commercial principles, with no inclination to sympathise with the tenantry or to recognise any rights not secured to them by the law.

VI

THE COLONIES AND AMERICA

The early years of Queen Victoria's reign form a very definite epoch in the history of British colonial development. In effect during those years the more important colonies all acquired an advanced degree of autonomy. Some of them in 1833 were possessed of legislative assemblies, but even in the most advanced of them those assemblies were in part nominated, and in every case the executive government was responsible to the governor and to the Crown, not to the legislature. That is to say, the administrative offices were all held at the Crown's nomination and did not change hands with the changes of party predominance in the Chambers. The situation, in fact, was very much like that in England before the system of party government came into full play. In the course of the next twenty years all the leading colonies had acquired elective legislative assemblies, and in nearly all of them ministries were practically constructed in accordance with the party majority in the legislature.

The change began with Canada, where discontent was already becoming rife before the Reform Bill was passed in England. Both in Upper and in Lower Canada the cause of discontent lay largely in the fact that the administrative offices had become the virtual monopoly of a few families. In Lower Canada the trouble was intensified because these predominant families were British, whereas the mass of the population was of French blood, French in its ideas, traditions, and language. The development of the great republic on the south fostered advanced political ideas. Both in Upper and Lower Canada the elected legislative assembly raised an insistent demand for increased control over administration, and claimed that the



Map of the Dominion of Canada

Second Chamber also should be an elected instead of a nominated body, a change which in Lower Canada would have ensured an overwhelming French preponderance. In 1837 the troubles culminated in an armed revolt in Lower Canada known as Papineau's Rebellion, from the politician who was its recognised leader. Even advanced Canadian opinion did not in fact approve of such extreme action; the revolt was suppressed without difficulty, and a corresponding attempt at insurrection in the Upper Province scarcely made head at all. The home government adopted an unprecedented course. It suspended the constitution of the Canadas, and despatched a commission, invested with the supreme control, to investigate the whole question of Canadian discontent, and to conduct the government pending the results of the enquiry.

The Governor-in-Chief and High Commissioner was Lord Durham; but at the instance of the Opposition restrictions were placed upon the absolute powers with which it was originally intended to invest him. He was a man of strong and independent personality, very self-confident and somewhat arrogant, a difficult colleague who made many enemies, holding views which in England were regarded as dangerously advanced, but endowed with keen penetration. On his arrival in Canada he was faced with the difficulty of dealing with the political prisoners. In existing circumstances it would have been impossible that their trial in the ordinary course should have satisfactory results. Therefore, on his own responsibility he issued an ordinance banishing those of the rebels who had fled over the frontier, while those who were in his hands were deported to the Bermudas. Members of both groups were forbidden to return to Canada upon pain of death until permission should be granted. With the way thus cleared he proceeded, with the aid of his council, to investigate the whole situation and to prepare a report upon it for the home government. In his banishment ordinance however he had exceeded his powers; a hot attack was opened upon him in England; and the Melbourne Government, with a small and precarious majority in the Commons and a hostile majority in the Lords, gave way. Lord Durham was recalled, and the governorship was placed in the hands of Sir John Colborne. Durham, on his departure, issued a very injudicious proclamation, which was virtually an attack upon the Government which had deserted him. Canadian opinion was strongly on the side of the man whose sympathetic grasp of the situation in Canada had been made evident; nevertheless Durham had ruined his own career, and died shortly afterwards.

Colborne conducted the administration with ability and firmness. A fresh attempt at insurrection was promptly suppressed, and raids from the United States were sharply dealt with. Durham had sealed his own political fate, but he had done his work for Canada. A bill providing a new constitution for the colony was introduced and passed in 1840, and this Canadian Act of Reunion adopted his report almost in its entirety. He had seen that the prime necessity was the establishment of a national Canadian sentiment in the place of the existing local and racial sentiment. The two Canadas were united under a single legislature, and endowed with practically complete powers of self-government, while local government was put in the hands of local elective bodies. The Second Chamber, though enlarged, still consisted of nominees, and the executive government was still in form responsible to the Crown and not to the legislature. Nevertheless, before long the powers of the legislature predominated, and except in matters of imperial concern Canada had in a few years become a completely self-governing state with "responsible" government. The same course was followed in the maritime provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

In Jamaica also at the beginning of the queen's reign serious difficulties

arose mainly as a consequence of the Act for the Emancipation of Slaves. The arrangement establishing the system of what was called apprenticeship for a term of years, in order to allow a gradual adjustment to the conditions of complete emancipation, carried with it serious temporary evils; for the slave-owner, whose slaves were valuable property, had a direct inducement to take some care of the lives and health of his chattels, but there was no such inducement in the case of "apprentices" who were not marketable property. The planter class who monopolised political power were induced by pressure from England reluctantly to proceed to



Australia and Tasmania.

immediate emancipation; but the consequence was immediate and violent friction between them and the newly emancipated blacks. The result again was that the Melbourne ministry proposed to suspend the Jamaica constitution for five years. The opposition encountered led to Melbourne's resignation and the temporary *interregnum* marked by the bedchamber incident. When Melbourne returned to office, a new Jamaica Bill left the assembly the opportunity of avoiding a suspension of the constitution, and by the judicious management of Lord Metcalfe, who was sent out as governor, the crisis was tided over.

Turning now to the most remote quarter of the globe, we find the Australasian colonies steadily expanding. The year 1834 saw the begin-



GREAT COLLINS STREET, MELBOURNE, IN 1857

From a view published in 1857.




GREAT COLLINS STREET, MELBOURNE, IN 1912

From a photograph.

nings of the colony which afterwards was named Victoria, and its capital, Melbourne, was founded in 1837. As yet it was an offshoot of New South Wales and was administered by officials under the New South Wales government. South Australia was colonised from England in 1834; its capital, Adelaide, took its name from William's queen. In 1839 New Zealand was annexed, completing the list of the Australasian colonies, since the settlement of Queensland and of Western Australia had been commenced in the previous decade.

The convict settlements with which the colonisation had originated had now become a serious drawback. In the settlements begun later than 1829 there were no convicts; and transportation to New South Wales ceased in 1840, to Queensland in 1849, and to Tasmania in 1853. The



Gold-seekers at Bathurst, Western Australia, on their way to the fields at Ophir, 1851.

[From a print published at Sydney, N.S.W., in 1851.]

Canadian troubles in fact awakened the British Government to the wisdom of giving the great Australasian settlements the status of free self-governing colonies. It was not that the modern imperial conception had taken hold of men's minds; the idea was rather that the principle of self-government ought to be applied to all British communities which were sufficiently advanced to admit of it. Free self-government was incompatible with the use of the colonies as convict settlements; hence the gradual abolition of the system.

Hitherto every colony in Australia had been controlled by a governor with a small nominated council, the council being primarily merely consultative, though by degrees the arbitrary powers of the governor became limited. In the year 1842 came the beginnings of representation in New South Wales. The legislative council was enlarged, and two-thirds of the members were elected. The movement towards self-government was not

at first rapid, but a great change came over the character of the Australian population with the discovery of gold-fields, which brought in a rush of immigrants. In 1854 the four most highly organised of the colonies were given responsible government in full measure, their several constitutions varying in accordance with the wishes they had severally expressed. In every case one chamber was wholly elective, though the composition of the

second chambers differed. Each colony had its governor, but in each the executive was responsible to the legislature. Thenceforth they, like Canada, were virtually independent states except as concerned relations with foreign Powers.

The story of New Zealand requires separate attention. The Maoris, the native population of those islands, were an advanced race infinitely superior to the "black-fellows" of Australia and Tasmania both physically and intellectually. The annexation of New Zealand was carried out after the Treaty of Waitangi, an agreement made with the native chiefs. The relations between the Maoris and the British settlers occupy a much more prominent position than corresponding questions in Australia. There the natives were primitive nomads, without anything which could be called organisation.



Map of New Zealand.

The Maori, on the other hand, lived in a community which had quite definite conceptions with regard to law and to property; he was no doubt a barbarian, but he had a definite civilisation of his own. When the Maori chiefs made their bargain they knew what the bargain meant, and they expected the white man to keep it. They were to be under the protection of the Queen of England. The land was to remain, as it was at the time, specifically the property of the tribes. Only the tribe could alienate it; no individual chief or other person had power to do so. And if a tribe was willing to part with or sell any of its land, the only recognised legal purchaser, the only person who could acquire possession from the tribe, was to be the governor representing the queen. Only from the governor could the individual white man obtain land in New Zealand. In Australia,

on the contrary, no one had ever dreamed of regarding an inch of the soil as the property of any individual native or group of natives.

Unfortunately, would-be settlers ignored the treaty, under the mistaken impression that they had to deal with merely ignorant savages. They bought land for themselves which they had no right to do, from chiefs who had no power to sell it. The Maoris protested and backed their protests by force. Only the interference of the then acting governor, who recognised the essential justice of the Maori position, prevented the white men from being driven into the sea. The situation, however, remained extremely dangerous until the arrival, in 1845, of one of the greatest of all British colonial administrators, George Grey, who had already proved his capacity as governor of South Australia. Grey resolutely insisted on the terms of the Treaty of Waitangi, suppressed the acquisition of land by irregular means, won the confidence of the Maori chiefs, and brought them to aid him in suppressing those who continued recalcitrant, when they saw that he had established control over his own countrymen. The completeness of his self-reliance was again demonstrated and justified when the home authorities supplied New Zealand with an unsatisfactory constitution. Grey refused to put it in force until his own views had been taken into consideration. So effective was his protest that the constitution was withdrawn; and ultimately in 1852 his own scheme was practically accepted establishing responsible government analogous to that which was already in force in Canada, and was set up two years later in the four leading colonies of Australia.

Eventful also were these years in the third great field of British colonial enterprise, South Africa. The history of South African problems cannot be fairly grasped without a preliminary sketch of some of the elements which generated them. In the first place it must be understood that the original native inhabitants of the Cape where the Dutch colonists had planted themselves were not negroes but mainly Hottentots, a yellow-skinned race entirely distinct from the negroes, though possibly having a mixture of negro blood. Beyond the borders of the colony, inland and on the east coast from Natal up to the Portuguese territory, were the tribes of Bantus, otherwise called Kaffirs—negro people of a very fine physique, savages certainly, but often with a social and especially a military development which had passed far beyond a rudimentary stage. Comparatively but only comparatively speaking the southern tribes were peaceful agriculturists upon whom the ultra-military tribes of the Zulus and the Matabele were pressing from the north. Apart from the subject Hottentots, however, there was in the Cape Colony a considerable black slave population not drawn from the Kaffirs but imported.

Now in 1834 the Dutch at the Cape were already irritated by the comparative anglicising of the institutions of the colony. In 1834 came the Act for the Emancipation of the Slaves, for which the farmers were shortly to find that they were to receive compensation extremely inadequate from their point of view. Also for the past fifty years there had been periodical

collisions with the Kaffirs, who were with difficulty held within their own borders, and collisions became more frequent in consequence of the planting of many British settlers in the eastern regions on the Kaffir border. With



Map of South Africa.


the exception of the missionaries, every one, British and Dutch alike, regarded the Kaffirs as dangerous savages who could only be kept in restraint by fear; but the humanitarian spirit was at this time extremely active in England, where the missionaries had the ear of the public. Hence just at this time the governor, Sir Benjamin Durban, received positive instructions which, in effect, precluded him from such a demonstration of force as was needed to preserve peace on the Border. The result was that at Christmas time a horde of Kaffirs poured across the Fish River, robbing, raiding, and murdering. Of course there was a war, and of course the Kaffirs were beaten; but even then the instructions from home were on the same lines as before. None of the precautions considered necessary on the

spot were to be taken. The Kaffirs were not to be irritated by the overbearing white man.

The cup of the Boers or up-country Dutch farmers was full. The English had disturbed their time-honoured institutions, adopting an air of superiority. They had robbed them of their slaves. Now they would neither allow them to protect themselves against the bloodthirsty Bantu nor provide them with protection. Therefore they would go forth into the wilderness, shaking off the dust of their feet against the British as the children of Israel departed from Egypt to find the Land of Promise. So

the Great Trek began. Hundreds of Boer families—men, women, and children, with their cattle and their baggage waggons—crossed the Orange River, which was virtually the boundary of the colony, and marched away into the interior to seek independence. It did not strike them that they were British subjects, and would not cease to be British subjects merely because they had removed themselves into barbarian territory.

In those parts the native tribes lived in deadly fear of the Matabele army, which had recently taken possession of the country beyond the Vaal. The enterprising Boers crossed the Vaal, were duly attacked by vast hordes of Matabele, and, fighting with dogged obstinacy within their "laager," routed them with terrific slaughter. The Matabele retired beyond the next great river, the Limpopo.



Port Natal in 1852, and the arrival of the first mail steamer.

[From a drawing made in 1852.]

Another set of the emigrants crossed the eastern mountain range called the Drakensberg, and descended into what is now the colony of Natal. They negotiated with Dingan, the king of the mighty warrior tribes of the Zulus, to procure land from him. He received their envoys with fair words and promises, then suddenly fell upon them and slaughtered them. Then he launched his legions against the nearest Boer camp. Only one of the four hundred souls there escaped to give warning to the rest of the emigrants, who were thus able to beat off the next attack. But it was not till many months had passed and many lives had been lost that an overwhelming defeat was inflicted upon Dingan upon "Dingan's Day," beside the stream thenceforth known as the Blood River.

But the Boers had hardly proclaimed a republic in what was now in effect conquered territory, when the British government at the Cape

decided that the conquered territory belonged to Great Britain. The Boers in sullen resentment again retired across the Drakensberg, and the British established the colony of Natal. The Boers between the Orange River and the Vaal accepted the position of a dependency of the British Crown under the name of the Orange River Sovereignty in 1848; but in 1852 the home government, by no means anxious to shoulder more extensive responsibilities in South Africa, in effect recognised the independence of the Boers beyond the Vaal by the Sand River Convention. To complete this portion of the story, it may be added that after two years more the Orange River Sovereignty was deliberately cut adrift by the home government against the will both of Cape Colony and of the Boers themselves. The Orange Free State, as it was now called, was left to work out its own salvation, which it did for many years with remarkable success.

In the course of the colonial policy by this time universally prevalent, representative government was thrust upon the Cape Colony in 1853, a boon not greatly desired by the colonists themselves. But the executive was not yet made responsible to the legislature.

VII

INDIA

When the first Reformed Parliament was opened at Westminster Lord William Bentinck was still Governor-General in India. Besides the administrative progress recorded in the previous chapter, two other important measures are connected with his term of office. All previous Governors-General had accepted as axiomatic the principle of Cornwallis that only Europeans should be allowed to hold posts of responsibility within the British dominion. Under Bentinck's rule the theory was discarded while the practice was retained. Race, colour, and religion were no longer recognised officially as barriers to office; but as a matter of fact, neither while appointment continued to be made by selection, nor at a later period when admission to the public services was obtained by competitive examinations, did the natives of India obtain anything more than a very small share in the higher business of government, outside the native states. Nevertheless the official acceptance of the theory was a condition which made the official adoption of the practice possible whenever it should seem compatible with the public security.

The second measure in fact had the same object in view. This was the establishment and endowment of an educational system which was to imbue the intelligent Eastern mind with the practical wisdom of the West. From the study of English science and English literature the natives would learn to recognise the superiority of Western civilisation, would imbibe Western ideas, and would become fitter for association with the British in

the task of government. Thomas Babington Macaulay, a brilliant young Whig, who was sent out as legal adviser of the Indian Council in 1834, was the most energetic and persuasive promoter of the scheme; but it scarcely answered the precise purposes with which it was initiated. The natives who profited by the new education belonged almost entirely to a class extremely intelligent but apt to be deficient in the moral qualities which the natives of India require in their rulers. Moreover, while they duly acquired a literary acquaintance with Western ideas, these did not displace the oriental conceptions which were rooted in their minds from birth, but were only grafted on to them, bearing a fruit very different from that which had been intended.

Bentinck was succeeded after a brief interval by Lord Auckland, and a period unprecedentedly peaceful was followed by one of renewed warfare, though the wars were nearly all beyond the borders of the British dominion.

In the north-west corner of what is now British India lay the powerful and independent Sikh state of the Punjab, which had been consolidated and still was ruled by Ranjit Singh. Beyond the mountains was the turbulent Afghan nation, beyond Afghanistan lay Persia, and behind Persia was Russia, creeping always steadily forward, absorbing new territories decade by decade, and, as Palmerston and all Indian statesmen believed, aiming at the ultimate appropriation of India itself. Persia was still accounted a great power, and half the Mohammedan world regarded the Shah of Persia as the lineal head of Islam. The idea then was that Russia intended to make a catspaw of Persia. Persia was to be encouraged to re-absorb Mohammedan Afghanistan, once a province of its own; and was then to call upon the Mussulmans of India to rise against the British ascendancy and restore the Moslem supremacy under the ægis of Persia. Upon the chaos that would supervene Russia would descend and set up her own dominion.

British attention to Asiatic problems is always fitful; successive British Governments had omitted to pay due regard to the relations between Russia and Persia; Britain had failed in her treaty obligations to support Persia against Russian aggression; and before 1830 the Persian government had made up its mind that its true interests lay not in a British but in a Russian alliance. In 1837 a Persian army marched upon Herat, the great city of Western Afghanistan. Unhappily Lord Auckland and his advisers misread the situation in Afghanistan, where Dost Mohammed, the ruler of Kabul, was not at all inclined to submit either to Persian or to Russian domination. The true British policy would have been to give the Dost vigorous support in resisting Persian aggression; but his attitude was misunderstood, and it was believed that he meant to play into the hands of Russia. Many years before, Shah Shuja, then reigning over Afghanistan, had been driven from the country into British territory, and the power of Dost Mohammed's family had then been established. The plan to which

the Indian government now committed itself was the restoration of Shah Shuja to the throne at Kabul as the ally or puppet of the British.

By September 1838 the stubborn defence of Herat, brilliantly conducted under the guidance of a young British officer, Eldred Pottinger, had proved too much for the Shah ; the siege was raised and the Persian army retired. But although the imminent danger was removed, the British Government persisted in its design in defiance of all the most experienced authorities ; and in 1839 the British expedition advanced into Afghanistan. Kandahar was captured, then Ghazni. Dost Mohammed retreated, Shah Shuja was enthroned at Kabul, and then it became evident that his position could only be secured by the retention of a great British force and a British Resident at the capital. In the next year, 1840, Dost Mohammed surrendered to the British and was removed to British territory. Peace apparently reigned ; but there was a rude awakening. The chiefs of the Afghan tribes had at first been pacified by subsidies, and they were the more enraged when the subsidies were withdrawn. The country was soon in a state of ferment unperceived by the Resident MacNaghten. In November 1841 a great riot broke out in Kabul. Allowed to go unchecked, it developed into a general insurrection. The commander of the great British force at Kabul was hopelessly incompetent, and the Resident was compelled to accept an ignominious treaty under which the country was to be entirely evacuated by the British, who were to leave hostages behind them in the hands of the Afghans. The garrisons at Kandahar, Ghazni, and Jellalabad repudiated their orders and refused to budge. MacNaghten was murdered, and in midwinter the British—men, women and children, civilians and soldiers, numbering some fifteen thousand souls—started on their defenceless march from Kabul only to be massacred in the mountain passes. Of all that host only one escaped, and reached Jellalabad.

Such was the great disaster which for the moment seemed to threaten the very existence of the British power in India. It took place just at the moment when Peel's great administration began in England. Lord Ellenborough arrived in India to take Auckland's place, and active steps were taken to retrieve the position. The force at Kandahar held its own without difficulty ; that at Jellalabad only with extreme difficulty and by distinguished gallantry ; Ghazni surrendered. The first order issued for general evacuation was practically cancelled by a second, which instructed General Pollock with a relieving force which was entering Afghanistan *via* Jellalabad to effect the evacuation *via* Kabul. Between April and September Pollock's force and Nott's from Kandahar completely demonstrated to the Afghans the futility of resistance, and the British flag was again hoisted at Kabul. In the meanwhile the luckless Shah Shuja had been assassinated, and now the British Government did what it ought to have done in the first instance. It restored Dost Mohammed to the throne of Kabul, since he was obviously the chief incomparably the best fitted to hold the reins of power ; and it made with him the firm alliance which he would gladly have accepted at

the outset. To that alliance he remained admirably faithful, and his loyalty proved of immense service in the troublous years that followed. The situation was saved, but British prestige had received a terrible blow in spite of the triumphal processions and grandiloquent proclamations by which Ellenborough endeavoured to persuade himself and the natives of India that the overwhelming power of the British had been magnificently vindicated.

Another demonstration was given in the next year, 1843, the one example of a deliberate act of wanton aggression in our Indian annals. The annexation of Sindh was not inaccurately described by its perpetrator, Sir Charles Napier, as a piece of beneficent rascality. Sindh lies on the Lower Indus, beyond what was then the sphere of British dominion. Napier, sent to this region as Resident or Agent, picked a quarrel with the Amirs, routed their forces in a brilliant campaign at Miani, and the annexation of the whole territory followed. Only a few months later came another campaign, this time against Gwalior. Gwalior was the capital of the Maratha Maharaja Sindhia, who at this time was a child. The Gwalior government controlled what was now the one powerful native army in India outside the Punjab. The effective ruler at Gwalior was the Rani, the young widow of the last Sindhia. The actual Sindhia was a young boy, whom she had adopted; for, by a very singular fatality, no Sindhia had ever left an heir of his body; in every case the successor had been a child adopted in accordance with the Hindu law of succession. The Rani's power depended upon her popularity with the army, so that in effect the army was the government; and the army was arrogant and aggressive. In the existing circumstances, since the Rani seemed determined to pay no heed to the advice or instructions of the paramount power, a demand was made that the Gwalior army should be reduced and the British subsidiary contingent enlarged. The demand was backed by the presence of a considerable British force on the Gwalior frontier. The British ultimatum was ignored, the British army crossed the border, and in two fiercely fought engagements at Maharajpur and Puniar the Rani's forces were shattered. The government was placed in the hands of a Council of Regency appointed by the British and practically directed by the British Resident, until the young Sindhia should come of age. The native army was reduced from forty thousand to nine thousand men, and the British contingent, that is to say the sepoy force under British officers, was increased to ten thousand.

The result of a single-combat between Gwalior and the British was never doubtful. The real danger lay in the north-west; the real value of



Dost Mohammed.
[From a native painting.]

the Maharajpur campaign lay in the removal of a great hostile force posted upon our flank and capable of co-operating very effectively with the Sikhs of the Punjab. Had the Sikhs attacked first while the Gwalior army was in full strength the latter would have been able to fall upon the British communications, enclose the British army, and threaten the rear of the British advance; and in that case complete disaster might have been the result. Speculations on such points, however, are somewhat vain. Lord Ellenborough's methods created so much uneasiness that he was recalled to make way for Sir Henry Hardinge, who had won his spurs in the Peninsula War and was not without administrative experience; and had the Gwalior army still been dangerous he would undoubtedly have taken adequate military precautions.

Hardinge was never in doubt about the menace from the Punjab. Ranjit Singh died in 1839, and the Lahore state, as the Punjab was also called, was now without any strong central government. The old Maharajah's chieftainship had been a kind of military despotism based upon an army and upon institutions of a very exceptional type. The Sikhs had been primarily a religious brotherhood, a sort of reformed sect of Hindus who had abjured many of the peculiar institutions of Hinduism, notably that of caste. Of diverse races at first, they had become by exclusive association for some three centuries a special breed with marked characteristics of their own. The brotherhood, subjected to a fierce persecution, had organised itself into an army under the name of the Khalsa, and, though forming only a small percentage of the population, it had in the latter years of the eighteenth century dominated the Punjab. The Sikh army was the one great organisation in India which could be called democratic in its structure; but, besides the Khalsa proper, the great chiefs or sirdars could, like medieval barons, bring large numbers of their own retainers into the field. Working upon this basis and helped by European officers, Ranjit Singh had moulded the Khalsa into an army probably the best disciplined and the most powerful, at least in comparison with its numbers, ever controlled by an Indian monarch. Ranjit's death left the Khalsa completely master of the country; or would have done so if the army had realised its own strength and had possessed a directing head. It was not long in realising its strength, but it still lacked a head. The new Maharajah was a boy, and the reins of power were grasped by his mother, the Rani Jindan, whom Henry Lawrence described as the Messalina of the Punjab. After a series of intrigues and assassinations the Rani seemed to have established herself and her paramour Lal Singh at the head of the government (it may be remarked that every Sikh bore the name of Singh), but not without extreme jealousy on the part of many of the sirdars; while the sirdars and the Rani alike felt that the really dominant power was the Khalsa.

The Khalsa knew its own military strength long before it awoke to its political power. It had proved itself decisively the master of every foe with whom it had fought. Even in Ranjit's day it would have hailed

with joy a proposal to challenge the power of the British, but that astute monarch was alive to the vast reserves of force which lay behind the British Government in India. But there was no one now who could dominate the Khalsa, and both the Rani and the sirdars perceived possibilities of great gain to themselves if it should hurl itself against the white men. If it were beaten its power would be broken, and every man dreamed that then his own private ambitions might find an opportunity of realisation. If it were victorious the Sikhs would become the masters of India, and every Sikh would have his chance. So the army was egged on to challenge fate. Early in December 1845 the news reached Sir Henry Hardinge that the Sikhs had crossed the river Sutlej, the border-line of the Punjab state.

Ever since his arrival in India the Governor-General had been preparing for this emergency as rapidly as was possible without dangerous ostentation. Troops had been concentrated in the north-west provinces and in the outposts which guarded the Sikh frontier. Two converging columns were promptly on the march to effect a junction with the garrison of the advanced post at Ferozpur. They met the advancing Sikhs at Mudki, and after hot fighting drove them off the field. Two days later the advance towards Ferozpur was renewed, but the way was blocked by a great Sikh army which had entrenched itself at Ferozshah. The attack was delayed till the afternoon in order that the British might be reinforced by a column which was on its way from Ferozpur. The Commander-in-Chief, Sir Hugh Gough, would have attacked at once, but Hardinge considered the risk too great, and used the power which he possessed to assume the supreme command himself. A furious contest raged long after darkness had fallen, but the Sikhs held their entrenchments and the British passed a night of intense anxiety, resolved to renew the attack on the morrow, but in actual doubt whether they might not be themselves overwhelmed and annihilated. The morning brought relief, when the British troops rushed the entrenchments to find that the Sikhs had already withdrawn under cover of darkness.

The Sikh invasion was broken ; it was now the turn of the British to invade the Punjab. Two months were passed in preparations for forcing the passage of the Sutlej, during which there were two sharp engagements at Bulowal and Aliwal. Then came the decisive battle at Sobraon, where the Sikhs held the passage of the Sutlej. Only after desperate fighting their entrenchments were carried, and the Sikh army was driven over or into the river, after which there was no further possibility of resistance.

The British marched to Lahore, bent not on annexation but on establishing an efficient government. A Council of Regency was appointed ; Henry Lawrence was left as Resident with very large powers of control over the administration, which in various frontier districts was delegated to subordinate British officers ; a large part of the Sikh army was disbanded ; and at the earnest request of the sirdars a considerable British

force remained in the country. This was to be withdrawn at the end of the year; when once more, at the request of the sirdars, the troops were allowed to remain and the administration was virtually placed in the hands of Lawrence, under whose powerful and sympathetic rule it seemed probable that the country would soon settle down in peaceable and orderly fashion.

Very different was the actual event. At the end of 1847 all seemed to promise well. Hardinge, now a Viscount, left India in January, believing that there were no serious troubles in store. With him went the great administrator of the Punjab. Within four months a flame had been kindled which soon blazed into a general insurrection, necessitating another sanguinary campaign which ended with the annexation of the Punjab and its final absorption into the direct British dominion.

Lawrence's successor at Lahore was an experienced and capable official but of no exceptional power. Hardinge's successor in the Governor-Generalship, Lord Dalhousie, was a man of very exceptional abilities, but his capacities were still unknown. The veterans of the Khalsa were sore at their overthrow, which they still attributed not to British superiority but to the treachery of their own leaders. The minds of the sirdars were divided; they resented any other ascendancy than their own, but they distrusted each other; they were not sure of themselves; but even though the British had remained in the Punjab at their own request they suspected them of intending to establish themselves permanently. Thus when insurrection broke out it was not a national movement, but it was in danger of at once becoming so unless the British ascendancy were forthwith asserted vigorously and decisively. It began as a local revolt at Multan. The governor, Mulraj, resigned. His resignation was accepted by the official Sikh government at Lahore, and two British officers were sent to Multan to take over the administration until the new governor should be appointed. The troops in Multan rose, murdered the officers, and proclaimed a revolt against the British dominion.

Technically there was no British dominion. The government was the Sikh government, acting temporarily under the advice and with the support of the British Resident and some British, that is to say Sepoy, regiments. The British Government therefore called upon the Sikh government to suppress the revolt. A young frontier officer, Herbert Edwardes, hearing that British officers at Multan were in danger, but not that they had been murdered, at once marched to their rescue from the Derajat, the hill-frontier, with a force mainly of the hillmen, who, throughout, showed an admirable devotion to their British officers, the more so as they had no love for their Sikh masters. He acted on his own responsibility. He had already routed the insurgents and driven them into Multan, when he was joined by the troops of the Lahore government under the command of Sher Singh. It was, however, obvious that those troops could not

be trusted, and a British column was presently despatched from Lahore to take part in the siege. Dalhousie accepted the view of his commander-in-chief, Lord Gough, that it would be worse than useless to send a small expeditionary force into the Punjab, since it would be superfluous if the insurrection did not become general, and would be annihilated if it did.

The result was that the insurrection did become general. The British column from Lahore had hardly joined Edwardes before Multan when Sher Singh withdrew with his whole force from the siege and began to gather all the old members of the Khalsa to his standard. Some six weeks later, Gough, with the army of invasion which he had been organising, was in the Upper Punjab seeking to force a decisive battle upon Sher Singh. At the crossing of the river Chenab a sharp skirmish and a sharp engagement took place at Ramnagar and at Sadulapur; but Sher Singh made good his retreat and entrenched himself at Rassul on the river Jhelum. The Sikh army, established in an entrenched position, was not to be attacked hastily. Presently, however, Gough advanced, and found the enemy, always behind entrenchments, at Chillianwalla, where there was a furious engagement with very heavy losses on both sides, and the Sikhs were again able to retire to their position at Rassul, though they left the British masters of the field of battle. Rassul was impregnable, and Gough could only hold Sher Singh under watch. A month later Sher Singh, who had received considerable reinforcements, suddenly slipped out of Rassul. But in the meanwhile Multan had fallen, and the British column was on its way to join the commander-in-chief. A week after his march Gough brought Sher Singh to battle at Gujerat, where the Sikh army was decisively and finally shattered. The Sikhs accepted the situation; this time they knew that they had had a stand-up fight with the British and had been soundly beaten without any treachery on the part of their own leaders. Perhaps there was hardly any one except Henry Lawrence himself who was not satisfied that the annexation of the Punjab was now the only course possible. It was the course adopted by Dalhousie, who regarded the new province with an especial favour which it speedily repaid.


VIII

EARLY VICTORIAN

In a constitutional monarchy the personality of the monarch, however striking it may be, is of less importance in the national history than in days and realms in which the Crown directly controls national policy. The dates of the accession of kings and queens are no more than convenient landmarks, in themselves signalling only minor events. George III. was

the only one of the Hanoverian kings whose accession marked a departure from the normal lines of national development, excepting of course his great-grandfather. Although Queen Victoria herself played no insignificant part on the stage of history, her succession rather ensured continuity of development than gave it a new direction. The characteristics of what we call the Victorian Era distinguished her second uncle's reign as well as her own. The epoch, the starting-point of the era, is marked by the Reform Bill, whether we consider its political or its social aspects, and we can legitimately apply the term Early Victorian to the twenty years which followed the passing of that measure.

During those twenty years the Industrial Revolution was carried to completion by the huge development of steam traffic both by land and by water. Passenger traffic by rail was in effect inaugurated by the opening of the Manchester and Liverpool railway in 1830; in 1850 all the main railway lines were at work. The railroad carried goods in an hour perhaps



Open Coaches on the Manchester and Liverpool Railway, 1831.

[From a print.]

as far as the old horse haulage conveyed them in a day, and in immensely greater quantities at a time. An Act of Parliament in 1844 required the railway companies to provide a sufficiency of trains with covered accommodation for passengers at the rate of a penny a mile—the origin of the term “Parliamentary Trains.” Forced against their will to provide cheap fares, the railway managers very soon found that the innovation increased instead of diminishing their profits. The trains were used by thousands of passengers, most of whom in the old days would have been obliged either to stay at home or to tramp on foot, helped forward by an occasional lift on a friendly waggon. The steam-engine drew tons of goods where canals had carried them by the hundredweight. The new traffic made its way in defiance of æsthetic and academic opposition, and in spite of the great financial panics which followed upon excessive inflation especially in 1845.

The steamship established itself less rapidly. The first ocean line was only opened in 1839, the year after the first passage of the Atlantic completed under steam. It is to be remarked that even these first steamers covered the distance in only about thrice the time taken by the swiftest

modern vessels, while the speed of George Stephenson's locomotive has hardly even been doubled.

Out of the development of steam traffic came the creation in 1840 of the Penny Post, carrying with it an enormous increase in correspondence; and immediately after the establishment of the Penny Post came the Electric Telegraph. The first telegraphic line in England was set up between London and Slough in 1844, and seven years later came the laying of the first submarine cable between Dover and Calais. It is a little difficult to realise that until Queen Victoria was seated on the throne the conveyance of a letter from London to Edinburgh took nearly as long as its carriage from London to New York fifty years later, and that the journey to India might take any time from six to eighteen months instead of something under three weeks.

The most prominent feature in the modern industrial world is Trade Unionism. The formation of trade unions, combinations of the workers, primarily for the purpose of collective bargaining with the masters, became temporarily active after the repeal of the Combination Laws in 1825. But the movement was checked by the repeated failure of strikes owing to lack of funds and inefficient organisation. The political ideal, the demands formulated shortly afterwards in the People's Charter, seemed to the working man to promise better than local and sectional combinations. In the thirties, however, the movement took new shape. In place of the simple idea of the trade union, the combination of the employees in a trade, came the idea of the trades union, the combination of workers in several trades. Such a combination was the Builders' Union, which sought to unite the workmen in all the diverse departments of the building trade, an aggressive body which increased the alarm created by its aggressiveness by adopting a fantastic and melodramatic ceremonial of initiation. The masters began to announce that they would make the repudiation of this trades union a condition of employment. Another such union, more far-reaching in its conception, was the Grand National Trades Union devised by Robert Owen, who, having been an extremely successful and liberal employer of labour, developed into the champion of a reformed social order. Capitalism and competition were to disappear, and the workers were themselves to be the proprietors and controllers of all the materials and machinery of production and distribution.

These unions did in effect undoubtedly increase their power by means of intimidation. The accepted doctrine of *laissez faire*, as understood by



Robert Owen.

the masters, meant that the prosperity of trade depended on the masters having an entirely free hand in the control of their business. If combinations could resist their dictation they had not a free hand, and if the workers were coerced against their will by the combinations an unmitigated tyranny would be established. In actual fact at this time the alarm of the masters was groundless. The unions were invariably beaten if they attempted to fight, because the labour market was still largely overstocked, and labour, doing battle with capital, requires a war chest which the unions did not possess. The masters were commonly strong enough to compel the men to renounce the unions as a condition of service by signing a declaration known as the Document. But the masters also had the whole force of the Government on their side; the conspiracy laws could be applied so as effectively to paralyse the action of the unions, and the obviously unjust severity with which the law was applied in some particular instances only had the effect of embittering class hostilities. Trades Unionism and Trade Unionism were both beaten as aggressive methods of fighting capitalism, and from 1838 to 1848 Chartism held the field.

But not altogether. Intelligent working-men saw the futility of wasting the union funds on hopeless battles with masters; but unions and funds could be turned to good service on the lines of benefit societies, and on those lines their organisation could be steadily and quietly strengthened. They ceased to be aggressive, and almost confined themselves to a defensive resistance to aggression on the part of the masters. In those employments especially where skill and higher intelligence are demanded, the unions set themselves to educate their own members and to study the problems with which they had to deal in a scientific spirit. Such unions were no longer aggregations of unreasoning and hot-headed men, but bodies of intelligent persons who knew what they wanted and had at least a rational idea of how it was to be obtained. The new spirit which made trade unionism an effective force in the country found its most convincing expression in the carefully organised Amalgamated Society of Engineers, which, in 1850, brought into a single combination a number of the separate societies then existing in Lancashire and in London. The great strike of the engineers in 1852 on the questions of piece-work and overtime produced an immense impression on the public mind, because of the sobriety and discipline with which it was conducted. The men were beaten; they were obliged to return to work without gaining what they had demanded; but they had won public sympathy; their union had not been broken up, and they had given the industrial world an invaluable lesson in organisation.

If the working-men were beginning to realise their own need of education, the country was also slowly beginning to realise that education was becoming a national concern. Hitherto it had been left entirely to private enterprise. The schools in which the children of the poor were taught were maintained chiefly by the National Church and occasionally by other

religious bodies, supported by voluntary contributions. England before the Reform Bill, very unlike Scotland, was one of the worst educated countries in Europe. The spirit of reform then touched education so far that in 1833 the Government ventured upon a grant of £20,000 in its aid, to help in the building of a few more schools. Five years later came proposals for the formation of a Board or Committee of Education.

But from the moment when the application of public funds to education became a matter of debate the religious difficulty presented itself. It appeared to one side that public funds must be distributed and applied irrespective of the religious opinions of teachers or pupils. To the other side it appeared imperative that the Church should retain its effective control, since the teaching of religion was of the essence of education, and no teaching could be called religious which was not, in modern phrase, denominational. Neither side was prepared even to consider an educational system from which religion was omitted. The Liberal Government only so far got its way that its committee was appointed for the distribution of a slightly increased grant, which was not actually monopolised as hitherto by the Church schools. The subject continued to engage attention periodically, and another bill was brought in in 1843 as part of a Factory Bill. It was wrecked on the usual rock, Dissenters and Roman Catholics finding it too favourable to the Anglicans, and Anglicans finding it too favourable to Dissent. In 1847, however, the government grant was increased to £100,000, of which the benefit was still withheld from Roman Catholics, and for fifteen years no further steps were taken.

Both in England and in Scotland religious movements were extremely active during this period. The moderation, indifferentism, or rationalism prevalent in the eighteenth century had been disturbed by the Wesleyan revival and the growth of a more vigorous Evangelicalism in the English Church. But now a new fervour of Churchmanship arose within the Anglican communion, known as the Oxford or Oriel movement because it took its rise in Oxford and especially in Oriel College, or as Tractarianism because it found its literary expression in a series of publications called Tracts for the Times. The most spiritual of its exponents was John Henry Newman, who, with many of his followers, ultimately found refuge and rest in the Church of Rome. But in the eyes of the public its most prominent figure was that of Dr. Pusey. Essentially it was a re-assertion of the Divine authority of the Catholic Church, the Church to whose priesthood the apostolic authority had been transmitted in unbroken continuity through the centuries by the rite of ordination. That authority could not



Dr. Pusey.

[From a photograph.]

be overridden by the state, and no lay jurisdiction could be recognised. The sanction for its doctrines and ritual was to be found in the decisions of the General Councils of the Church, in the teaching of the early fathers, and in the practice of the Church Universal. On this basis doctrines and practices which had been condemned as papistical were revived. Whatever views may be held with regard to those doctrines and practices the essential fact must be recognised that the movement brought a new intensity of spiritual life into the Church, while it challenged the essential doctrine of Protestantism by claiming not only that the Church was independent of the state but that the priesthood were the authoritative intermediaries of Divine Grace. The state declined to recognise the claims of the new school and continued to assert its own authority; but the Tractarians did not adopt the solution of seceding from the establishment and surrendering endowments for the sake of spiritual independence.

This, however, was the more heroic course adopted in Scotland. In that country also there was a revival of religious energy, but there was no question of dogma or ritual or priesthood. The question was that of the right of the state to control the spiritual independence of the congregation. The spiritual independence claimed was the right of the congregation to choose its own minister, whereas the state, that is to say the law, had placed the patronage in private hands. The legal question was carried to the highest court of appeal, the House of Peers, and the House of Peers upheld the rights of the patrons. Thereupon the party of spiritual independence separated itself from the establishment; a host of ministers resigned their livings, departed from their manse, and formed a church free from state control—the Free Kirk—whose clergy depended for their emoluments entirely upon stipends provided by voluntary contributions.

The splendour of the last literary period was maintained by new writers. Before 1840 Tennyson and Browning had begun to publish poetry; before 1850 Tennyson's fame was securely established, though many years were to pass before his great rival had won popular recognition. Charles Dickens gave a new joy to life with the appearance of the *Pickwick Papers* in the year of Queen Victoria's accession. Thackeray achieved a triumph with *Vanity Fair* eleven years later. Disraeli revealed himself to the world in a series of novels before he entered Parliament. Macaulay created a prose style which became the model of half the writers in England, while Carlyle, Newman, and John Ruskin began to be numbered among the prophets.

CHAPTER XXXV

THE PALMERSTONIAN ERA

I

THE CRIMEAN WAR

THE term coalition is one which until the twentieth century had a perfectly clear meaning. It meant not a combination of parties in Parliament in support of a ministry whose members are drawn from the ranks of one party, but the combination in a single ministry of members drawn from the ranks of different parties. The Liberal Government formed by Lord John Russell in 1846 depended upon the support of the Peelites, as the Melbourne ministry before had virtually been established by a compact with O'Connell. Lord Aberdeen's ministry was what they were not, a coalition ministry in the correct sense of the term, because the ministers were drawn from the ranks of two parties, the Peelites and the Liberals. Its chief, Lord Aberdeen, was a Peelite, so was its Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gladstone. Palmerston was not allowed to return to the Foreign Office but had to be contented with the post of Home Secretary; he was in fact distinctly antagonistic to Aberdeen, who was strongly opposed to assuming anything like an aggressive attitude in foreign affairs. By the not unfamiliar irony of politics Aberdeen was the one minister under whose leadership the British Empire has been involved in a European war since Waterloo, actually taken at first by Lord John Russell.



The Earl of Aberdeen.

[From a sketch made in the House of Lords
in 1854.]

Palmerston's old place was
The year 1853 was notable for the first Gladstone budget, in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer advanced along the lines of Free Trade.

Duties upon some two hundred and seventy articles were either reduced or removed. But in a very short time it became evident that foreign not domestic affairs were to absorb public attention.

Early in the year, Nicholas I., the Tsar of Russia, expressed to the British ambassador his conviction that the Turkish Empire was "a very sick man," very near to dissolution. Russia and Britain ought to be agreed upon a policy when that contingency should arise; and if Britain wanted Egypt and Crete for her share he should not object. Britain did not receive the proposal with any favour; she had no desire to see Russia in possession of Constantinople, with an unlimited fleet in the Black Sea ready to pass through the Dardanelles into the Mediterranean whenever it might suit her. She adhered to the policy of maintaining the integrity of the Turkish Empire, a fact which Nicholas failed to grasp. It was evidently his intention to hasten the dissolution which he had persuaded himself to regard as inevitable, and he found his opportunity in the differences between the Greek and Latin Christian Churches in Palestine.

France had a traditional and purely sentimental theory that she was the protector of Latin Christianity in the East; Russia had a traditional and exceedingly practical theory that she was the protector of Christians in general, but particularly those of the Greek Church. Louis Napoleon had just made himself Emperor of the French, and it was necessary for him to justify his position in the eyes of France and of the world by an active assertion of French claims. When Greeks and Latins quarrelled over points of precedence, Nicholas on one side and Napoleon III. on the other brought pressure to bear upon the Porte. The Porte tried to satisfy both, and succeeded in pleasing neither, with the result that the Tsar in effect put forward a claim to be formally recognised as the protector over all the Christian subjects of the Porte. The Porte refused the demand, which no sovereign state could possibly have tolerated, whereupon Russian troops crossed the river Pruth and occupied the trans-Danubian principalities. Hostilities were delayed by an attempt on the part of the Western powers to effect a pacification. They addressed a joint note to Russia and Turkey. Russia accepted it, but Turkey pointed out that it might be interpreted as confirming the Tsar's most extravagant demands. The Powers, who had no such intention, thereupon withdrew the note, Turkey demanded the evacuation of the Danubian provinces, Russia did not move, and at the end of October 1853 the two countries were technically at war.

Now after the episode of the "sick man" it was impossible for the British Government to doubt that Russia was bent on her programme of the partition of the Turkish Empire, according to the precedent of the partition of Poland. The Tsar, on the other hand, was comfortably convinced that Britain was wholly given over to commercial pursuits and would, at any rate, stop short of armed intervention, a view which he might not have taken had Palmerston been at the Foreign Office, where Russell's place had been taken by Lord Clarendon, Russell himself being

occupied at the conferences of the Powers. The French Emperor, however, was in hearty co-operation with the British Government, and was perhaps rather eager for war than otherwise, since military glory was almost a necessity to the imperial successor of the first Napoleon.

In October the British and French fleets were ordered to the Bosphorus to protect their national interests; Turkey declared war upon Russia, and the Tsar announced that he was merely holding the trans-Danube principalities as a material guarantee, and would not take the offensive against Turkey. Almost immediately afterwards the Russian Black Sea Fleet fell upon and annihilated a Turkish squadron lying in the Turkish harbour of Sinope. Popular indignation in England and France rose high, and Aberdeen was forced to consent to the occupation of the Black Sea by the joint fleets. It can hardly be doubted that the extremely pacific language adopted by the Prime Minister had encouraged the Tsar in the conviction that Great Britain might be relied upon not to declare war.

In the meantime the Turks had crossed the Danube and had achieved some definite successes. In February (1854) France and Britain, who had reason to expect support from Austria but did not wait for her joint action, sent to Russia a demand for the evacuation of the principalities; and the rejection of the demand was followed

at the end of March by the declaration of war. The position seemed to point clearly to an approaching campaign on the Danube. In that expectation the forces of the allies were conveyed to Varna. The situation, however, was changed by the intervention of Austria, which, although she did not actually declare war, induced Russia to withdraw from the principalities. This was enough for Austria, but not for Britain and France. It was universally felt that the retirement of the Powers would still leave Russia free to choose her own opportunity for striking at Turkey. It was imperative to strike a blow which would enable the Powers to dictate terms giving the necessary security. The strength of the Russians in the Black Sea depended on their position at Sevastopol in the Crimea, and a campaign in the Crimea was resolved upon.

Unfortunately it was not anticipated that there would be any necessity



The Crimean Peninsula.

for a winter campaign. Had it been possible to carry out the plan at the moment when it was first mooted by Lord Palmerston, in June, it is probable that Sevastopol would have fallen at once; but transport difficulties and cholera intervened, and it was not till the second week of September that the French and British forces landed in the Crimea, at a point some thirty miles to the north of Sevastopol, in the Bay of Eupatoria. The British, commanded by Lord Raglan, numbered something less than twenty-five thousand men, the French force, under Marshal St. Arnaud, being slightly larger. The advance of the force was blocked by the Russians on the river Alma. After a hard fight, of which the British bore the brunt, the Russians were driven back in rout, but owing to the opposition of the French Marshal the pursuit was not pressed. When the army did advance Lord Raglan again yielded to St. Arnaud, and



The British forces marching to the attack at the Battle of the Alma, September 20, 1854.

[After a sketch made from a battleship stationed in the river during the battle.]

instead of making an immediate attack on the north side of Sevastopol, the allies marched round and took up their position at Balaclava.

For the third time the British yielded to the French, who objected to an immediate attack, and the allies prepared themselves to lay siege to Sevastopol on the southern side, the British lying on the east of the French, and therefore being in the more dangerous position. For the Russian general, Menschikoff, had withdrawn into the interior to secure his communications, not into the fortress, and any attack from him would fall upon the British. His communications with Sevastopol were also open, the allied force not being sufficiently large to effect a complete investment. The delay in attack enabled the Russian, or rather German, engineer, Todleben, to strengthen the defences, a work accomplished with extraordinary skill and rapidity; while the harbour had been protected from the operations of the allied fleet by sinking Russian ships in the entrance. The actual garrison consisted mainly of the sailors from the Russian fleet.

The general result was that a great bombardment was opened on October 17th and was maintained for a week, but only to prove that Sevastopol would not fall without a prolonged siege. On the 25th the Russians attempted to relieve the fortress by seizing the port of Balaclava, on which the British were dependent for their supplies. The attempt was foiled mainly by the magnificent charge of the Heavy Brigade, which shattered and rolled back an advancing column of Russians of five times their own numbers. But the splendid action of the Heavy Brigade, crowned as it was by triumphant success, has been eclipsed in the minds of men by the famous charge of the Light Brigade, as futile and purposeless as it was heroic. Under a misapprehension of orders received from the general, Lord Lucan, in command of the cavalry, entirely against his own judgment, ordered the Light Brigade of six hundred men to charge through a deadly storm of fire upon a distant Russian battery. The order was obeyed. The six hundred charged to the guns, carried them, and then the survivors rode back again—"all that was left of them."

Ten days later Menschikoff again attacked the British position at Inkermann. The attack was made in the early morning in a thick mist. As a consequence of the conditions the battle resolved itself into one in which groups of soldiers fought independently in detached parties not knowing what was going on in other parts of the field. It was a soldiers' battle, fought and won by the sheer obstinate valour of the men, unaided by tactical skill or science on the part of the officers, for which there was literally no opportunity. By downright valour and discipline the British won and drove off the hosts of the Russians.

After Inkermann the army settled down to the long horrors of the winter siege which have become a proverb. The campaign had been entered upon with no expectation that it would be prolonged through the winter, and with no preparations for that contingency. The home organisation failed disastrously in providing supplies; even those which reached Balaclava in the first instance were destroyed in a gale before they could be disembarked. Those which arrived later could only with extreme difficulty be carried to the front. The criminality of contractors from whom the supplies were obtained made matters infinitely worse. The storm of public indignation which was aroused compelled Aberdeen to resign, and the nation demanded that Palmerston should be called to the position of Prime Minister. Fresh vigour was imparted to the administration; the system was reorganised, and the conditions improved rapidly




Lord Raglan.

[From a drawing by Edward Armitage in 1854.]

with the advance of the spring. But perhaps the most notable feature in the improvements was due to the initiative of Miss Florence Nightingale and her heroic staff of nurses, to which has been due the whole new modern conception of the treatment of the sick and wounded in war.

A conference of the Powers was summoned in March; it came to nothing; but, when Sevastopol fell in September, peace negotiations were renewed, and in March 1856 the Powers signed the Treaty of Paris. Even then Britain would hardly have obtained by the treaty the security against Russian aggression for the sake of which she had entered upon the war, but for the resolute attitude of Palmerston and Clarendon, who was still Foreign Secretary. The Emperor of the French had won the military prestige which was more important to him than the curbing of Russia, and he was anxious for peace. The Austrian Emperor had owed a good



The Port and town of Sevastopol, showing the Forts, in 1854.

[From a drawing made in 1854.]

deal to Russia in the past, and Russia was prepared to concede as much as the direct Austrian interests demanded. It was only by making it clear that Britain was prepared to carry on the war single-handed if necessary, that Clarendon obtained a satisfactory treaty. The Black Sea was neutralised; it was to be open to commerce, but the Russians were to be allowed to have only six ships of war upon it. All disputes between the Porte and any of the Powers which signed the treaty were to be referred to the joint decision of the signatory Powers. All conquests were to be restored, and the Sultan was again pledged to carry out the engagements which he had made as to the treatment of his Christian subjects. The trans-Danube principalities were to be in effect autonomous but under Turkish suzerainty. The British conceded sundry points which they had hitherto upheld with regard to maritime law in time of war; the goods of neutrals and goods carried under a neutral flag, with the exception of actual contraband of war, were to be exempt from capture. But

blockades, to be technically recognised, must be actually effective, and privateering was to be abolished.

Apart from the retirement of the Peelites, including Gladstone, when Palmerston's administration was formed, the only political event of domestic importance at this time was an unsuccessful attempt to revive the creation of Life Peerages. Had the attempt been successful, it would have become possible to modify very considerably the character of the House of Lords by introducing an increasing non-hereditary element. Baron Parke was to be raised to the peerage as Lord Wensleydale, but the form of the patent conveyed the peerage for his own life only. The Lords protested; the question was referred to a Committee of Privilege; and it was found that no such form had been used for four hundred years. The Government gave way and the ordinary form was adopted.

Though the war in Europe was brought to an end, two other minor wars were soon engaging a degree of public attention. The Shah of Persia, misled, like other orientals, as to the character of the Crimean War, and by Russian successes which attended it in Asia Minor, imagined that the British power was collapsing and that the Russian star was in the ascendant. Therefore once more he attacked Afghanistan and captured Herat. Lord Auckland's blunder, however, was not repeated; the British came to the aid of Dost Mohammed, and an expedition to the Persian Gulf under the command of Sir James Outram very soon brought the Shah to reason. He retired from Afghanistan, promised not to interfere with it again, and accepted Britain as arbitrator in any dispute which might arise between himself and the Russians. The British action also had the valuable effect of securing the confidence and loyalty of the Amir at Kabul. But the necessity for the Persian expedition was unfortunate, because it withdrew white troops from India at the moment when a grave and unsuspected crisis was impending.

Almost at the same moment the country became involved in complications with China. A collision some years before, arising out of the opium traffic, had resulted in a small war terminated in 1842 by the Treaty of Nankin, under which Hong-Kong had been ceded to the British. In 1856, a Chinese vessel called the *Arrow*, commanded by an Englishman and flying the British flag, was seized by the Chinese authority at Canton, and her crew were carried off on a charge of piracy. On the doubtful assumption that the *Arrow* was a British vessel, the Chinese were bound by treaty to hand over the crews to the British authority at Hong-Kong for the investigation of the case. The Chinese refused to do so. Sir John Bowring at Hong-Kong summoned the British squadron to coerce the Chinese. Palmerston supported his action in Parliament, and the hostilities developed into open war. The high-handed action of the Government was seized upon both by the formal Opposition and by the advanced Liberals, who disliked Palmerston's aggressiveness, as providing a ground for attacking the ministry. Palmerston, however, appealed to the country,

finding his actual position in parliament untenable, and the country returned him to power with a decisive majority. But the operations against China were delayed by the diversion of the expedition to the support of the British Government in India, which in the early summer of 1857 was plunged into the great catastrophe of the Sepoy Mutiny.

II


DALHOUSIE AND THE SEPOY REVOLT

Great men of the highest rank have been numbered among the British Governors-General of India; brilliant men who might have achieved greatness but failed to do so; masterful men whose successes were achieved by methods which were sometimes questionable; strong men who went their way wisely and quietly, whose names the British public has almost forgotten. But in the whole series from Warren Hastings himself to the distinguished statesmen who are still living among us to-day there is no figure more remarkable than that of the man who left India at the beginning of 1856 after eight years of strenuous rule.

Two only among the great Governors-General, Wellesley and Dalhousie, have been guided by the conviction that it was desirable to seize every opportunity to bring native states under direct British dominion. All have recognised the necessity for asserting British influence and British control, but all the rest have done so with a distinct preference for maintaining the government of the native dynasty if it were practicable to do so. Dalhousie and Wellesley alone preferred on principle to substitute direct British dominion wherever it was possible to do so without positive injustice. The most extensive annexations were indeed those for which Lord Hastings was responsible; but in his case there had been no alternative; they were necessitated by the Maratha War. Wellesley had proceeded mainly by the method of subsidiary alliances, and in the case of Arcot by the ejection of a dynasty which had proved itself hopelessly unfit to govern.

Dalhousie now added to the British dominion by the conquest and annexation of the Punjab as already narrated, and, somewhat against his will, by the conquest and annexation of a great part of Burmah. In both cases the war was not of his making, and the annexation was bound to follow; but the case was very different in sundry other cases, where it may be laid down with certainty that Dalhousie's predecessors would not have annexed at all. Most of them were examples of "escheat"; that is to say, the territories passed to the paramount power, the suzerain, by lapse or failure of heirs, a process familiar alike to Western and to Indian law. The most prominent instance was that of Nagpur, where Lord Hastings in similar circumstances had not annexed but had preserved the native

government by setting up a Bhonsla who was of the kindred of the lapsed family, though he had no legal title to the succession. But Dalhousie,



when the Nagpur Rajah died without an heir, refused, acting perfectly within his legal rights, to seek for a native successor, and annexed the Nagpur territory.

But he went further than this in other cases. It had been customary for a Rajah, failing heirs of his body, to adopt a successor in accordance with Hindu law. The paramount power, whether the Moguls or the British, had never admitted an obligation to recognise adoption as conveying a title to the throne, but had habitually recognised it as a matter of grace. At Satara, Jhansi, and elsewhere Dalhousie refused to sanction adoption, and annexation by lapse was the necessary result. No one could dispute either the legality of his action or the immensely superior character of the administration by the British; but intense uneasiness was created among all the native dynasties who saw that a continuation of the process would gradually absorb the whole of India under direct British dominion. The final annexation was that of Oudh, but for a different reason—the persistent maladministration by the reigning Mohammedan dynasty in spite of repeated warnings. Here, however, the responsibility did not rest with Dalhousie, who had recommended a different course; and he had himself left India when the annexation was actually carried out in accordance with instructions from England.

Dalhousie during his term of office greatly extended the system of education, carried out immense public works, introduced the telegraph, initiated railway construction, developed the material prosperity of the country, and completely mastered the disorderly elements. The Punjab in particular, first under Henry Lawrence and then under his brother John, was converted into an exceedingly prosperous and, as was presently proved, loyal province. But Dalhousie's system had produced an intense unrest beneath the surface; it had involved a large increase in the native army, while, in spite of his own protests, this had been accompanied by a reduction in the number of the white troops. His masterfulness and his personal hold upon every branch of the administration had taught many of the higher officials to look to headquarters for direction instead of being prepared to take a vigorous initiative themselves; and thus Dalhousie's powerful rule even by its own efficiency and progressiveness prepared the way for the cataclysm which followed.

The mutiny is apt to be regarded outside of India as a somewhat unintelligible phenomenon, the outcome in part of the arrogant attitude of the British towards the natives and in part of a panic because of what was called the Cartridge Incident. As a matter of fact the phenomenon is perfectly intelligible if we attempt to realise the whole situation. In the first place the government was lulled into a sense of perfect security by the completeness of its power demonstrated during the régime of Lord Dalhousie, and also by the consciousness of the material advantages that the peoples were reaping or would reap from the excellence of its administration. That sense of security provided the very best opportunity for those who wished to organise a revolt. There were two groups of natives who had a very strong inducement in their own history to overthrow the British power, the Mohammedans who had been the lords of India, and the

Marathas who believed that they would have been the lords of India but for the British. The available instrument of revolution was there in the sepoy army, if it could be persuaded that its own interests lay in the overthrow of British dominion. The government in its unconsciousness blindly played into the hands of agitators by giving them the opportunity of appealing to the superstitious or religious terrors of the soldiery; and it had alienated the Hindu princes, who would normally prefer a British to a Mohammedan or a Maratha ascendancy, by its new attitude on the adoption question. As for the population at large it had been accustomed for centuries to treat wars and revolutions like earthquakes and famines as inflictions to which it had to submit passively without dreaming of taking a direct part. The elements which were not thus fatalistically peaceful were precisely those which very much preferred anarchy to any orderly government, and especially such a government as that of the British. Finally, all over Hindustan from the borders of Bengal proper to the river Sutlej there were swarms of native regiments, while the white troops could be reckoned in hundreds. The salvation of the British lay in the fact that there was not and could not be any national organisation of India for their overthrow because there was not and never had been an Indian nation. The overthrow of the British could only be followed by an internecine struggle for supremacy among the different divisions and cross divisions into which India was broken up by races, religions, and dynasties. The Mohammedans were not going to fight for Hindu liberties or a Maratha supremacy. The Marathas were not going to fight for a Mogul supremacy. The Rajput princes were not going to fight either for Marathas or for Mussulmans. There could be no common aim except a merely destructive one. And so when the insurrection came it was the work mainly of the Mogul faction, and was joined only by such Hindu princes or chiefs as had a personal grudge against the British Government. The Nizam remained loyal, though he found it hard to keep his troops in restraint; Sindhia remained loyal, though it was only for a time that he succeeded in keeping his soldiers in check. The Rajputs and the Punjab remained loyal, and in the end the Sikhs, who were traditional enemies of the Moguls and detested the Hindustanis, rendered splendid service to the British. Even in Oudh the great landowners or *talukdars* stood resolutely aloof until after the back of the revolt had been broken.

The organisers then of the revolt, so far as it was organised at all, were a Mussulman faction on the one hand, who intended to reinstate the Mogul empire over India, and on the other Nana Sahib, the adopted son of the last Peishwa who had been deposed in 1819. The Nana looked upon himself as the hereditary head of the Marathas, and he cherished an intense personal grudge against the British Government because, while it left him great estates, it had not continued to him the immense pension which it had allowed his adoptive father for life. The Nana secretly fomented sedition, while the Mussulman conspirators directed their especial attention

to the army, utilising for that purpose the superstitions of the Hindu soldiery as well as the sympathies of the Mohammedans. An ancient prophecy was circulated which pronounced that the British *Raj* would end with its hundredth year, 1857. Hindus and Mohammedans alike could never rid themselves of a belief that the British intended by force or by trickery to make them all Christians, for which Mohammedan rulers had given ample precedents in the forcible conversion of Hindus to Mohammedanism. The Hindus had recently been disturbed by being ordered to



Nana Sahib.

[From a sketch made in 1857.]


serve in Burmah; for the Hindu who crosses the seas thereby loses his caste, a matter at least as serious to him as excommunication to a Roman Catholic. This alarm was increased by a proclamation issued by Lord Canning, soon after his arrival as Governor-General in 1856, announcing that in future all regiments would be liable to service across the sea. Then came the Cartridge Incident. A new rifle was adopted in which greased cartridges were used, the tips of which the sepoy had to bite. It was reported that the grease was made from the fat of cattle and pigs. To the Mussulman the pig is an unclean animal and to the Hindu the cow is a sacred one. The panic was not allayed even by the withdrawal of the first batch of cartridges and the public declaration that the grease employed would be free from the obnoxious ingredients.

The whole sepoy army throughout Hindustan was in a ferment. Regiments began here and there to mutiny; then on May 10, 1857, the whole of the regiments at Mirat, a great military station in the north-west provinces, mutinied, killed every European they could lay hands on, marched upon Delhi, and proclaimed the restoration of the Mogul. In the next few weeks nearly every sepoy regiment between Delhi and Patna had thrown off its allegiance though Allahabad was secured, and almost all the British with the few sepoys who remained loyal were shut up in the Lucknow Residency, or at Cawnpore or Agra, or were assembled on the Ridge outside Delhi besieging a mutineer force in that city which outnumbered the besiegers by at least five to one.

Before the end of June Cawnpore had fallen. There a mere handful of combatants and a large number of non-combatants, women and children, were besieged by Nana Sahib. For three weeks the defence was maintained till the place had become untenable. Then the defenders took the only course open to them and surrendered on terms. They were to be sent

down the river in safety to Allahabad. They were crowded into boats and pushed off into the stream. Then the native boatmen slipped overboard, and the Nana's men from the shore began to pour volleys into the helpless fugitives. The treacherous attack was followed up by a general massacre of the men, while the women and children were carried back to captivity in Cawnpore.

From the end of June to the second half of September the interest of the great struggle concentrated at three points, the siege of Delhi by the small force on the Ridge, the defence of the Lucknow Residency, and the efforts of Sir Henry Havelock to effect the relief of Lucknow. The mutineers were assembled in force at Delhi itself, in the city of Lucknow, and at Cawnpore, blocking the advance of the relieving force. Until the latter part of August the six thousand men on the Ridge before Delhi were kept mainly on the defensive. By that time John Lawrence had been able to despatch a flying column from the Punjab under General Nicholson to reinforce the besieging army, followed at the beginning of September by a siege train, without which it would have been impossible to attempt the actual capture of the mutineer stronghold. By the daring and skill of the engineer operations, actively conducted by Alexander Taylor, breaching bat-



Sir John Lawrence.

teries were at last brought to bear on September 11th; on the 14th the Kashmir gate was blown up and the ramparts of Delhi were stormed; day by day the British troops fought their way into the city, and on the 21st they were in full possession, with the Mogul himself in their hands, though a large portion of the mutineer force was on its retreat to Lucknow.

Meanwhile at Lucknow itself the Residency held out stubbornly. The character of the defence may be gathered from the fact that no fewer than twenty-five mines were detected and exploded by the vigilance of the garrison engineers in nine weeks. The force was never in actual danger of starvation, but the absolutely ceaseless strain was terrific; practically no news could be obtained from outside; a serious loss had been suffered by the death of Sir Henry Lawrence in the first week of the siege, and even the loyal sepoy, splendidly as they fought, were declaring that they must

march out on October 1st unless relief had arrived, when Havelock and Outram broke their way in on September 25th and the pressing danger was averted.

Havelock had begun his march from Allahabad on July 7th with two thousand men all told, a quarter of whom were sepoys. The first object was to rescue the captives at Cawnpore, the next to advance through Oudh to Lucknow. On the tenth day he reached Cawnpore. On one day he had fought two successive actions, and on this tenth day three. He was too late. When Nana Sahib found that nothing could stop Havelock, he deliberately butchered the women and children in cold blood and flung the bodies of his victims into a well. Never in our history had such a cry for vengeance arisen as when the story of that hideous crime was told.



The Memorial Well at Cawnpore.

Havelock crossed the Ganges and drove the rebels before him in one fight after another; but cholera had attacked his force, and now came news that down the river Dinapur had mutinied and on the west the Gwalior army was on the march. With-

out some reinforcement it was impossible to advance, and he had to fall back on Cawnpore itself. It was an unfortunate necessity, for it made the people of Oudh imagine that the relief was abandoned and the triumph of the mutiny was assured, so that the talukdars no longer ventured to restrain their dependents from joining the insurgents.

Nevertheless reinforcements under Outram did arrive. On the day after the ramparts of Delhi were stormed, Havelock and Outram joined hands at Cawnpore, their whole force numbering three thousand men. Outram, the senior officer, would not deprive his heroic comrade of the glory of achieving the relief, but chose instead to serve as a volunteer under him. Ten days later they drove their way through the mutineer hosts, and the Lucknow Residency was secured.

The tide had been stemmed; now it turned. Sir Colin Campbell had already arrived in India to take the chief command. On November 17th he effected the actual relief of the Residency, the non-combatants were withdrawn, the position so long and so stubbornly defended was abandoned, and a strong garrison was placed instead under Outram in the neighbouring fort called the Alam Bagh. Havelock's work was already done; that typical Puritan hero passed away a few days after Sir Colin's arrival.

There was still plenty for the commander-in-chief to do. The city of Lucknow was still held by an immense force of mutineers. On the south-west the Gwalior army, under the one really capable mutineer leader, Tantia Topi, had joined Nana Sahib at Cawnpore. Not three weeks after the relief of the Residency, on December 6th, Campbell routed and split the enemy's force, driving the Nana over the Ganges in one direction and Tantia Topi over the Jumna in another. On March 17th Lucknow itself was captured after hard fighting. Meanwhile Sir Hugh Rose had been conducting a brilliant campaign in Central India, and at the beginning of April he put



Sir Henry Havelock.

[After the portrait by Frederick Goodall, R.A.]

Tantia Topi finally to rout and captured Jhansi, the last real stronghold of resistance, though many months still passed before the last embers of the great revolt were stamped out. Only in the final stage the Oudh talukdars had taken alarm at a proclamation issued by the Governor-General and had thrown themselves actively into the revolt when it was already hopeless.

No episode in our history has in it so much of tragedy, none more of heroism than the story of the Indian Mutiny, when the British fought with their backs to the wall shoulder to shoulder with loyal natives; when numbers of women showed a supreme fortitude in the day of supreme horror. But not the least heroic among many heroic figures was that

of Lord Canning, the Governor-General, who, in the midst of such a storm of wrath as never before or since has moved the British people, dared to face bitter obloquy, fierce denunciation, and angry ridicule, while he held fast to the principles of justice and refused to seek an indiscriminating revenge. The name of "Clemency" Canning, flung at him in scorn, will cling to him through the ages as a high title of honour.


The mutiny brought the end of the old order. It convinced the government at home that the time had definitely come for ending the old East India Company and transferring the government of India to the Crown. It was not British dominion but the dominion of the East India Company which lasted for a hundred years. The India Act of 1858 established the system under which the government of India is vested in the Viceroy and Council, responsible to the Secretary of State for India, who is a member of the ministry responsible to Parliament. The first Viceroy under the new régime was the last Governor-General under the old, Clemency Canning.

III

PALMERSTON


While the Indian Mutiny was still in progress the Chinese war was brought apparently to a conclusion. The French were associated in it with the British because they had taken the opportunity to press demands of their own, and the Chinese governor, who defied the British, had issued a proclamation setting a price upon the heads of Frenchmen as well as Englishmen. In January 1858 Canton was captured. The Chinese government made no reply to peace proposals, so the Europeans attacked the Pihò River, destroyed the forts which were intended to secure it, and advanced to Tien-tsin. There a treaty was concluded in June, by which the Chinese were forced to open some additional ports and the rights and powers of jurisdiction of the foreigners were defined.

The announcement of the peace did not fall to the Palmerston Government, which had come to a sudden and unexpected end in February. An attempt was made upon the life of the French Emperor by throwing bombs under his carriage. The principal conspirator was a man named Orsini, who had been a refugee in England while the plan was concocted. In France there was great excitement and a clamour for severe repressive measures in England. Language of a highly aggressive and bombastic character was used, which created corresponding irritation among the British. Palmerston and Clarendon were the last men to yield on points where British honour and British interests were concerned; but Palmerston desired to remain on good terms with the Emperor, and there was obvious reason at the bottom of the clamour in France when the right of asylum



THE TOWN FORT AND HARBOUR OF BOMBAY FROM MALABAR HILL IN 1800

From a print published in that year.



PART OF THE CITY OF BOMBAY AND BACK BAY, SEEN FROM MALABAR HILL, IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

From a photograph by Johnston and Hoffman.

in England for political refugees was utilised for the concoction of assassination plots. Lord Palmerston introduced what is known as the Conspiracy to Murder Bill. Conspiracy to murder was a capital offence in Ireland, but only a misdemeanour in England. The bill proposed to make it both in England and Ireland a felony punishable by transportation or imprisonment with hard labour, without respect to the particular country in which it was intended that the murder should be committed. But the country took it as a base submission to the threats of France, while advanced Liberals regarded it as a surrender of the right of asylum. The Government was defeated, and Palmerston resigned. For the second time Lord Derby took office, with Disraeli as the leader of the Conservative party in the House of Commons.

The fall of the Palmerston ministry followed upon the introduction of a bill for transferring the government of India to the Crown. A new bill was now introduced, remarkably ingenious, but obviously open to the most hostile criticism; yet the Liberals, seriously shaken by the dissensions which had brought about the fall of the late administration, were by no means anxious to turn the new Government out, though they could hardly have avoided voting against the bill. Both parties, then, accepted Russell's proposal that the bill should be withdrawn, the sense of the House taken upon a series of resolutions, and a bill then introduced embodying the views which had found favour, the scheme not being treated as a party question at all. The plan was successfully followed; the India Act was passed, and the government of the great dependency was transferred to the Crown.

For some years past there had been a growing inclination in the country to recognise the need of further parliamentary reform. Palmerston, however, with a considerable section of the Liberals, was by no means willing



Queen Victoria in 1857.

[From a pastel painting by Alexander Blaikley.]

to proceed further in the direction of democracy, and the question had more than once been shelved. But now the Conservatives were uneasily dominated by the personality of their brilliant leader in the House of Commons, Benjamin Disraeli. Disraeli was a man of ideas, to an extent exceedingly rare among British politicians. Those ideas were as remote as possible from the unimaginative conservatism, which views with alarm any possible change from that to which it has been accustomed, and remains blind to altering conditions, impervious to new facts. But he had thrown in his lot with the Conservative party; it was the instrument with which he had to work, and he had to educate it into acceptance of his leadership along paths which it would never have dreamt of treading on its own account. Disraeli was not afraid of democracy, because he believed in his own power of leadership and in popular support as the strongest basis on which government can rest. He saw now his opportunity for transforming the Conservatives into the popular party, and came forward as the advocate of parliamentary reform, which the Liberals had successfully relegated to the background.



Benjamin Disraeli.

[From an early portrait in the "Maclise Portrait Gallery."]

But Disraeli had not yet realised that he was too ingenious both for the old Tories and for the country at large. The Government bill was full of subtle devices which, in the eyes of a suspicious Opposition, were intended only to bring into the enlarged franchise classes whose interest it would be to vote for the Conservatives, while shutting out those who were likely to vote Liberal; whereas to cautious

Conservatives it seemed fraught with democratic perils. The Reform Bill was thrown out, Lord Derby appealed to the country, and when the new Parliament met a vote of "no confidence" in the Government was immediately carried. Lord Derby resigned, Russell consented to serve under Palmerston with the charge of the Foreign Office, and all administration was formed which remained in power till Palmerston's death.

It was inevitable in the circumstances that the new Government should bring in a reform bill of its own. But as a matter of fact the country, the House, and the Cabinet were all apathetic. It was not difficult to find excuses for postponement, and the postponement was in effect a withdrawal. The question was once more shelved, and it was generally understood that it would not again be officially brought forward under Palmerston. The interest of domestic affairs during Palmerston's premiership centres almost entirely in the series of budgets by which Gladstone, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, carried to completion the system of Free Trade which logically

followed upon the financial policy of Sir Robert Peel. Incidentally one of Gladstone's finance bills foreshadowed the great collision between the two Houses of Parliament which was precipitated by another finance bill almost fifty years afterwards.

No effective movement was made in this direction in the 1859 budget, because the European situation was threatening, an increased expenditure was anticipated, and, instead of reducing taxation, Gladstone increased the income tax, a course which was held preferable to that of raising a loan. It was in effect becoming a recognised principle that the year's expenditure should be met out of the year's revenue whenever the country was not actually at war. But before the next budget was introduced in 1860 a commercial treaty was entered upon with France which was negotiated by Richard Cobden, the great apostle of Free Trade. Napoleon III. himself was a believer in the economic doctrines which now held the field in England; but neither in France nor speaking generally in the rest of Europe were those doctrines accepted. The treaty, therefore, went just as far as the emperor could venture. Cobden and the free-traders themselves believed in the commercial advantage of abolishing all tariffs, whether foreign countries adopted the same system or no; although they anticipated that foreign countries would adopt the system and that British commerce would gain all the more, an anticipation which has not been fulfilled. But in form the commercial treaty was one of reciprocity; that is, France agreed to abolish prohibitions and to reduce the duties on practically all British goods, while no preference was to be given to goods from any other country. On the other hand, Britain removed the tariff on very nearly all imported goods.

This principle was embodied in the budget of 1860. Of the four hundred and nineteen articles still on the schedule all but forty-eight were struck off. Between 1845 and 1859 more than seven hundred had been removed. As regards the forty-eight articles now remaining, none of the duties were either preferential or protective; that is to say, the whole of the proceeds went directly to the revenue, all producers competing on equal terms so far as British taxation was concerned. In spite of the greatly diminished cost of collection, it was estimated that the immediate loss to revenue would exceed two millions, although the Chancellor of the Exchequer looked forward to increased receipts in the future from articles on which the duty was reduced. For the time, therefore, the full amount of the duties on tea and sugar was retained and the income tax was placed at tenpence.

At this date a very substantial item in the national revenue was derived from the tax upon paper, which it was now proposed to abolish. This was a demand which the Radicals had been urging, because the high price of paper stood in the way of the publication of cheap literature. From the high Conservative point of view the publication of cheap literature appeared to be not desirable but dangerous, since it would enable the lucubrations of

agitators to be scattered broadcast. But, apart from this, it appeared at least questionable whether cheaper literature was needed more urgently than cheaper tea and sugar. Palmerston himself and many other Liberals viewed the proposal with anything but enthusiasm. The bill for the abolition of the paper duties was not incorporated with the rest of the financial proposals for the year in one bill, but stood by itself. It was passed in the House of Commons by a majority of fifty on the second reading, but on the third reading the majority dwindled to nine. The bill went up to the House of Lords. Since the days of the Stuarts the Lords had never interfered with a finance bill; but Lord Lyndhurst, a former Conservative Lord Chancellor, now led the opposition to the paper bill, laying it down as the law of the constitution that, while the Lords might not amend a finance bill, they had the right of rejecting it in its entirety, and were therefore free to reject this particular bill if they thought fit. The Opposition were victorious, and the Lords threw out the bill by a large majority.

It is curious to find that the Prime Minister expressed to the Queen his own personal conviction beforehand that if the Lords rejected the bill they would deserve well of the country, although the Cabinet, of which he was the head, was responsible for it. Extreme indignation, however, was aroused by the action of the Lords, and a violent collision was only averted when Palmerston introduced in the House of Commons a series of resolutions, claiming that the Commons alone had the right of controlling supplies, that the Lords' right of rejecting money bills was viewed with extreme jealousy by the Commons, and in effect that the remedy lay within the hands of the Commons themselves. Effect was given to the resolution by the Commons in the following year when the paper bill was incorporated with the rest of the budget. The Lords did not venture to throw out the budget in its entirety, and thus the abolition of the paper duties was carried. The right of the Lords to throw out a money bill was not again asserted until 1909.

The expansion of trade and the increase of revenue derived from the lowered duties were so remarkable that, in spite of increased expenditure on national defence, the income tax, the tea duties, and the sugar duties were all materially reduced in 1863 and 1864. The rapid increase in the national wealth may be realised from the fact that between 1842 and 1861 the assessments for income tax rose more than forty per cent.; and the increase in the last eight years had been more than three times as great as that in the first ten. It was this enormous advance which completely established the almost universal conviction which prevailed throughout the rest of the century that Protectionism was absolutely dead and could never be revived.

In the summer of 1865 Parliament was dissolved after a life of six years. Several successes in bye-elections had produced an impression that the Conservatives would come back to Parliament in greatly increased

numbers. But the anticipation was not fulfilled. Palmerston was still the most popular minister in the country; he commanded a great amount of support from Conservative sentiment, and his majority when the new Parliament met numbered more than sixty. But his reign was almost over. He was past eighty years of age; he had recently been suffering from ill-health; and in October he died, two days after his eighty-first birthday. The long truce was over; the battle of democracy was immediately to be renewed.

IV

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The period of the Derby and Palmerston administrations was one of arrested activities at home. Foreign affairs were of a more exciting order.



The capture of the North Fort at Piho, August 1860.

[From a sketch made on the spot.]

We had affairs of our own to settle with the Chinese and Japanese, and also in the neighbourhood of the African Gold Coast, all of them involving military or naval operations. But also we had in Europe the exceedingly difficult task of endeavouring to assert ourselves effectively and at the same time avoiding war; while events in the United States provided an equally difficult problem in another hemisphere.

The Chinese trouble had not after all been settled by the Treaty of Tien-tsin since the Chinese government took no steps towards acting upon it. When the French and English envoys endeavoured, in accordance with the terms of the treaty, to make their way to Peking, they found the forts on the Piho rebuilt, the obstructions in the river restored, and their own passage refused. An attempt to carry the forts was repulsed; and the usual necessity in dealing with orientals followed, of despatching


an irresistible joint force of British and French. An ultimatum forwarded to Peking was rejected. The Piho forts were taken after hard fighting. A conference was arranged to take place near Peking, but the British officials who were sent forward to meet the Chinese commissioners were treacherously seized, some of them murdered, and others imprisoned. Lord Elgin, the British Plenipotentiary, demanded their release within three days; as they were not released the army advanced, and seized and sacked the celebrated "summer palace." The Chinese, however, now found resistance useless, the prisoners were released, the allies occupied Peking, and the Chinese submitted to the terms dictated. The previous treaty was ratified, a large indemnity paid, and the port of Tien-tsin was opened.

Japan had hitherto cut herself off from the outside world even more completely than China. Until 1858 the Dutch were the only foreigners admitted to trade, and that only under very restricted conditions. At that time, however, Lord Elgin procured a treaty of commerce under which five ports were opened to British subjects, and a British embassy and consular agents were admitted. Four years later a Japanese embassy visited England. But the Japanese were not yet reconciled to the presence of foreigners. A member of the British embassy at Yokohama was murdered. Compensation was demanded; the compensation was promised but not paid, and the ports were closed. The British admiral in those seas seized some Japanese ships at Kagosima. The batteries on the shore opened fire on the squadron, and the squadron bombarded Kagosima. Thereupon the Japanese gave way, and the ports were again opened.

The African affair referred to was an expedition from the Gold Coast against Ashanti, a somewhat futile demonstration against a savage native potentate who had been harrying friendly tribes. Such expeditions in peculiarly unhealthy regions are inevitably costly both in lives and in money, and, necessary though they are, always appear to be unproductive. The Ashanti expedition of 1864 was no exception to the general rule.

Meanwhile Europe and America kept Lord John Russell at the Foreign Office very fully occupied, and it is possible that, but for the restraining influence of the Queen and of the Prince Consort while he lived, the self-assertiveness of Russell and Palmerston might have involved the country in war. Grave European complications arose at the beginning of 1859 in Italy. The hopes of Italian nationalism centred in Victor Emmanuel, the King of Sardinia, and the first condition for Italian nationalism was the ending of the Austrian supremacy in North Italy. Victor Emmanuel's great minister, Cavour, secured the alliance of the French Emperor, and, after the failure of attempts to procure a European conference, a campaign was opened in Northern Italy in which the arms of the allies were successful. Napoleon, however, was playing for his own hand and stopped short of driving the Austrians out of the Peninsula. A temporary arrangement was arrived at, at the Treaty of Villafranca, by which Austria gave up Lombardy to Sardinia, Sardinia gave up Nice to France, and the former ducal dynasties were to

be restored in the Italian duchies. But the duchies entirely declined to accept the arrangement and were solidly determined to annex themselves to Sardinia. The British Government had refused to intervene, while displaying the strongest sympathy with the Italian movement, and by its attitude it probably prevented Prussia from lending aid to Austria. Now its attitude was again the decisive factor in the situation. British influence



Lord Palmerston.

[From a photograph.]

was exerted to the utmost to prevent any interference with the duchies in deciding their own fate.

Austria accepted the situation, and those of the duchies which desired it—which meant every one of them—were permitted to annex themselves to the kingdom of Northern Italy. France however demanded the cession to herself of Savoy, which Savoy itself favoured. But the whole performance fomented British distrust of Napoleon, whose selfish designs had been made unmistakably clear. Ostensibly the two Powers had been working together; but in fact the action of the British had thwarted the

Emperor's real intentions. The sudden insurrection of Sicily led by the warrior-hero of Italian liberty, Garibaldi, the overthrow of the Bourbon dynasty of Naples, the skilfully audacious management of the situation by Cavour, and the voluntary annexation of the Southern state to Sardinia, made Victor Emmanuel King of Italy, with the exception of Rome, which was still held by the Pope under French protection, and of Venetia, which was still an Austrian province. In these developments the attitude of the British Government once more went far towards preventing active intervention by any other of the Powers.

Very much less satisfactory, on the other hand, was the line taken by the Foreign Secretary, now raised to the peerage as Earl Russell, in connection with other European complications. The exceedingly intricate question of the sovereignty of Schleswig-Holstein, provinces attached to the kingdom of Denmark, became acute. Very few people indeed understood them, but to the British public it seemed that Prussia and Austria were combining to rob the little state of Denmark. It appeared that the Powers had guaranteed the integrity of Denmark, and popular sentiment was greatly excited. Russell remonstrated in a manner which was absurd, unless it was intended to back the remonstrance by force of arms, a course which the country would probably have endorsed. Already Russell had followed a similar line in addressing bellicose remonstrances to Russia on her treatment of an insurrection in Poland, when he had also induced Napoleon to remonstrate; but he had then permitted both the Tsar and the French Emperor to see that the remonstrance would not be backed by force. Both the Western Powers were snubbed for their pains. Now, therefore, when Russell invited Napoleon to join in bringing diplomatic pressure to bear upon Austria and Prussia on behalf of Denmark, the Emperor declined to subject himself to the risk of another affront, and for the second time Britain was placed in an ignominious position in the eyes of Europe. British prestige suffered severely, not from British non-intervention, but because non-intervention had been preceded by threatening language to which the minister who used it had never been prepared to give actual effect.

Altogether different was the tone adopted by the British Government in relation to the great civil war which broke out in the United States of America early in 1861. There the attitude assumed was one of determined neutrality. The Southern States declared their right to separate themselves from the union and form a distinct confederation. Their ostensible reason for doing so was the claim of the central government of the whole body to exercise over the separate states a larger control than it was entitled to in the eyes of those states. The immediate cause was the growing determination of the Northern States to abolish slavery. The Northern States denied the right of secession, claiming that the union was a "federal" one, in which case the attempt at separation is rebellion. The Southern States claimed that the Union was a "confederation" from which any member is


entitled to separate itself. Hence the names "Confederates" applied to the Southern States and "Federalists" applied to the Northerners. The British Government declined to judge between them. Popular sentiment was violently divided, the passionate horror of slavery drawing one section of the public into fervent sympathy with the North, while the political advocacy of the right of self-government, which in fact had originally brought the United States into being, attracted the sympathies of another section to the Confederates. It must also be remarked that the sporting instincts of the British people were a powerful influence in favour of the South, since it was fighting against heavy odds.

In America, however, British neutrality was viewed with extreme indignation. That the indignation was unjustified is most effectively proved by the fact that North and South felt it in almost equal degree, each being firmly convinced that right was on its side and that it was monstrous for the British not to act on that assumption. The Northerners felt that American nationality was at stake, while to many of them it seemed impossible to question that every right-thinking man was bound to give his whole sympathies to the abolition of slavery. The Southerners felt that they were fighting for a principle of political freedom which ought to appeal to every Briton; they had been brought up to believe that slavery was a system emphatically sanctioned by Scripture, and half of them were much more alive to the condition of perfect contentment in which most of the slaves lived in the older states than to the ghastly abuses to which the whole system was liable. Therefore neither side forgave the British for not giving it whole-hearted and uncompromising support.

The attitude of neutrality was at first advantageous to the South, whose arms were the more successful, for the British Government recognised the South as belligerents not rebels. Sympathy with the South in England was increased by the affair of the *Trent*, which very nearly involved Great Britain in the war. The Southerners, having set up a government of their own, despatched two commissioners to England and France. The commissioners reached a neutral port and embarked on a British vessel, the *Trent*. The *Trent* was boarded by a Federal warship and the commissioners were carried off. A declaration of war was only averted when President Lincoln gave way to the demands of the British Government and released the commissioners.

On the other hand, the Federalists had serious cause of complaint. It was found that ships were built and fitted out in British docks and sailed from British ports with apparently harmless intent, their real destination, to be employed as cruisers by the Confederates, having been carefully concealed. It was claimed that the British Government did not display due vigilance in preventing such action, the most notorious instance being that of the *Alabama*. The British Government flatly repudiated the charge, but when the war had terminated in favour of the North, immense claims were brought forward for damages in respect of the depredations wrought by the cruisers.

Another circumstance offered a very strong inducement to the British Government to render effective support to the South. The blockade of the Southern ports cut off the supplies of raw cotton on which the great Lancashire cotton industry was mainly dependent. The cotton famine deprived vast numbers of the Lancashire operatives of their means of livelihood. Immense credit was due to the Government and to the lavish generosity of the general public for the admirably organised efforts to relieve the terrible distress which resulted. But still higher praise is due to the operatives themselves for the splendid self-control they displayed. Had



The "Alabama."

[From a sketch by Charles W. Wyllie.]

they clamoured as they might well have done for a refusal to recognise the blockade of the Southern ports as efficient, so that the cotton ships might have sailed, the Government could hardly have resisted. But the Lancashire men, in spite of their own sufferings, would not urge a course which would help in the perpetuation of slavery, and they bore their deprivations with a noble fortitude which exhibited the character of the British working-man in the very highest light.

The resolute neutrality preserved from the beginning to the end of the war was bitterly resented for opposite reasons both by the North and by the South; and in that fact is to be found the very strongest testimony to the essential justice of the British attitude and to the dignified self-control displayed by the Palmerston Government.

V

AFTER PALMERSTON

The death of Palmerston involved little change in the ministry, but it restored Earl Russell to his old position as leader of the Liberal party, and it removed the great check upon the activities of the more advanced section of that party. Forty years before, Russell had already been conspicuous as the importunate advocate of parliamentary reform; and if he had declared himself satisfied with the great Reform Act, he had nevertheless for several years past been an advocate of further franchise extension. The question, however, was one on which it was almost certain the Liberals would split, since the Palmerstonian section was averse from any further democratic movement. But before the meeting of the Parliament which was destined to take up the question of reform, Irish affairs once more assumed a prominence which they had lost since Smith O'Brien's abortive insurrection in 1848.

The destitution of the Irish peasantry intensified by the famine had brought about an immense emigration to America. Under the then existing conditions of industry and agriculture the country had become over-populated; emigration relieved the strain, the excessive supply of labour in comparison with the actual demand was diminished, and the state of the country generally appeared to improve. But the emigrants departed to America with bitterness in their hearts, and the Irish in the United States became a new and disturbing factor in the Irish problem. In their eyes the root cause of the evils which had driven them into exile was the British dominion, and for many of them the release of their native country from what they regarded as a foreign yoke became a passion. In 1858 the Fenian Brotherhood was formed among them, a secret organisation having severance from England as its avowed aim and secret warfare as its avowed method, since open war was out of the question and force was regarded as the sole possible instrument for achieving the end in view. The strength of the movement lay in America, for it was essentially political, neither agrarian nor religious, appealing very little to the Irish peasant and not at all to the Irish priest. And the organisation gathered a new strength from the American Civil War. Irishmen fought in the ranks on both sides, and learnt something of discipline and of military organisation; and the leaders were not without hope that the hostility to the British which had been aroused in America might be utilised to further their schemes.

Secret societies, however, rarely remain for long exempt from the activities of informers. Acting upon information, the Government in Ireland suddenly arrested a number of the Fenian ringleaders and seized their papers. They were condemned to long terms of imprisonment, and

the widespread character of the conspiracy was revealed. The Habeas Corpus Act was suspended, numerous other arrests were made, there was a hasty exodus of Fenians, and the United States Government dashed all hopes of assistance from that quarter by suppressing raids over the Canadian frontier.

In March Lord Russell's Reform Bill was introduced by Gladstone, who had succeeded Palmerston as leader of the Liberals in the House of Commons. The county franchise was to be lowered to £14 and the borough franchise to £7. It was estimated that some four hundred thousand voters would thus be added to the register. The bill went far enough to excite the alarm of the Conservative element, but not far enough to arouse enthusiasm on the other side. It was opposed by a section of the Liberals who were nicknamed the "Adullamites" by John Bright, who likened them to the followers of the outlawed David. The bill passed its second reading by a majority of only five, and an adverse vote in committee induced the Government to resign. For the third time Lord Derby took office, with Disraeli as his Chancellor of the Exchequer and leader of the House of Commons.

The introduction of the Reform Bill had been received in the country with apparent apathy, but its rejection aroused a surprising amount of resentment. A great Reform demonstration was announced to be held in Hyde Park. At the last moment the authorities closed the park gates, and it was not surprising that the mob which assembled broke down the park railings and behaved with considerable violence and disorderliness, though no very serious damage was done and no lives were lost. A vigorous oratorical campaign was opened in the country, and the result was that when Parliament met again at the beginning of 1867 Disraeli had persuaded his colleagues that they must carry a Reform Bill themselves.

It was Disraeli's intention to follow the precedent of the India Act, removing the bill out of the sphere of party politics and proceeding by resolutions on which a bill was ultimately to be based. The plan failed. The central idea of Disraeli's scheme was to admit working-men to the franchise, but to check the power given them through their numerical preponderance by multiplying the votes of the educated and propertied classes. The last bill had been defeated on an adverse motion substituting rating for rental as the basis of qualification for the franchise, a difference of which the main effect was to exclude the "compound householder," the man who in paying his rent compounded for the rates which were paid not by him but by the landlord. Accordingly the resolutions for the new bill set £6 in the boroughs and £20 in the counties, on the rating basis, as the qualification; but sundry "fancy franchises" were added giving a separate vote apart from property qualification to ministers of religion, university graduates, and any one who had £30 in the savings bank, £50 in the funds, or who paid 20s. or more of income tax. The reception of the resolutions was unfavourable; they were thereupon withdrawn under

promise that a fresh bill should be formulated, and some Conservative stalwarts retired from the ministry, most notable among whom was Lord Cranborne, who was destined at a later day, as Marquess of Salisbury, to lead the Conservative party.

The new bill when introduced proved to be more democratic than the resolutions. It proposed to give the franchise in the boroughs to all householders who paid their own rates, with a fifteen pound rating franchise in the counties. But the fancy franchises remained, with the further proviso that they conferred an extra vote on those persons possessing them who were otherwise qualified to vote as householders. The bill as it stood was acceptable neither to the advanced Liberals nor to the cautious Conservatives. Lord Derby himself described it as a "leap in the dark." To Disraeli it was a party bid for popular favour, intended, as Derby phrased it, to "dish the Whigs"; but at the same time it expressed his own genuine convictions first that the people ought to be admitted to a larger share of political power, and, secondly, that education and intelligence should be called in to counterbalance the mere counting of heads. In the eyes of Liberals the fancy franchises were of course a mere party move to increase the influence of Conservative voters. The one unmistakable fact about the bill was that it would not go through unless it was made acceptable to the Opposition, and the Opposition was by no means at one. A number of Liberals voted against Gladstone's amendment that there should be a five pound rating limit, and that above that limit the compound householder should have the vote. Gladstone however recovered his mastery of the party, and it would be difficult to say whether the Act which was finally passed was more his or Disraeli's. Double votes and the fancy franchises disappeared. In boroughs the householder and the £10 lodger were qualified after a year's residence. In the counties the qualification was lowered to £12. The compound householder difficulty was solved by an amendment which abolished compounding in parliamentary boroughs. No borough with a population of less than ten thousand was to have two members. The members thus removed were in part added to the county representation, nine new boroughs were created, and six large towns acquired an additional member. Corresponding but not identical Acts were afterwards passed for Scotland and Ireland. The grand practical effect of the whole was that the urban working-man acquired a vote but the agricultural labourer did not. The latter remained without the franchise till seventeen years later.

The Liberal Government had not succeeded in getting rid of the Fenian problem. The Derby administration found it necessary to maintain and to renew the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, and at first that policy seemed to be sufficiently effective. Nevertheless, early in 1867 a series of sporadic insurrections took place in Ireland, apparently with the simple intention of keeping up a continual and ubiquitous disturbance; for the armed bands were always easily dispersed, nor was popular

sympathy expressed by the usual method, the refusal of juries to convict. The Fenians, however, were not content with their efforts in Ireland. Early in the year a plot for capturing the castle and military stores at Chester was frustrated, and in September a desperate attempt was made at Manchester to release by force a couple of Fenians who had been arrested actually on a charge of burglary. A police officer was killed, and consequently three of the men concerned were hanged, somewhat unfortunately, since it led to their glorification as the "Manchester Martyrs." Then came a desperate attempt to blow up a part of Clerkenwell gaol, resulting in the death of twelve persons and in injuries to some hundred more. Fenianism altogether failed to accomplish anything, and after the Clerkenwell affair it died out. But it was itself merely a symptom of the disaffection which had taken root not in Ireland itself but among the Irish in America, a disaffection which was still to play a serious part in the Irish problem.

At the beginning of 1868 Lord Derby, whose health was failing, retired. However uneasy the Conservatives might feel under the audacious guidance of Disraeli, there was no man in either House whose claims to the party leadership could for a moment be compared to his, and he now became Prime Minister. He had already achieved the passage of a democratic reform bill by a Conservative ministry, but only through repeated concessions to the Liberals. The Government held office under a tenure too precarious to last. It was perhaps the Fenian movement which established in the mind of Gladstone, the leader of the Opposition, the conviction that Irish unrest was to be removed by attacking its root causes, which in his view were the religious and agrarian difficulties. If these were removed it was still his conviction that the political grievance would be found to have no independent life. Ireland, therefore, was selected as the point of attack. Always a fervent Churchman, Gladstone until recently had been a strong upholder of all ecclesiastical claims. Latterly, however, he had spoken ominously concerning the position of the Church in Ireland, and he now brought forward resolutions in favour of Irish Disestablishment. The Government was defeated, but Disraeli's proposal, that the Scottish and Irish Acts consequent upon the English Reform Act should be passed in the summer and that there should be an autumn dissolution, was accepted. The appeal was made to the new constituencies in November, and the new constituencies returned the Liberals with a decisive majority of one hundred and twelve.

Since the death of Palmerston the policy of non-intervention in Europe had been followed on the same principles as before by both Governments, though with an avoidance of the indiscretions which had occasionally given it such an unfortunate colour. Austria and Prussia were left to fight out their struggle for supremacy in Germany in the brief but decisive Seven Weeks War of 1866; while the diplomacy of Lord Stanley at the Foreign Office was of material influence in averting the immediate danger

of a war between France and Prussia. Outside Europe the conduct of Theodore, the "Negus" of Abyssinia, in imprisoning sundry British officials and other residents, necessitated the despatch of an expedition to that country at the beginning of 1868. The command was given to Sir Robert Napier. The campaign was conducted with entire success. It was inglorious because the resistance offered by the enemy was merely futile, but the highest praise was due to the commander because it was conducted in an extremely difficult country, while the utmost rapidity of movement was essential in order to ensure the withdrawal of the forces before the summer. Napier's army was drawn from India, but it is not easy to perceive how the British Government justified itself in charging India with the cost of the expedition.

The reorganisation in India, in the years following the Mutiny, under Canning, Elgin, and Lawrence, cannot be adequately described without entering upon technicalities more fully than is possible in these pages. Certain points however may be noted. Dalhousie's policy of refusing to recognise adoptions was explicitly set aside. The Oudh talukdars found that the government was ready to make full allowance for the misapprehensions under which they had at the last revolted; their treatment was acknowledged by themselves as generous, and they became once more thoroughly loyal. All the princes who had remained faithful found their services amply recognised; and beyond the border Lord Lawrence laid down those principles of non-intervention and "masterly inactivity" in Afghanistan which were presently to be challenged by the advocates of what is called the Forward Policy. On the death of Dost Mohammed the various claimants to the succession were left to fight out their own quarrels, and it was not until all rivals had been crushed or expelled that the British Government definitely recognised the Amir Sher Ali as the friendly ruler of an independent state.

In the colonies the close of 1865 witnessed an unhappy episode in Jamaica. An insurrection of the black population was attributed largely to the inflammatory language used by a native proprietor and preacher, George William Gordon. The insurrection was sharply suppressed by Governor Eyre, whose previous record proved his natural inclination to deal sympathetically with native populations. Martial law was proclaimed and Gordon was arrested, sentenced by a court-martial, and put to death. The severity however with which the insurrection was suppressed, the numerous executions, and the floggings to which women as well as men were subjected, created intense indignation in England; while, on the other hand, there was a powerful party which insisted that the principles of government applicable to white races are not applicable to black populations, with whom severities are necessary which would be wantonly brutal if employed in a European community. On the whole, in spite of many great names in the list of those who headed the attack on the governor, public opinion condoned if it did not entirely endorse his action. All parties, it may be

said, agreed in principle that the rights of coloured races must be protected, while the supremacy of the white race must be maintained ; but there is an eternal antagonism over individual cases in which the two principles come into conflict.

One event of supreme importance in the history of the British Empire remains to be recorded here. By an Act in 1867, the British North America Act, the colonies were authorised to unite under a federal government. All the North American colonies with the exception of Newfoundland came into the new arrangement and formed the great Dominion of Canada, the separate colonies or states having their own governments for the control of their own affairs, while those which are the common concern of all were in the hands of the single central government. Thus began that system of associating the colonies into federated groups in which present-day Imperialism is finding the solution of the problem of combining self-government with imperial unity.

VI

MID-VICTORIAN

In the years which passed between 1852 and 1869 great events occupied public attention—the establishment of the Second Empire in France, the Crimean War, the Indian Mutiny, the Unification of Italy, the American Civil War, and the decisive contest between Austria and Prussia. They ended with the Act which transformed the British House of Commons, at the instance of a Conservative ministry, into a body representing a democratic instead of a bourgeois electorate. But they were years in which domestic progress flowed on and the tide of material prosperity rose higher and higher, undisturbed and unaided by any heroic legislation or startling innovations. No sweeping changes came over the face of the land ; no mechanical inventions broke in upon the consistent development of the established system of manufacture, of traffic and of commerce.

The great names which had come to the front in literature in the previous twenty years were still the leading names, though in poetry they were most notably reinforced by Matthew Arnold, Swinburne, and Rossetti, and among novelists by George Eliot and Charles Reade. Still more characteristic of the period, however, as finished expressions of its placid conventions, were the by no means profound works of Anthony Trollope and Charlotte Yonge. While poets and novelists accomplished work of the highest rank, and in work sometimes of a much lower order produced photographic pictures of the life and manners and customs of mid-Victorian upper middle-class life ; while Carlyle and Ruskin, each after his own inspiring, if occasionally erratic, fashion, upheld moral ideals to an age which presented itself to their eyes as drearily materialistic and hidebound



WINNIPEG IN 1870


In the background is Fort Garry. On this site now stands the Union Station of the Grand Trunk Railway. From a painting of 1870 in the possession of the Canadian Government.



WINNIPEG IN 1912

The building in foreground is the Bank of Montreal.

by conventions—the most distinctive intellectual work of the day was being accomplished in another field. At the beginning and at the end of the seventeenth century the achievements of Francis Bacon and Isaac Newton had marked epochs, turning points, in the history of human thought. Another such epoch was now marked by the publication in 1859 of the *Origin of Species* by Charles Darwin. Already the geologists had alarmed religious orthodoxy by their demonstrations of the world's antiquity, proofs that it had not been created precisely in the first week of the year 4004 B.C. The exact and literal interpretation of Scripture as an inspired record not only of spiritual truths but of material historical facts, a record of which no single word might be gainsaid, now suffered an infinitely more damaging blow from the biologists. An investigator of infinite patience, a whole-hearted seeker after truth, was able to place before the world a provisional demonstration that the infinitely varied forms of life in the world were not the outcome of a single creative act, but had been evolved through countless years from one infinitesimal primordial type. Man himself was but the most perfect type to which evolution had attained. Species had become differentiated



Charles Darwin.

[From a medallion by Alphonse Legros.]

by the transmission of inherited characteristics. If those characteristics rendered them better adapted to their environment they survived; if not, they perished. It appeared at first sight that if this theory were true the formulæ of orthodoxy must be false fundamentally. It was only by slow degrees that men realised the true significance of the doctrine of evolution and the moral and spiritual insignificance of the conventional beliefs which it displaced, just as they had taken a very long time to realise that the truth of Christianity was compatible with the truths of astronomy. Orthodoxy had to readjust its formulæ to the newly ascertained facts, though it presently discovered that the readjustment touched nothing fundamental. But the misapprehensions were not confined to the orthodox, and a sceptical philosophy was generated, based upon biology, of which the most brilliant popular exponent was Professor Huxley, while Herbert Spencer was its high priest.

If the principle of *laissez faire* in commerce was thoroughly established by Peel and carried to completion by Gladstone, its rejection in the relations between capital and labour was hardly less definite. The Factory Acts, that is to say, reasserted the old doctrine that the state was warranted in intervening for the sake of the public good even at a certain economic risk. The advocates of intervention, indeed, generally denied the economic risk, claiming that profits would not be diminished by the restrictions imposed; but at the bottom of the public support lay the conviction that the intervention would still be morally justified even if the profits of trade were reduced. The restrictions, however, on unqualified competition were applied with definite limitations which emphasised their origin as moral, not economic. They were employed exclusively for the protection first of children and then of women from excessive labour tending to the physical and moral deterioration of the race. Grown men must take care of themselves, and must be left to unqualified competition so far as the state was concerned.

The whole process of restriction, moreover, was tentative and experimental. It was at first brought to bear only on specific employments in which experimentation was comparatively easy, or where, as in the case of the collieries, the evils born of non-intervention were particularly flagrant. But it followed that during the succeeding years the experiment was extended to other trades and was carried further in the trades to which it applied. Thus textile factories were at first alone subject to its operation, but in the fifties and sixties other allied trades were brought within the compass of the Factory Acts, then trades such as pottery, which were not allied to them; and, finally, in 1867 the Factories and Workshops Act defined the factories where the regulations were applicable as covering all premises where more than fifty persons were employed on any manufacturing process. Also during these years there was an increasing disposition to impose regulations of a definitely sanitary character, and requiring the employers to fence their machinery and to take other precautions for protection against accidents. There were, no doubt, always employers who declared that every fresh restriction placed them at a disadvantage with the foreign competitor, but there was never any appearance that the British manufacturer failed to obtain adequate profits.

The men were left to themselves, and there was a steady advance of the new trade unionism exemplified by the Engineers' Society. The new unionism was not bellicose; nevertheless in 1859 there was another great contest between masters and men in the building trade. The strength of the men's organisation led the masters to resolve not merely to refuse to recognise the unions but to break them up at least as militant organisations. A local strike was met by a general lock-out. The struggle lasted for a long time; finally the men did not obtain the concessions for which they had originally struck, but, on the other hand, the masters were

obliged to withdraw their demand that the men should separate themselves from the unions.

Now the new unionism represented by the great societies may be said to have had a double aim—to enforce all round conditions which the most liberal masters were willing to concede, and to procure legislation which would strengthen their own hands. They did not want state regulation, but they wanted a legal status which would enable them to bargain more effectively. It was therefore in their interest to be recognised as law-abiding bodies. But there were many among the workmen who were not satisfied with what may be called constitutional methods. The prominently violent action of some of these minor unions, wholly opposed though it was to the spirit of the principal bodies, was naturally looked upon by the public as characteristic of the whole trade union movement. The result was that in 1867 there was a commission of enquiry which was eagerly courted by the leading unions. While the enquiry resulted in a report of a character immensely more favourable to the unions than had been generally anticipated, a judicial decision in the same year stamped them as illegal associations, which consequently had no power at law to protect their own funds from malversation. It thus became decisively clear that trade unions would in future be practically powerless until they acquired a recognised legal status. That was the work of the next period, when the Reform Bill had given the working man a parliamentary vote.

The year however also witnessed an Act which removed a serious inequality. Theoretically the law applied the same treatment to employers and employed, but in actual fact it did not. In the case of a contract between "master and servant," which covered contracts of service generally, the master who broke the contract could only be sued for damages, but the servant who did so committed not a civil but a criminal offence, consequently the latter could not give evidence in his own defence; he was liable to imprisonment, and might be tried before a justice of the peace, who, on such questions, could hardly be regarded as an unbiassed judge. The Masters and Servants Act, procured in effect by the action of certain northern trade unions, and passed by the Derby Government, remedied the worst features of the existing law in this respect.

CHAPTER XXXVI

DEMOCRACY

I

EUROPE

THE years of the last Russell and Derby administrations and the early years of the first Gladstone administration were marked by events on the Continent which almost amounted to a revolution of the European system, through Prussia's two great contests first with Austria and then with France. Those contests incidentally secured the completion of United Italy. To any one born within the last fifty years "Germany" means a consolidated German Empire wielding the most highly organised army in Europe, a military power which it is assumed that no other nation could defeat single-handed. In the popular mind Austria, however closely allied with the German Empire, is as completely distinct from it as Russia or France or Italy. The unity of Italy is taken for granted no less than the unity of Germany. Nevertheless, in 1865 a great section of Northern Italy was still a province of the Austrian Empire, while Germany was at best a confederation of independent states, among which Austria rather than Prussia still exercised a sort of presidency. To Austria, in fact, still clung the tradition of the so-called Holy Roman Empire, which had in effect been essentially Germanic ever since it was created by Charlemagne. Not till the days of Frederick the Great had the King of Prussia acquired among the German princes a position which made it possible to challenge the Austrian ascendancy. Never at all had there been a consolidated German Empire, a Germany standing as a united nation among the other nations of Europe. The creation of a united Germany was the work of Otto Von Bismarck, the great minister of William, King of Prussia, in association with the great soldier Moltke.

The name of Germany, then, like the name of Italy, was little more than a geographical expression covering a number of loosely associated Teutonic kingdoms and principalities, two of which ranked among the first-class Powers; while to one of these two, Austria, tradition assigned a sort of leadership. But of the Austrian Empire only a portion was Teutonic, the greater part of the dominion being either Slav or Magyar. Bismarck's great aim was to transform this loose association of German states into a solid unity; but in a United Germany there would be no room for Austria.

Prussia must be supreme, and she could not be supreme unless Austria were entirely excluded.

The first business, therefore, was to secure the ejection of Austria and the acceptance of Prussian ascendancy. There would have to be a war between Prussia and Austria, and Austria would have to be decisively beaten. The war, then, must be procured at the moment and under conditions which would ensure victory. No one outside Prussia knew the perfection with which the military machine was being organised. Bismarck timed his arrangements with consummate precision. The neutrality of the British and the Russians could be reckoned upon; that of France was secured through Napoleon's complete miscalculation of the odds. He anticipated that Prussia would be soundly beaten, that he would be able to intervene at the right moment to shield her from destruction, and that he would reap his reward on the Rhine. Italy was drawn into active participation, with Venetia—the completion of a united Italy—as her reward. In 1866 Austria was manoeuvred into a quarrel at the right moment, with a sufficient appearance of her being the aggressor, and war was declared. In Italy the Italians were defeated; but in Austria the brief Prussian campaign was absolutely decisive. The victory of Sadowa or Königgratz wrecked the Austrian army, and Bismarck was able to dictate his terms, which were not vindictive. Italy was rewarded with Venetia, Prussia annexed Hanover and some other minor principalities; the general German confederation was dissolved, and a new North German confederation was established practically under Prussian direction. South Germany was as yet excluded. The complete unification of Germany was still to wait for a very little while, until the South German states should learn to realise that their own interest was engaged in it.

The outcome of the "Seven Weeks War" was not at all what Napoleon had desired. Bismarck had got what he wanted without French help, and what the Emperor had wanted he entirely failed to obtain. The danger now to the completion of Bismarck's plans lay not in Austria but in France. It was his object therefore to crush that danger, but not to fight till he could strike with certainty of victory. Four years after Sadowa he was ready for a decisive struggle. The proposal for placing a Hohenzollern prince on the vacant throne of Spain gave him his opportunity of forcing a war upon France for which public opinion in France was at the moment more than willing. As with Austria, so now, Prussia had a plausible case for maintaining that France was the aggressor—that it was France which forced the war. Again, as in the case of Austria, the perfection of the Prussian military organisation, now extended over the North German confederation, coupled with the support of South Germany, gave the Prussians or Germans decisive victory. When peace was made after the fall of Paris Alsace and Lorraine were surrendered to Prussia, and a terrific war indemnity was imposed upon the French nation.

But the cession of territory and the indemnity were not the only results.

The French Empire collapsed when the Emperor himself surrendered at Sedan. For the third time France became a republic, with a government which for many years was necessarily unstable. But, on the other hand, while the besieging armies lay before Paris, the King of Prussia was proclaimed German Emperor, the Southern States uniting with those of the North German confederation to form a single union with the King of Prussia at its head. Germany had become the greatest military power in the European system. The new German Empire was born, like the fully armed Pallas Athene of Greek mythology.

Incidentally Italy had seized her opportunity, when the French Emperor was no longer in a position to shield the Papacy, to crown her unity by taking possession of Rome and making it the capital of United Italy.

II

THE GLADSTONE ADMINISTRATION

Lord Russell's public activities had ceased on his retirement from office in 1866, when he was already seventy-four years of age; Gladstone was marked out as the leader of the Liberal party, as emphatically as Disraeli was distinguished among the Conservatives. For twelve years to come those two personalities entirely overshadowed all others in parliament, and the rivalry only ended with Lord Beaconsfield's death in 1881.

Gladstone, as we have noted, had already come to the conclusion that the endless troubles in Ireland must be met by dealing with two questions in which he found a legitimate cause of grievance, the Established Church and the land system. The Irish Church question he brought definitely to the forefront while Disraeli was in office in 1868, and he had united the Liberals in determining upon disestablishment. In Ireland, as in England, the technical continuity of the Church as a religious corporation had been preserved in Tudor times. Apart from confiscations, the Reformed Church retained the wealth which had belonged to the Church before the Reformation. But the Reformed Church was never at any time the Church of more than one-fourth of the Irish people. It was a National Church only in the sense that it was recognised as such by the state. Obviously it could be argued with equal plausibility that the Church in the nineteenth century was one and the same with the Church a thousand years before, and was entitled to all that it had then possessed or that had subsequently been bestowed upon it—or, on the other hand, that the Church was not one and the same, that the Romanist priesthood, not the Anglicans, were the real successors of the Church, and that as a matter of fact all property bestowed upon it was merely held by it in trust, by the sanction of the state, upon condition of its fulfilling the office of a National Church.

Since in the Liberal view it did not fulfil that office, it was legitimate for the state to appropriate that wealth to national purposes.

Next, the two arguments stood opposed—on one side that the state in a Christian country ought to make profession of its Christianity, which it could only do by supporting and recognising a National Christian Church, and, on the other, that while Christianity was divided into sects the state as such ought not to recognise one sect in preference to the rest; to which was added the contention that endowments and connection with the state in fact tend to weaken the activities of the Church and to destroy its spiritual independence, an argument which involved the rejection of counter-proposals for the concurrent endowment of other religious bodies. Apart from such abstract questions there was the concrete difficulty that institutions and individuals derived their stipends from these endowments, which the usage of centuries had entitled them to count upon, and of which they could not be deprived without flagrant injustice.

The measure proposed by Gladstone took full account of this last consideration. All life interests were secured, £10,000,000 out of the £16,000,000 at which the wealth of the Church was valued being restored to it. At one stage it seemed likely that there would be a sharp conflict between the Commons and the Lords, since the Lords sent down amend-

ments which were for the most part rejected by Gladstone. They were satisfied however with a show of compromise, practically arranged between Lord Granville and Lord Cairns for the Liberals and Conservatives respectively, and the bill became law. In its final form the uses to which the surplus was to be put were not specified, but were left to the pleasure of parliament.

With his next measure Gladstone embarked upon that troubled sea of Irish legislation which provided abundant occupation for Liberal and Conservative governments until after the twentieth century had opened. Theoretically in Ireland, as in England, the occupation of the land was for the most part a matter of contract between landlord and tenant; the terms were settled by simple bargaining, modified in practice by local customs which however had not the force of law. But in fact the conditions in Ireland and in England were entirely different. In England the contract was com-



Mr. Gladstone in 1869.
[From a photograph.]

paratively at least a free one; the diversity of employments open to the small capitalists who occupied the soil compelled the landlords to lease their farms upon reasonable terms, and improvements were for the most part carried out either wholly or partly at the landlord's expense. In Ireland, on the other hand, the occupier of the soil was a poor man who, if he left his holding, would find it exceedingly difficult to get any other employment. In effect he had to accept the terms that were offered him. And the Irish landlords, though of course with notable exceptions, were either unable or unwilling to sink their money on improvements. Consequently, if improvements were made at all, the tenant was apt to find that he paid for making them and that the landlord then pocketed the profits by increasing the rent.

Gladstone's Land Bill, then, proposed to provide by law two of the three conditions of a healthy and progressive occupancy which in England were practically secured without any direct application of law—fair rents, fixity of tenure, and free transfer, involving the tenant's right to have his property in improvements which he had effected recognised. But this could only be done by interfering with freedom of contract, which was held to be justified by the argument that the contracts interfered with were not in fact free. In Ireland the tenant was usually a tenant at will, occupying only under an agreement without any written lease, and liable to be simply evicted on six months notice. But the "Ulster custom" habitually observed by Ulster landlords, though it could not be enforced in law courts, forbade the eviction of a tenant who paid his rent, and allowed him to sell the goodwill of his tenancy—in other words, the value of such improvements as he had made—to some one else if he wished to part from his holding. The Ulster custom in effect recognised fixity of tenure and freedom of sale. The bill proposed to give this custom the force of law, thereby in effect establishing a joint proprietary. Land however could under this bill be granted on long leases, free from these restrictions; on the other hand, the tenant at will who was evicted for other reasons than the non-payment of rent could claim compensation for disturbance as well as for improvements. Also public loans were authorised in order to enable tenants who so desired to purchase their holdings; that is, it was attempted to provide means for establishing a peasant proprietary by the side of the dual proprietary. There was no machinery however for securing fair rents. The bill became law in 1870, the year after the Disestablishment Act.

Still the introduction, with a pacificatory intent, of these two measures failed to produce pacification. Though the Fenian movement had not been agrarian, it had revived the spirit of hostility to the law among the agrarian population; and the disturbed state of the country caused a second bill to be accompanied by the Peace Preservation Act, forbidding the carrying of arms in proclaimed districts, and increasing the powers of the police and the summary jurisdiction of the magistracy. Irish Nationalist sentiment began to take shape as a demand for an undefined "Home


Rule" professedly differing both from the unqualified separatism of the Fenians and from O'Connell's old demand for the repeal of the Act of Union.

If Ireland occupied the first place in Gladstone's programme, the first democratic parliament was also necessarily zealous for the amelioration of popular conditions in England. The lack of education and of educational possibilities among the poorer classes attracted, as we saw, periodical attention after the passing of the great Reform Bill ; but the result had been little more than the application of a slowly increased government grant in aid of schools maintained for the most part by voluntary support, under the control commonly of the Church of England, but in some cases of other religious bodies. The admission of the working-man to the franchise had extracted from a prominent Adullamite, Robert Lowe, the remark that we "must educate our masters," and at last the education of the children of the poor was recognised as a matter which must be taken in hand directly by the government.

The result was W. E. Forster's great Education Act of 1870. The voluntary schools were wholly unable to cope with the vast amount of work that had to be done, and hosts of children got no teaching at all because there was no accommodation, and no superfluous zeal on the part

of parents in seeking to obtain it. The essential principle of the scheme was to provide sufficient accommodation for all children, to make school attendance compulsory and contributory—that is, to require the parents to pay something towards the cost—but to throw the bulk of the expense upon the public at large, the provision being made not by the central government but locally through the rates. The new schools were to subsist side by side with the voluntary schools.

But the difficulty of religious instruction at once presented itself. The great consensus of public opinion demanded unmistakably that there should be religious instruction ; but it seemed equally clear that in schools maintained by public funds drawn from the pockets of persons of every kind of religious denomination, the teaching should not be that of any one denomination. The difficulty of applying a government grant to Church schools had been surmounted by a conscience clause, which permitted parents to



W. E. Forster.
[From a photograph.]

withdraw their children from the religious instruction; but if the same principle were applied in the new state-supported schools, the children of Nonconformists would be shut out from religious instruction altogether; while it did not appear practicable to adopt the alternative of providing special religious instruction for each denomination. The solution was found in the "Cowper-Temple Clause," which required that no formularies of any religious denomination should be employed, but that undenominational Biblical instruction should be given; a compromise with which the majority of the public were satisfied, since the position of the definite Church and other denominational schools remained unaltered. All the schools were to be under government inspection, and the general control in each district was to be in the hands of the locally elected School Board.

Another question was necessarily brought into prominence in a parliament representing an electorate largely composed of the working-classes. This was the regulation of the position of trade unions. As matters stood in 1868 the trade union was an illegal association. It could not protect its own funds, even although those funds might be mainly used not for militant purposes, but for sick pay and other benefits. The law of Conspiracy had proved to be so elastic as to make practically any action in furtherance of a strike a punishable offence. To make combination an effective method by which the men could bargain collectively with the masters, it was necessary that the existence of the unions should be legalised, but that they should not be liable to be sued as corporate bodies, since they would then be open to ceaseless attacks involving a perpetual and paralysing litigation. Further, it was necessary that it should be legal for men to do jointly what it was legal for an individual to do; that is, that an action should not be rendered criminal because it was committed by persons acting in concert instead of singly, or, again, because the person who committed it was what the law called a "servant."

The Government however was by no means eager to move. Under pressure it at last brought in a bill which was subsequently divided into two. By the one, the unions were allowed to register themselves as legally constituted societies, while, as was universally understood, they were protected from being sued as corporations. The second, called the Criminal Law Amendment Act, sought to summarise and define the coercive acts which might be penalised. It did not introduce new penalties, but it so defined the law that, while it declared the strike or joint withdrawal from work to be legal, it declared every action by which the strike could be rendered effective to be illegal, including the mere publication or communication of the fact that a strike had been declared. Violence or threats were unnecessary. Any kind of persuasion to abstain from working in a place where a strike had been declared was "molestation" within the meaning of the law. To this position the Government held resolutely, with the result that employers fastened upon the first bill as having made

trade unions dangerously powerful, while the union men fastened upon the second bill as having completely paralysed them.

The Government then very emphatically lost favour with the working classes, and they did little to recover it by the introduction of the ballot, one of the old demands of the Chartists. The ballot enabled the voter to cast his vote without any one knowing on which side he had voted unless he chose himself to give the information, and was intended to secure him against giving it under virtual intimidation, though it was only to a limited extent that it actually served the purpose intended.

The Franco-Prussian War, with its startling demonstration of the military power of Germany, led to a much needed reorganisation of the British Army. One of the proposed changes encountered the most vehement opposition. This was the abolition of the purchase system, by which officers were able to buy promotion. That system had been established by royal warrant, and, in the face of the determined opposition to the bill on the part of the House of Lords, Gladstone took the unexpected course of abolishing it by royal warrant, a step which was vigorously condemned as unconstitutional.

If the domestic methods of the Government tended to diminish its popularity, this was still more the case with its conduct of foreign affairs. It successfully maintained the attitude of neutrality throughout the European war, and in some degree reduced the severity of the terms imposed by the Germans upon the French. Nevertheless, there was a good deal of popular feeling that British intervention ought to have been carried further, and that the dignity and power of the nation should have been emphasised more vigorously and decisively. The impression that ministers allowed themselves to be brow-beaten by foreign Powers was intensified by two grave diplomatic defeats. Russia seized the opportunity of Napoleon's fall to announce her repudiation of the Black Sea Treaty. Britain was able to insist upon the position that no single Power had a right to withdrawal, and that grievances must be referred to a conference of the signatory Powers. To this Russia acceded; but at the conference held in London her diplomacy procured everything she demanded. Britain in effect found herself isolated, and the clauses neutralising the Black Sea were cancelled.

The second defeat was suffered over the United States claim for compensation in connection with the *Alabama*. In 1871 the British, who refused to admit any liability for the injuries done by the cruisers, agreed to the appointment of a joint commission to settle the question. The American commissioners proposed that a lump sum should be paid to cover all claims. The British suggested arbitration. The Americans agreed, on condition that certain views of their own upon international law should be accepted as a preliminary. The British allowed their acceptance, while denying that they had as a matter of fact been valid heretofore. British counter-claims in respect of damage done by Fenian

raids were withdrawn from the arbitration, which was referred to a court whose members were nominated by various European sovereigns. The court awarded damages, chiefly in respect of the *Alabama*, amounting to 15,500,000 dollars, to the intense disgust of the British people, who jumped to the somewhat hasty conclusion that any court composed of foreign arbitrators might be relied upon to give an anti-British verdict. The mere fact that such an arbitration had been attempted at all was a great step towards finding peaceful solutions for differences of a certain type; but it did not add to the prestige of the Government at the time.

The Prime Minister appears to have been unconscious of the extent to which the Government was losing popularity in the country. Nevertheless, when in 1873 a bill dealing with the Irish Universities was defeated and Gladstone resigned, Disraeli refused to take office, which was resumed by Gladstone. In this last year of the administration there was another Ashanti expedition, in which the actual operations were skilfully conducted by Sir Garnet Wolseley. But before this necessarily inglorious war was finished a general election at the beginning of 1874 returned the Conservatives to power. The Liberal ministry was weakened by dissensions, but Gladstone expected that an appeal to the country would give him a fresh lease of power. He had a large surplus, and believed that the long desired time had come when the income tax could once more be taken off, a consummation which he had always desired. His intention was to substitute for it an increase of the succession duties, the charges payable when property passed by inheritance. The announcement of his intention was denounced as a trick for catching votes. The government measures had aroused the indignation of one section of the community after another—Churchmen and Dissenters, the Army, the landowners, the licensed victuallers (a particularly dangerous body when their hostility was aroused), the manufacturers, and the working-men. This last group, who at the previous general election had voted for the Liberals, now in their irritation at the Criminal Law Amendment Act ran several independent candidates of their own, with the almost unfailing result that the Conservatives headed the poll; and that party returned to power with a solid majority.

III

BEACONSFIELD

According to the Conservative theory the country did not want heroic legislation and reconstruction such as the Liberals had attempted, but minor reforms which would make life work more smoothly for the working classes. In the philanthropic legislation of the past the Conservatives had been quite as active as the Liberals, since orthodox Liberalism was closely associated with the manufacturing class, and had been largely dominated

by the economic theories of what was called the Manchester School, the doctrines of unqualified competition. Though it was true that there had always been a Radical wing with sympathies very much more democratic and humanitarian than those of the official Liberals, it was not particularly difficult for the Conservatives to claim that they were the true friends of the working-man. It was therefore the Conservatives not the Liberals who now threw over the Criminal Law Amendment Act, and did actually give to the trade unions all that they had demanded. The application of the Conspiracy Law to trade disputes was limited. The terms "employer" and "workman" were substituted for those of "master" and "servant" in a new Act which made the agreements between them a simple civil contract, in which the two parties stood on the same legal footing. The "coercion" and "molestation" of the Criminal Law Amendment Act disappeared; persuasion which stopped short of violence or actual intimidation ceased to be punishable, and peaceful picketing was expressly sanctioned. Also a Nine Hours' Bill, limiting the work of women and children to nine hours, was now obtained by the Lancashire cotton spinners, though the Liberal Government had stubbornly refused it. Again, as the friends of the people, the Conservatives passed a series of Acts—an Agricultural Holdings Act, a Labourers' Dwellings Act, and others—which would have been extremely useful to the working classes if they had been compulsory. As they were merely permissive, the practical benefits derived from them were open to question, since in one group of cases local authorities made little use of the powers conveyed to them, while in others one party could practically insist upon the other agreeing to "contract out." In fact, among Liberals as well as among Conservatives there was still a strong feeling against interfering with freedom of contract. It remained for later parliaments to apply the principle that in actual fact such contracts very rarely are free and the desired end can only be secured by compulsion. For Ireland, after the sweeping measures of 1869 and 1870, the Government had no legislation to offer except the renewal of the Peace Preservation Act, which appeared to have been attended by entirely satisfactory results.

The real interest, however, of the Beaconsfield administration—so called because during 1876 Disraeli withdrew from the Commons to the Lords, with the title of Earl of Beaconsfield—lies in the revival of British activity in the field of foreign politics. The policy of non-intervention had been professed theoretically by every British minister from Castlereagh and Canning down to Palmerston and Gladstone; but the interpretations and applications of the policy had followed exceedingly diverse lines. With Canning and Palmerston it had at least been a first principle to insist that their voices should be heard in the councils of Europe; that Britain was not to be treated as a negligible quantity. On the other hand, another school, at this time dominant in the Liberal party, was disposed to be somewhat ostentatiously pacific; and the results of their diplomacy during the late administration had undoubtedly been viewed with extreme dissatis-

faction by the country. It was to the Conservatives not to the Liberals that the Palmerstonian tradition had passed. Disraeli, the most imaginative of English statesmen, adopted as his own the magnificent view of the high destinies of the British Empire and its moral supremacy among the nations; also he was of opinion that the other nations should understand that it would in no way suffer its own interests to be ignored.

To those principles he added a predilection for startling and theatrical effects. Thus in 1875 he took the world by surprise with an exceedingly ingenious stroke which gave the British Government a dominant control over the Suez Canal, the new waterway from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean. The canal itself had been constructed mainly by French enterprise and practically without British support. It was the property of a commercial company in which the dominant influence was French, while the Khedive of Egypt was by far the largest shareholder. But the Khedive was very much in want of cash, and contemplated the sale of his shares; Disraeli was no sooner made aware of the fact than he forestalled all other buyers by purchasing shares for the British Government at a cost of £4,000,000. It was obvious that circumstances might arise when British control would be of the utmost importance, but from a merely commercial point of view it was a sound investment for the nation. At the same time the entire unexpectedness of the step created an uneasy feeling in the minds of that very large portion of the British public which particularly dislikes being taken by surprise. The capture of the Canal shares emphasised the interest to Britain of Egypt, the Eastern Mediterranean, and, by consequence, the Turkish Empire. Disraeli inherited from Palmerston that statesman's views upon Russian aggression, and his policy towards Russia is the dominant feature of his administration both in its European and in its Indian aspects.

The root of the troubles in the Near East is always to be found in the Turkish government's treatment of its Christian subjects. A united Europe in which the great Powers trusted each other and each one might be counted upon to act with pure disinterestedness could always have brought the Turk to reason. But the Turk enjoyed a deep-seated conviction that the Powers distrusted each other, would never be roused into taking active steps in unison, and yet would never permit any one Power to take action independently. He had no objection to making the most satisfactory promises, but the promises never materialised in action. British statesmanship generally regarded the preservation of the Turkish Empire as necessary to British interests, and was equally convinced that Russia in her own interest desired Turkey's disintegration. Therefore while Britain might view favourably the application of a strictly joint pressure by the Powers upon Turkey, she was emphatically opposed to permitting the independent intervention of Russia. Germany regarded the whole question as secondary; and Austria had no inclination to active intervention unless she could reap her reward in the Balkan States.

In these circumstances the Porte suavely ignored the European concert, and continued its misrule in the mainly Slavonic and Christian provinces of the Balkans and of the Danube. Consequently in 1875, just before the purchase of the Suez Canal shares, the Western Provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina revolted. In the following January the Powers, at the instance of Austria, addressed a note to the Porte without any tangible result. In the summer a series of palace revolutions ended by placing Abdul Hamid on the Turkish throne. Meanwhile the insurrections had spread to Montenegro, Servia, and Bulgaria, and England was startled and horrified by the appalling reports sent home by newspaper correspondents of the atrocities committed by Turkish troops in Bulgaria. A strong anti-Turkish agitation was set on foot. The continued failure of the Powers to influence the action of Turkey, which merely amused itself by promulgating empty projects of reforms, gave Russia excuse or justification for implying that if the Powers would not take effective action in concert, she would do so independently; and in the spring of 1877 war was declared between Russia and Turkey.

In England the anti-Turkish agitation had risen high, but it sank as the anti-Russian agitation rose. All the old suspicions of Russian intentions and Russian methods were excited to the highest pitch, and the magnificent defence of Plevna and of the Schipka Pass by the Turks against tremendous odds appealed powerfully to British sentiment. At the turn of the year the Russians had forced the Balkan passes and were moving towards Constantinople. The British Government made it clear that they regarded war with Russia as something more than a possibility, and their attitude in making active preparations was indubitably popular. Every barrel-organ in the country was grinding out the strains of the popular ditty, "We don't want to fight but by jingo if we do," which introduced the new term Jingoism, which has ever since held its own in political slang. The British fleet was despatched to the Sea of Marmora to protect British interests. But a few days later, on March 3rd, it was announced that Russia and Turkey had agreed upon the Treaty of San Stefano.

The terms of the treaty were less alarming than had been anticipated; but in Lord Beaconsfield's view Russia and Turkey were not to be permitted to settle matters on their own account. The Treaty of San Stefano must be referred to the Powers, in accordance with the Treaty of Paris. Russia declared her willingness to refer the treaty to the Powers, but reserved to herself the right of accepting or rejecting their proposals. Britain refused to attend the congress on such terms; war appeared to be almost inevitable, and the Foreign Minister, Lord Derby, who was opposed to war, resigned. His place was taken by Lord Salisbury. Active preparations continued, and the country was again startled by the announcement that the Crown, without reference to Parliament, had ordered a contingent of Indian troops to be despatched to Malta.

Nevertheless war was averted. Russia agreed to submit the treaty to

a European congress to be held at Berlin. That change of attitude was due to a secret agreement negotiated by Lord Salisbury. Another secret agreement had been made with Turkey. The terms did not, in fact, insist upon all the objections which had been raised to the Treaty of San Stefano. Lord Beaconsfield, accompanied by Lord Salisbury, attended the Berlin Congress, and the practical outcome was a triumph for his diplomacy. Roumania, Servia, Montenegro, and Bulgaria north of the Balkans, were made independent principalities. Austria was to control the administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The reservation of Southern Bulgaria secured the Turkish frontier. This was the sum of the Russo-British bargain. But the Berlin Treaty did not touch the separate British treaty with Turkey, by which Britain gave an independent guarantee to defend the Turkish dominion in Asia by force of arms, and herself occupied the island of Cyprus. Turkey, of course, gave the usual promises with regard to the treatment of her Christian subjects and the introduction of necessary reforms. Lord Beaconsfield returned to England, having achieved the proverbial "Peace with honour." Thus in the summer of 1878 his government was at the high tide of its popularity; yet in less than two years it had fallen.

Of the troubles in India and Africa which contributed to this end we shall speak in the next sections. But apart from these, though submerged for the time by the popular excitement over the restored European prestige of Britain, was a latent sense of uneasiness caused by Lord Beaconsfield's devotion to a policy of surprises, his habit of announcing decisive steps taken before the nation had any inkling of what was coming. That feeling sprang into renewed life as soon as the Government met with failures instead of successes. And at home nothing was done to attract popular favour. Lord Beaconsfield's programme had been expensive; there was no relief of taxation, and the country was passing through a period of depression for which the Government was held responsible. Beaconsfield's withdrawal to the House of Lords had left the Commons without a strong leader, and there Charles Stewart Parnell had organised the band of "Home Rule" Irishmen into an instrument for the prevention of all government. Every available form of the House was systematically employed to make the efficient conduct of business impossible. In Ireland also he created the Land League, a body whose primary object was to insist upon fair rents and, if fair rents were refused, refusal to pay any rent at all, with the secondary intention of ultimately converting tenancies into ownership. At the same time he made it apparent that his own ultimate intention was at least to destroy the English ascendancy, if not to sever Ireland from the British Empire.

The inability of the leaders to control the House of Commons detracted from the dignity of the Government. In Afghanistan and Zululand there were disasters. At the end of 1879 Gladstone, who had retired from the active leadership of the Liberals, emerged from his comparative seclusion to denounce the ministry in his famous Mid-Lothian campaign. A bill was introduced by ministers to transfer the property and powers of

the London water-companies to a single central body. It seemed likely to prove that the bargain proposed was a very bad one; and the bill was unpopular. The Government had now held office for six years; Lord Beaconsfield appealed to the country, and discovered too late that the country had turned against his policy. Of the 652 members returned to the House of Commons 349 were Liberals, and of the rest 60 were Irish Home Rulers. Beaconsfield resigned; the Liberal party recognised, and its chiefs impressed upon the queen, that the electorate demanded a government with Gladstone at its head.

IV


INDIA

One of the last acts of the previous Conservative administration had been the appointment of Lord Mayo to the Indian viceroyalty in succession to Lord Lawrence. Lord Mayo was assassinated after achieving an unexpectedly high reputation, and the Liberals appointed Lord Northbrook in his place. Both Mayo and Northbrook maintained their predecessors' attitude towards Afghanistan, but a strong school of politicians was growing up in India who were dissatisfied with "masterly inactivity." In their view the persistent advance of Russia in Central Asia made it of extreme importance that there should be a rectification of the whole north-west frontier which should not only render it impregnable but should make it also an effective basis for military operations in and beyond Afghanistan. They held also that, however excellent the intentions of the particular ruler in Afghanistan might be, it was necessary to exercise a certain supervision over that country in order to prevent Russia from planting her influence there, and to keep the British government in India supplied with really trustworthy information. These ideas were adopted by the Beaconsfield administration; Lord Northbrook was not prepared to fall in with them; and in 1876 he resigned, to be succeeded by Lord Lytton.

It was at this moment that Disraeli had resolved upon another of his picturesque effects. It was one of Lord Lytton's earliest duties to hold a great Durbar or assembly of native princes in order to proclaim, on the first day of 1877, that the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland had resolved to add to her titles that of Empress of India, *Kaisar-i-Hind*. The step was viewed with considerable disapprobation at home, but Disraeli was probably right in believing that it would appeal to the imagination of the Indian peoples with whom pomp and ceremonial magnificence is a visible testimony to power.

Whether the effects were great or small they were of an intangible order; not so was it with the Afghan policy of Lord Lytton. There could be no doubt in the mind of any one at all as to the real advantages which

would be derived from the presence of a British Resident at Kabul, on one condition—that his presence should be acceptable to the Amir and to the people of Afghanistan. The difficulty lay precisely in the fact that it was not acceptable. But Lord Lytton had made up his mind that it was necessary whether acceptable or not. Pressure was brought to bear upon the Amir to receive a British mission, and the Amir at once scented an intention on the part of the British to establish control over him through a Resident. He explained that a mission could not possibly be admitted. Relations became very much strained; but active measures were postponed in view of the then imminent danger of a European war. The war was averted, but the Berlin Treaty was followed by increased activity on the part of Russian agents in Asia. Lord Lytton learnt that a Russian



The British Residency, Kabul, after the rising of 1879.

mission had been received at Kabul. There could be no excuse then for refusing a British mission. He again announced that a British mission would be sent to Kabul with Sir Neville Chamberlain at its head.

Sher Ali protested, declaring that the Russians had not come by his good-will. Nevertheless the mission was despatched, but was turned back on the Afghan boundary. The result was inevitably an ultimatum demanding the acceptance of a permanent mission. The demand was ignored, and Lord Lytton proceeded to invade Afghanistan. Only one of the three invading columns, that commanded by Sir Frederick Roberts, had any hard fighting to do. Sher Ali recognised the futility of resistance; the Russians, who had no intention whatever of helping him, departed from Kabul, and he himself fled, to die very shortly afterwards, leaving the Kabul government in the hands of his son Yakub Khan. Yakub accepted a treaty. A


“scientific frontier,” that is, the military control of the passes, was ceded, and a British Resident, Sir Louis Cavagnari, was accepted. In July (1879) he arrived at Kabul with a small escort. The third column under Sir Donald Stewart, of which the objective had been Kandahar, where it was now stationed, was to remain there till the cold weather. The rest of the British troops were withdrawn.

Then the old story was repeated—up to a certain point. There was a rising in Kabul; the Resident and his escort were cut to pieces after a gallant defence. But within four weeks of the massacre Roberts, with a force of six thousand men, was back within fifty miles of the capital. Ten days later he had entered it. Yakub Khan, who, with questionable truth, declared his own entire innocence of the recent outrage, was permitted to resign; and the temporary administration was placed in the hands of Roberts.

This was at the end of October; but by December it had become clear enough that Roberts with his small force could do nothing more than remain on the defensive in his position at Sherpur. Here, however, a prolonged attack was finally and decisively repulsed at the end of the year, and Roberts was master of the Kabul district.

In the spring (1880) Stewart to a considerable extent cleared the country by his march up from Kandahar to Kabul, in the course of which there was one exceedingly hot but brief engagement at Ahmed Khel.

From this time policy was dictated by the newly inaugurated Gladstone Government; Lytton was recalled, and his place was taken by Lord Ripon. The intention was to revert to the Lawrence policy. The restoration of Yakub Khan was impossible, as also was the recognition of his brother Ayub at Herat. The Amir chosen was one of the claimants whom Sher Ali had succeeded in expelling, Abdur Rahman. But Kandahar was to be retained by the British under British control with another Afghan governor, a second Sher Ali. Between Abdur Rahman at Kabul, Yakub at Herat, and this Sher Ali at Kandahar, the preservation of peace was most improbable. Yakub opened the attack by marching from Herat towards Kandahar, raising the tribes as he went; Sher Ali's troops mutinied, and a part of the small British force which had been left at Kandahar, marching



Sir Frederick (Lord) Roberts in 1880.

[From a photograph.]

out to face Yakub, met with a disaster at Maiwand. Kandahar was rapidly placed in a state of defence, and Stewart and Roberts at Kabul resolved that the latter should at once march to the relief of Kandahar with a force of ten thousand men. Speed was essential. For three weeks Roberts vanished into the unknown. At the end of three weeks he had successfully accomplished his march of three hundred miles, entered Kandahar, and on September 1st entirely shattered Ayub's forces.

Again there was a modification of the political programme. The Government was convinced that the sound principle for dealing with Afghanistan was that which had been ultimately adopted towards Dost Mohammed. The Amir was to be left to establish his own authority. He was not to have a Resident forced upon him, but he was to be pledged to have no diplomatic relations with any foreign Power, while the British were pledged to defend him against aggressive action. The retention of the ceded frontier outposts was a necessity, but it was decided that the occupation of Kandahar would involve more risk than benefit, since the way to it from India was secured by the occupation of Quetta at the head of the Bolan Pass on the Baluchistan frontier. The retirement from Kandahar was strongly disapproved by military advocates of the forward policy, but it may be said that the best military opinion was divided on the question. The evacuation of Afghanistan was completed early in 1881, and Abdur Rahman proved himself entirely capable of establishing his own authority. Also he was shrewd enough to distrust Russia more than the British. On the whole, it may be claimed that the policy of evacuation, in spite of the risks involved, was justified by the event.

V

SOUTH AFRICA

Events in the distant regions of the Empire are apt to escape much public attention at home unless they happen to involve military operations. This was the case with South Africa until the outbreak of the Zulu War during Lord Beaconsfield's administration. Nevertheless, events of grave import had taken place at an earlier date.

We have seen that, by the direct action of the British Government during the fifties, two Boer republics had been recognised on the west of the Drakensberg mountains, the Orange Free State between the Orange River and the Vaal, and the South African or Transvaal Republic beyond the Vaal. The ill-defined boundaries on the west of these two states left open a line of expansion northward from Cape Colony which was, for the time being, ignored. Some years later, however, the discovery of diamond mines changed the situation. The lands were claimed by a Griqua or semi-Hottentot chief, but also by the two Boer states. An arbitration on

the question decided in favour of the Griqua, from whom they were purchased by the British Government in 1871. When it was subsequently proved that the award had been wrong, the Government declared that, as the paramount and responsible power in South Africa, it could not surrender the diamond fields to the Free State, to which it gave not over generous compensation in cash. The westward expansion of the Boer states was blocked, and the way to the interior was held open to the British.

The Orange Free State under President Brand was a model of orderly and progressive government. The same thing could not be said of the community beyond the Vaal, where there was no firm central administration. There were troubles with the neighbouring Bantu tribes, and behind those tribes on the south-east lay the highly organised military state of the Zulus, under their exceedingly vigorous monarch, Cetewayo. The exchequer of the South African Republic was exhausted, and there appeared to be a very serious danger of a collision with the Zulus, in which there was a painful presumption that the Boers would be wiped out. The wiping out of the Boers was likely to be followed by a huge general rising of the black races against the white. Sir Theophilus Shepstone, a commissioner sent up from Natal to investigate the position, came to the conclusion that there was only one way of averting the danger—the annexation of the South African Republic, and the termination by British rule of the anarchy there prevailing. There were by this time considerable numbers of British and German settlers in the Transvaal district who were in favour of the annexation, and Shepstone persuaded himself that only a minority of the white population was opposed to it. Consequently in April 1877 the annexation of the Transvaal was proclaimed.

Lord Beaconsfield's Colonial Secretary at this time was Lord Carnarvon, the pioneer of the conception of a federation of South Africa on Canadian lines. South Africa, as a matter of fact, was not at this time ripe for the development of that conception, but it was with this aim in view that Sir Bartle Frere, an Indian official of great experience and ability, was at this moment appointed Governor of Cape Colony and High Commissioner for South Africa. The annexation of the Transvaal was not his doing; it merely fell to him in the course of official routine to confirm Shepstone's action. A much more pressing question was the exceedingly menacing conduct of Cetewayo.

The Zulu state was organised with a single eye to military effectiveness. Between the death of Dingan some thirty years earlier and the accession of Cetewayo in 1873, Zululand had remained comparatively quiet; but now it had become evident that the Zulu king was contemplating a revival of the military glories of his earlier predecessors. The protests of the British Government against his revival of certain sanguinary practices were answered with something perilously like defiance. To Frere it appeared imperative that the principles applied in the government of India, where

most of his experience had lain, must be applied also in Africa. He proposed to place a Resident in Zululand who should discharge the functions of the Residents at the courts of the native princes in India, and should impose limits on the barbarism of the Zulu government. This, with other demands, was formulated in an ultimatum delivered to Cetewayo in December 1878. In plain terms, Frere was convinced that, unless the Zulu military organisation were broken up, there would be a war sooner or later which might very well assume terrific proportions. Cetewayo would certainly yield to nothing short of a convincing display of force. At whatever risk there must be no symptom of a hesitation which could be construed as a sign of conscious weakness.



Cetewayo.

Carnarvon was now no longer at the Colonial Office, and the home Government, with its eyes fixed upon Afghanistan, could not be induced to realise the gravity of the situation. Cetewayo ignored the ultimatum. Under the general direction of the Commander-in-Chief, Lord Chelmsford, three British columns entered Zululand, the movements beginning in the second week of January 1879, when the date fixed by the ultimatum had passed. The advance of two of the columns was stopped by the news of a great disaster to the third column under Lord Chelmsford himself. A portion of his force was encamped at Isandlwana, while the Commander-in-Chief advanced with the

rest to attack a Zulu military post at some distance. But the Zulus were not waiting there. The 900 men left in camp at Isandlwana became suddenly aware that they were being enveloped by a force of 20,000 Zulus. In the desperate struggle which ensued the British camp was wiped out, though in some degree the blow was counterbalanced by the magnificent defence of Rorke's Drift at the passage of the Buffalo River, where a handful of men had been left to keep the communications with Natal open.

The advance into Zululand was paralysed. It was not till April, three months after Isandlwana, that the arrival of reinforcements enabled Lord Chelmsford again to take the offensive. The issue then could hardly be in doubt, and the Zulu army was completely shattered at the battle of Ulundi in July. Cetewayo became a fugitive; his hiding-place was subsequently betrayed and he himself was deported to Cape Colony. Lord Wolseley, who had arrived to supersede Lord Chelmsford, was left with the task of providing a system of government for Zululand, which was divided into districts, still under a dozen native chiefs with a single British Resident exercising a general control. The system, however, did not work satisfactorily, and Zululand was actually annexed in 1887.

The affairs in South Africa and in Afghanistan were very serious blows

to the Beaconsfield administration at home. But the destruction of the Zulu power had destroyed also the principal justification for the recent annexation of the Transvaal. While the Zulu menace was present, it would have been vain for the Boers to attempt any active protest. But the Dutch dislike to the British domination was as strong as ever, and when there was nothing more to be feared from the Zulus it bore fruit.

VI

THE EIGHTY PARLIAMENT


The new Gladstone administration rested at the outset mainly upon what was called the Whig element; its most prominent members were Lord Hartington, Lord Granville, and the Duke of Argyle. There were members of the extreme Radical wing who had strong claims to office, but the avowed or suspected republicanism of such men as Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Joseph Chamberlain made it difficult to find a place for them in the ministry. Sir Charles withdrew his own claims in favour of the member for Birmingham, who was for some time regarded by the Opposition, or at least by their organs in the Press, as the scarcely veiled influence which was hurrying the Prime Minister along the paths of destruction. In later years he was destined to assume a curiously different character in their eyes.

For four years domestic interests and domestic legislation were almost confined to Irish questions. Outside these islands public attention was engaged for the first eighteen months upon Afghanistan and South Africa, while from the summer of 1882 Egyptian affairs became absorbing, almost at the moment when Irish affairs had reached a startling climax. How the Afghan affair was settled we have already narrated, but we have only hinted at the next scene in the South African drama.

The burghers, as the citizens of the Transvaal called themselves, expected that a Liberal Government would be prompt to reverse the annexation carried out by its predecessors, and to restore the independence which a previous Liberal Government had granted without any reluctance. They were disappointed by emphatic pronouncements that there was to be no reversal of policy. Before the end of the year the Government was in fact reconsidering the question; but this was not known to the burghers. Shepstone had been mistaken in his belief that the majority of the white men had been in favour of his action; the majority resented the annexation, and when they understood that it was definitive they preferred defiance to submission. In December, on the anniversary of their great victory over the Zulu king Dingan, they proclaimed the Republic and successfully attacked two small British detachments at Potchefstroom and Bronkhorst Spruit. While Sir Hercules Robinson at the Cape was endeavouring to

obtain a solution of the dispute through the mediation of President Brand of the Orange Free State, Sir George Colley, who had taken Sir Garnet Wolseley's place, advanced to the Transvaal border with a British column to suppress what was unquestionably in a technical sense the rebellion of the burghers. On January 28th, 1881, he met with a reverse at Laing's Nek, and a month later his force was routed by a handful of the farmers at Majuba Hill, where he himself fell.

Before this event the home Government had made up its mind that the annexation had been a blunder, not, as represented by Shepstone, in accordance with the will of the people of the Transvaal. Retrocession was resolved upon and despatches to that effect had reached South Africa. On the face of it, it appeared that the disaster at Majuba made another change of front imperative. The authority and power of the Empire must be




The Monument at Paardekraal, Krugersdorp, where the Boers proclaimed the independence of the Transvaal in 1880.

vindicated before any concession could be made. Nevertheless, the Government resolved to set aside expediency in favour of the most elevated ethical principles. On these principles the burghers ought not to be penalised for their success in fighting for a cause which the Cabinet had already recognised as a just one. What would have been granted without their victory at Majuba should not be denied them because of that victory. Hostilities were suspended, and terms for the retrocession of the Transvaal were arranged.

The Republic was to be reinstated, endowed with complete self-government within a territory of which the boundaries were definitely delimited. The suzerainty of Great Britain was to be recognised, which precluded the Boer government from making treaties on their own account, and a British Resident was to be established at the capital, Pretoria. Two years later it must be remarked the arrangement was modified by a new "Convention of London," under which the Resident was withdrawn, and it became a

disputable question whether the British could thereafter legally claim any control over anything except the foreign relations of the Transvaal Republic. It was not perhaps surprising that the lofty morality by which the Government claimed to have been guided was not recognised either by the Opposition in England, the bulk of the Transvaal Boers themselves, or a large proportion of the white population of South Africa. The magnanimity of the mighty power which abstained from demonstrating its overwhelming strength was regarded as mere pusillanimity and weakness, at the best dictated by a paltry economy ; out of which conviction a brood of troubles was to be born in the future.

Gladstone assumed office in 1880 under the belief that Ireland was pacified by what he had done before, and by the expectation of what he would do in the future. It was immediately announced that the Peace



Majuba Hill.

Preservation Act would not be renewed. The Irish members, led by Parnell, clamoured for an immediate extension of remedial measures, while the Opposition clamoured against the withdrawal of the exceptional powers of the Executive. The Government introduced two bills, one a measure for the relief of distress, the other to provide compensation for evictions following upon the non-payment of rent, where the failure had been due to a *bona fide* inability to pay. In the Lords this bill was mercilessly criticised and decisively rejected. At the same time the Peace Preservation Act ceased to operate. Immediately there broke out a fresh crop of agrarian outrages, and the new weapon was brought into action which has taken its name from its first victim, Captain Boycott.

In the face of this new departure, commonly attributed to the influence of the Land League, it was impossible to rely merely upon the ordinary law. A fresh coercion bill was brought in by the Chief Secretary for

Ireland, W. E. Forster, the parent of the Education Act of 1870. It was passed after fierce and stormy opposition by the Irish members, but was followed by a new Land Bill of which the primary purpose was to secure fair rents. A new principle was introduced. Land courts were to be established for the assessment of fair rents on the application of tenants or of landlords and tenants acting in concert. The Irish members denounced the bill as wholly inefficient, the Opposition denounced it as a flagrant invasion of the rights of property, and the Duke of Argyle retired from the ministry which had repudiated the principle of freedom of contract. The bill was greatly mutilated in the House of Lords, and a deadlock was only averted by a compromise which satisfied no one.



C. S. Parnell.
[From a photograph.]

Some months earlier Gladstone's great antagonist had passed away. His strange and mysterious personality had fascinated first his party and then the country in spite of themselves, and the most audacious innovator among modern British statesmen was conceived as the ideal Conservative. He was a brilliant statesman who had inspired the nation with a new spirit of imperialism, a diplomatist who had triumphantly vindicated the position of the country in the councils of Europe, a parliamentarian who had fought his way to an unqualified leadership against apparently overwhelming odds. But he was a singular person to have been selected

as the great representative of Conservatism, a title which was absolutely appropriate to his successor in the leadership of the party, Lord Salisbury.

The Parnellites made no pretence of being satisfied with the Land Bill; outrages continued; and since English opinion held that Parnell and the Land League were responsible for them, several of the Irish leaders were arrested and imprisoned at Kilmainham. They replied by issuing a manifesto calling upon the tenants to pay no rent until they were released. The response was the condemnation and suppression of the Land League as an illegal organisation, though, according to the unfailing rule, it was presently revived under a new name.

In the spring of 1882 the Peers, on a resolution of Lord Salisbury, appointed a committee to enquire into the working of the Land Act. Gladstone replied by a resolution in the Commons virtually censuring the action of the House of Lords. Neither resolution could have any immediate material effect; but that of Lord Salisbury marked a definite political purpose on the part of the great Conservative leader. Unlike Lord Beaconsfield, Salisbury, who as Lord Cranborne had withdrawn from the last Derby administration on account of the Reform Bill, feared the new democracy and the power of the democratic House of Commons, and hoped to use the House of Lords as a counterpoise. It may be said that the

increased activity of the House of Lords was initiated by their treatment of the Irish Compensation Bill in the previous year, but it was Lord Salisbury who systematically developed the policy.

Immediately after this, the Irish leaders were released from Kilmainham and Forster resigned the Irish Secretaryship. There was undoubtedly an understanding that they would use their influence to stop outrages, which was developed in the mind of the Opposition into a corrupt compact for their support of the Liberal Government in parliament; and the whole transaction was vehemently stigmatised as the "Kilmainham Treaty." But it is equally certain that the Parnellites were not conspicuously transformed into allies of the Liberals.

The leaders had hardly been released when Lord Frederick Cavendish, who succeeded Forster as Irish Secretary, was assassinated in the Phoenix Park in Dublin. Consequently a bill promised for the relief of tenants whose rent was in arrear was preceded by a very stringent "Prevention of Crimes" Bill to be enforced for three years, giving to the Irish Executive abnormal powers of search, arrest, and summary jurisdiction. The murder in Phoenix Park to some extent silenced the Irish leaders; but in spite of the Crimes Bill there was no cessation of the outrages and murders, and the new organisation called the National League, avowedly political as well as agrarian, took the place of the suppressed Land League.

Two months after the Phoenix Park murder England was awakened to the existence of complications in another region by the bombardment of Alexandria. During the last decade the debts of the Khedive of Egypt, Ismail, had compelled him to subject the Egyptian finances to the joint control of British and French. As a practical consequence the dual control was inevitably extended to the Egyptian administration. A nationalist group in Egypt was consequently formed, which aimed at overthrowing the European ascendancy through the instrumentality of the Egyptian army controlled by Arabi Pasha. The group dominated the Khedive Tewfik, Ismail's successor, and captured the ministry. Counter-pressure from Britain and France aggravated the antagonism, and Arabi with the army assumed an attitude so aggressive that the British Admiral Seymour, after inviting the co-operation of the French, which was refused, considered it necessary to open a bombardment and then to occupy Alexandria. But while Arabi remained in arms nothing more could be done. An expedition was despatched to suppress him, and in September his forces were shattered by Sir Garnet Wolseley at the battle of Tel-el-Kebir. Arabi was taken prisoner and Cairo was occupied.¹



Arabi Pasha.

¹ For map of Egypt and the Sudan, see page 942.

The British action had destroyed not only the army but the whole system of Egyptian government. Except perhaps in France it was generally recognised that this action had been fully justified. France, by refusing to co-operate, had put herself out of court, and there was no escaping the necessity that Britain should on her own account reorganise the shattered government. Annexation would have been warranted; a protectorate would have been warranted; but the British Government wanted neither,

and chose instead to claim a complete immediate control of affairs, in the illusory expectation that it would be merely temporary. The Khedive's government was restored, but Lord Cromer—at that time Major Evelyn Baring—was appointed Agent and Consul-General, which meant in effect Dictator, and a British controller was appointed over each department of state—Finance, Public Works, Judiciary, and Army.

The work of reorganisation went on steadily and efficiently. But far to the south in the Egyptian Sudan there arose in 1883 a fanatic calling himself the Mahdi, the appointed successor of Mohammed, who gathered to his standard the wild Mohammedan tribes of the interior. The British refused to attempt bringing the interior under control; the organisation of efficient government in Egypt proper was work enough. But the Egyptian government despatched an expedition under an English officer, Hicks

Pasha, to overthrow the Mahdi, and the expedition was annihilated instead. The British insisted that the Sudan must be left to take care of itself and that the garrisons there must be withdrawn. The withdrawal of the garrisons was a task of extreme difficulty. To carry it out the British Government appointed the one man who might be able to accomplish it successfully, General Charles George Gordon. Gordon, a Puritan and a mystic, was one of those men who seemed to accomplish impossible ends by methods impossible to any one else. The one way of dealing with such a man is to accept the whole enormous risk of leaving him an absolutely free hand. Gordon went to the Sudan knowing that he had not an absolutely free hand; that he would be supported up to a certain point, but not beyond. When he got to the Sudan he acted on the assumption that he would be supported at all costs, and proceeded to carry out plans which to the authorities appeared to be madness. They refused the support which he



Osman Digna, leader of the Mahdi's forces.


[From a photograph.]

demand. The result was that in March 1884 he found himself shut up in Khartum, although a threatened invasion of Egypt proper by the Mahdi was broken by a force under General Graham at El-teb.

But it was not possible to leave Gordon to his fate at Khartum, although it had been definitely understood that no military expedition was to be sent to the Sudan. An expedition to rescue Gordon was necessary. Yet the home authorities failed to realise the urgency of the situation. Valuable time was lost over differences as to the form which the expedition should take. It was not till September, when Gordon had already been locked up for six months, that Lord Wolseley sailed for Egypt. Then the arrangements for an advance up the Nile were proceeded with vigorously. Even until the last moment it was believed that the relief would be effected. But in fact Khartum was hardly defensible. When the Mahdi appreciated that the British force was actually close at hand he rushed the place, and Gordon was killed two days before the arrival of the British on January 28th. So perished the heroic soldier whose marvellous personality had at last, at the very end of his career, suddenly impressed the imaginations of the British people with an enthusiastic admiration rarely paralleled. His death dealt an irremediable blow to the Government whose blundering failure to rescue him was felt as a shameful betrayal. But there was nothing more to be done. The

re-conquest of the Sudan was not to be thought of. The expedition fell back. Years of patient and persistent organisation were needed before the times were ripe for a conquering advance upon Khartum.

In the years between 1881 and 1884, during the period of the Egyptian troubles, attention was temporarily attracted to India by a somewhat ill-advised attempt on the part of the Viceroy Lord Ripon to carry out an administrative reform extending the jurisdiction of native magistrates over European residents. A storm of indignation was raised amongst the British in India, easily understood by any one who grasped the conditions of European rule there, but unintelligible on the hypothesis that there is no reason for recognising any distinction between the white and the brown races. The affair was unfortunate, because although the measure in the form in which it was finally promulgated did not give rise to grievances, it intensified instead of diminishing the racial antagonism which is always latent in the great dependency. In relation to the colonies, the growth, in the minds of a few leading men, of a new conception of the united British Empire, was marked by the birth of the Federation League; but



General Gordon.
[From a photograph.]

the idea had not as yet taken any general hold of the public. While Lord Rosebery was a lively advocate of the new movement, the official attitude was more nearly akin to that of the Colonial Secretary, Lord Derby, who had joined the Liberal ranks; it seemed to be governed by the assumption that separation was the natural and desirable goal to which all colonies were tending and should be encouraged to tend.

At home Ireland continued to be disturbed, and in England a good deal of alarm was created by sundry ineffective dynamite outrages originating with the extremists among the Irish in America. But there was little opportunity for legislation until, in 1884, a bill was introduced for completing the democratic system by extending the franchise to the agricultural labourer who had still been excluded by the Reform Bill of 1867. Officially the Conservatives declared themselves in favour of the franchise extension, but it was obvious that the step would necessitate a far-reaching redistribution of seats; and the Conservatives claimed that the two measures should be combined. The Government insisted that the Franchise Bill should come first, though it was to be followed by a Redistribution Bill. The Franchise Bill was carried in the House of Commons; the House of Lords, under Salisbury's leadership, passed a resolution that it should not become law except as a part of a complete scheme. This attitude was taken as implying an attempt to compel the Government to dissolve, and Liberals angrily denounced the claim of the peers to force a dissolution. The bill was withdrawn with the announcement that it would be reintroduced in an autumn session. There was every prospect of a fierce struggle between the Houses. The Government had been losing credit with the country; but a fiery campaign in the summer appeared to revive Liberal enthusiasm, and the "mending or ending" of the House of Lords seemed likely to become a plank of the Liberal platform.

Yet the strong element of Conservatism in Gladstone himself, as well as in the Whig wing of the party, made him anxious to avoid a constitutional crisis of such gravity, while the more cautious among the peers viewed the results of such a struggle with grave apprehension. A compromise was arrived at between the leaders; when the autumn session was opened, the bill went through the Commons, and it was then announced that if it were passed the Redistribution Bill should be brought in forthwith, and that in effect the second bill should not be made a party measure but should be shaped so far as possible in conformity with Conservative as well as Liberal opinion. The second bill was then brought in, the Lords passed the Franchise Bill, and the Redistribution Bill went through both Houses with the minimum of controversy. The fundamental principles of the measure were the disfranchisement of boroughs with a population of less than 15,000, and the return of one member only by every constituency with only a very few exceptions.

The Liberals had gained something by the vigorous campaign of the summer; but this was more than compensated by the fall of Khartum; and

the Penjdeh incident in Afghanistan in March 1885 probably weakened the Government again. There was a collision between Russian and Afghan troops on the border of Afghanistan, unmistakably due to the aggressive action of the Turcoman commander Ali Khan, whose name has been conveniently Russianised as Alikanoff. For a moment it appeared that there would be war between the Amir and the Tsar, and that the British would be bound to support the Amir in the most thorough-going fashion. Fortunately Abdur Rhaman, with a singular shrewdness, refused to make much of the incident which was judiciously smoothed over; and the process of delimiting the several frontiers, which had given occasion to it, was continued without further serious friction. At the same time there was a certain feeling, born of the general suspicion of timidity attaching to the Gladstone Government, that sufficient vigour and firmness had not been displayed; though on the merits of the particular case there was hardly sufficient warrant for that view.

The weakened Government was defeated on the Budget. Gladstone resigned, and Lord Salisbury took office. Divergencies in the ministry as to the treatment of Ireland had contributed to its fall. But the Conservatives, in an actual minority, were not inclined to throw down a direct challenge to the Irish members. They did not find it necessary to renew the Crimes Act, and they brought in a generous measure, known as Lord Ashbourne's Act, for the provision of public funds to facilitate the purchase of their holdings by the Irish tenantry. Coming from the Conservative Government the measure received no active opposition. In the circumstances however a dissolution was inevitable, and the results of the general election in August were unexpected. Gladstone had rejected certain overtures from Parnell, declaring that a definite Irish policy could not be laid down until Irish opinion had been clearly expressed by the now enlarged electorate. The answer as far as Ireland was concerned was emphatic. No Liberals were returned for that country, but there were eighty-five Home Rulers. The Liberals in the House of Commons numbered precisely one-half of that assembly, and it was obvious that the Parnellites were in a position to paralyse any government whatever. Lord Salisbury had no disposition to attempt carrying on government by Parnellite aid. When parliament met in January 1886, it was announced that a new Coercion Bill would be brought in. Ministers were defeated on an amendment to the address, Lord Salisbury resigned, and the queen sent once more for Gladstone.

CHAPTER XXXVII

LORD SALISBURY

I

THE HOME RULE STRUGGLE

THE brief Gladstone administration of 1886 may be taken as marking the moment after which it becomes no longer possible to view party politics with the impersonal detachment proper to a historian. From that date one of the two great political parties has been definitely committed to the doctrine that Ireland ought to have a separate legislature of her own to deal with Irish affairs. To the other party that doctrine has seemed to be fraught with such danger to imperial unity that resistance to it must be the paramount consideration to which all other questions must give way. Whatever other complications there may be, whether Liberal leaders have actually made Home Rule a definite part of their programme or not, they have always affirmed their adherence to the doctrine. Only at one general election has the party received substantial support from Unionists, because on that one occasion it was clearly understood that they would not introduce a bill for Home Rule. The Gladstone administration introduced a new line of cleavage which has continued until the present year, 1912, when a Home Rule Bill is before parliament. If that bill becomes law that line of cleavage will disappear, and it appears almost certain that economic policy will take its place, as it did in the case of the one general election referred to, that at the close of 1905.

When, in February 1886, Mr. Gladstone undertook to form a Cabinet on the defeat and resignation of the Salisbury Government, it immediately became clear that he intended to introduce a measure of Home Rule. Hitherto the overwhelming majority of Liberals as well as of Conservatives had regarded the idea of establishing a parliament at Dublin as entirely outside the sphere of practical politics. Advanced Radicals had indeed been suspected of leanings in that direction; but their minds were very much more set upon democratic reforms in England, while the Whig wing at least had absolutely no sympathy with the Irish demand. Mr. Gladstone succeeded in carrying the bulk of his party with him, but some of the most prominent of his former colleagues refused to join the Cabinet or left it as soon as his proposals were formulated, and formed a separate Liberal Unionist party in parliament. This group included on the one side Whigs


such as Lord Hartington and Mr. Goschen, and on the other the personal followers of the then recognised champion of Radicalism, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain.

The features of the new policy were presented in two measures, a Home Rule Bill and a Land Bill. The purpose of the first was to provide Ireland with a legislature of her own for the control of Irish affairs. While to the bulk of the Unionists, Conservative or Liberal, any conceivable scheme of Home Rule would have been obnoxious, opposition concentrated upon the point that Ireland was to cease altogether to be represented at Westminster. While the tactics of Parnell seemed to make the exclusion of Irish members eminently desirable from the point of view of the conduct of public business, it carried with it the separation of Ireland from all interest in imperial concerns, and it was therefore denounced as being emphatically separatist in its effects—an encouragement, that is, to the Irish people to sever their slender surviving link with the Empire. The Land Bill was opposed no less heartily. The intention was to remove the land question from the scope of action of the proposed Irish parliament by a huge scheme of land purchase on the part of the British Government which would have established a peasant proprietary. The real intensity of the opposition to the whole scheme lay in the rooted belief that the leaders of the Irish people were separatists who would merely use the new machine as an instrument for breaking down the British connection altogether, coupled with the anticipation that "Home Rule means Rome Rule." The Home Rule Bill was defeated on its second reading.

Mr. Gladstone appealed to the country; the Conservatives did not contest the seats of Liberal Unionist candidates; seventy-eight members of that party were returned; and the Conservatives outnumbered the British and Irish Home Rulers together by thirty-five. Mr. Gladstone resigned, and Lord Salisbury took office with an administration formed entirely from the Conservative party, since his own proposal for a Coalition Government with Lord Hartington at its head was rejected by the Liberal Unionist leader.

The measures for Ireland had effected little towards the relief of agricultural distress. Tenants were in arrears with their rent, and evictions multiplied. Mr. Parnell introduced a Tenants' Relief Bill, which, among its provisions, authorised the land courts to stay evictions if half the rent was paid. The bill was thrown out and the Irish leaders instituted the ingenious device known as the Plan of Campaign. The tenants were to combine and offer the landlords a fair rent, or what they considered a fair one. If the landlords refused it the tenants were to pay over that fair rent not to the landlords but to a committee charged with carrying on the struggle. When parliament reassembled at the beginning of 1887 new rules of procedure were adopted in the House for the repression of obstructive tactics. The application of the "closure" and its subsequent developments were invariably condemned by the Opposition of the day as shameless interference

with the right of free speech, and were defended by the Government of the day as necessitated by the gross abuse of free discussion by the Opposition. After settling procedure the Government went on to introduce a new Crimes Bill for Ireland, conferring upon the Lord Lieutenant new powers of condemning leagues or combinations as illegal, and of proclaiming disturbed districts, which were thereupon subjected to a practically arbitrary government. The long and angry debates were brought to an abrupt



Mr. A. J. Balfour.

[An early portrait by Lafayette, Dublin.]

conclusion by the application of the closure. The Act, however, was accompanied by a new Land Bill, in which the most important concessions gave some facilities for a revision of rents, and authorised the county courts to grant time for the payment of arrears. The bill was considerably modified in favour of the tenants, at the instance of the Liberal Unionists. Still Ireland continued to be the scene of violent disorders, of constant collisions between the peasantry and the police, who were employed to assist at evictions or to suppress illegal meetings, and of much excitement

over the arrests of leaders who encouraged the populace to defy the "tyranny" of the law. The language of partisanship was at this time peculiarly acrimonious, and was perhaps made the more so by the placid persistence with which the Chief Secretary, Mr. Arthur Balfour, treated offenders in Ireland precisely as if they had been ordinary law-breakers, while he remained calmly impervious to the most virulent personal attacks.

In the course of a controversy so bitter as was then raging no accusations were too gross to be readily believed. An exceedingly comprehensive attack upon the Land League in general, upon all the Irish leaders, and most uncompromisingly upon Mr. Parnell, in the *Times* newspaper, led to one of the Irish members bringing a libel action against that paper. The action failed on the ground that Mr. O'Donnell, the plaintiff, had not been singled out; but the republication in evidence of certain letters purporting to have been written by the Irish leader roused Mr. Parnell to action. He repeated his previous contemptuous condemnation of the incriminating documents as forgeries, and he demanded the appointment of a select committee of enquiry upon the specific question of the letters. The Government rejected his demand, but they passed an Act to appoint a commission virtually to investigate all the charges which had been publicly brought against the Land League and the Irish leaders in general. In effect sixty-five prominent Irish leaders were put on their trial on a series of definitely formulated charges.

The Parnell Commission, as it is always called, met in September 1888. Hitherto it may be said that almost the entire British public, whatever its political creed, had no doubt whatever that the Parnellites had habitually incited resistance to the government, that they had been enabled to carry on their operations by means of financial assistance from the American Irish, that they had not repudiated connection with the most extreme section of that body, and that they had rather encouraged than attempted to restrain agrarian crime. When, after a year had passed, the report of the judges confirmed these ideas, but with distinct modifications in favour of the Irish members, some of whom were proved to have actively endeavoured to check outrages, the verdict was taken by most Unionists to be a decisive condemnation of the Home Rule movement, and by most of the other party to prove that the most serious objection to Home Rule was less serious than they had previously supposed. But, as a matter of fact, public interest in the trial was only in a very minor degree concerned with the political question at issue; it was almost confined to the personal charges against individuals, and, above all, Mr. Parnell. The worst of those charges rested upon the evidence of letters, and, most conspicuously of all, one particular letter which, if genuine, would have proved Mr. Parnell's condonation of the Phoenix Park murder. But when it was proved in the course of the trial that this letter with others had quite certainly been forged and sold to the *Times* by a man named Pigott, there was a strong revulsion of public sentiment. The *Times* had permitted itself to be deceived

quite honestly; but it would never have done so if the virulence of political feeling had not made it incapable of testing evidence. The recklessness with which the forgery had been accepted recoiled upon the heads of Mr. Parnell's accusers at large, and from that time there was no longer the old readiness to assume as a matter of course the worst possible interpretation of everything said or done by any Irish member. Mr. Parnell almost became popular.

Yet in the year following, 1890, the Irish parliamentary party suffered a grievous blow from a scandal in which the leader was the most prominent figure. The Nonconformist conscience came into play, and the Irish party was split between those who stood by their old chief and those who declared that he could no longer be parliamentary leader. His death shortly afterwards did not for a long time suffice to heal the animosities which had arisen in this connection, and the affair went far to paralyse the activities of the disunited Irish parliamentary party.

Meanwhile, Mr. Balfour's drastic application of the Crimes Act in Ireland was accompanied not unsuccessfully by further remedial measures, an extension of Lord Ashbourne's Land Purchase Act, the reclamation of waste lands, and the development of light railways. By 1891 the Government found itself in a position not only to introduce still another Land Purchase Act, but at the same time to suspend the Crimes Act over almost the whole country. In the next year, however, a general election gave the Gladstonian Liberals in conjunction with eighty Irish Nationalists a majority of forty in the House of Commons; the defeat of the Government was followed by Lord Salisbury's resignation, and Mr. Gladstone formed his last administration.

Again the old leader returned to the one object which he had now set before himself, and introduced a new Home Rule Bill. The fundamental difference between this bill and its predecessor was that the Irish members were to be retained at Westminster, but with their numbers reduced to eighty. The proposal which it had first embodied for limiting the subjects on which they might vote was subsequently dropped. The bill was fought stubbornly line by line, and was ultimately forced through the House of Commons by the use of the closure, now vehemently denounced by its original authors. But the House of Lords declined to recognise that the authority by which the bill had been carried was that of the nation. They rejected the bill. Very shortly afterwards Mr. Gladstone, who was now eighty-four years of age, retired, and was succeeded in the leadership by Lord Rosebery. When, in 1895, the Government resigned, when defeated by a snap vote on a side issue, the electorate at the general election which immediately followed emphatically endorsed the action of the House of Lords by returning the combined Conservatives and Liberal Unionists with a majority exceeding one hundred and fifty. Not for seventeen years went another Home Rule Bill to be introduced in parliament.

II

LORD SALISBURY AND THE UNIONISTS

Though Irish affairs were exceedingly prominent during the ten years which followed the last extension of the franchise, they did not occupy public attention exclusively. Although the Liberal Unionists refused to take direct part in the administration after the fall of the first Gladstone ministry the Salisbury Government was dependent upon their support. Few as they were a very large proportion of them were men of ability and weight, respected on both sides of the House, though the most brilliant of their number was more feared than respected by his political opponents. Some considerable time elapsed before hopes of a reconciliation between Mr. Chamberlain and his former colleagues were entirely given up, and a reconciliation would have jeopardised the ministerial majority. Thus the Liberal Unionists held a strong position, and the Conservatives, willingly or unwillingly, found it necessary to defer largely to their wishes.



Lord Salisbury.

[From a photograph by Russell & Sons.]

The position became perhaps more marked when Lord Salisbury's brilliant but erratic Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Randolph Churchill, resigned at the end of 1886. Lord Randolph was the champion of what was called Tory democracy, the doctrine that it was the business of the Conservatives to carry out democratic measures. He resigned in order to force upon his colleagues economies which they were not inclined to sanction, believing himself to be indispensable to the Cabinet, since there was no member of the Conservative party in the House of Commons to whom the office which he held could be assigned with confidence. In this crisis the Liberal Unionists came to the rescue of the Government; Lord Randolph

had "forgotten Goschen," who, with the assent of his own party, accepted the vacant office, and thereby sealed the adherence of the Whig section to the Government. Mr. Chamberlain's section, however, was to a considerable extent in sympathy with Lord Randolph; his support of the Government became for the moment more dubious, and the efforts for a Liberal reconciliation were renewed. They failed completely, since the divergencies were such as could not be bridged over, and Mr. Chamberlain ultimately developed into the most uncompromisingly hostile of Mr. Gladstone's opponents. But the necessity for conciliating him until the later stage of actual coalition between Conservatives and Liberal Unionists was a constant factor in the Conservative legislation.

This influence made itself felt not only in the Irish Land Bills. In 1888 the ministers brought in a Local Government Bill, which caused Mr. Ritchie, the minister in charge of it, to be dubbed "Ritchie the Radical." Hitherto local administration had been very largely in the hands of the local justices. The bill established elected county councils on the same basis as the elective corporations which controlled local affairs in the boroughs, the elected councils themselves electing a number of coadjutors known as aldermen. The large areas were further divided up into districts with an elective district council. Boroughs with over fifty thousand inhabitants were constituted as separate counties, while separate arrangements were made for the metropolis.

The Local Government Bill of 1888 and the Free Education Act of 1891 were the two leading pieces of domestic legislation for which the Salisbury Government was responsible. Mr. Forster's Act of 1870 had made education compulsory; that it should be made free was the apparently inevitable corollary. The proposal, introduced by a Conservative Government, found comparatively little opposition; although there were not wanting some stout-hearted individualists who denounced the measure as destructive of the sense of parental responsibility, declaring that free meals would follow free education, and that in the long run the state would find itself called upon to make entire provision for the rising generation. But when a measure seems generally desirable to both parties in the state it is vain to call it Socialistic; that term in ordinary parlance is merely a phrase expressing disapprobation, which is somewhat unfortunate for persons who prefer the pursuit of accuracy in political terminology. Free education was in fact a measure typical of the "Socialism" which is based upon no abstract theory, but calls for state intervention and state action where immediate beneficial results are anticipated from action in the particular case.

The Conservatives then gave free education, and therein they had the support of the Opposition. Neither party perhaps realised at the time one unfortunate but inevitable result. Hitherto the voluntary schools had competed on comparatively even terms with the board schools. But if they were to provide free education they must have equivalent support from the

state. How far was the provision of additional support from the state compatible with the preservation of their denominational atmosphere? This question was presently to become acute, and the controversies on the subject embittered religious antagonisms, carried them into party warfare, and gave sectarian disputes a prominence painfully injurious to the efficiency of the educational system.

Before the close of the administration three other measures were passed with the general approval of the Opposition as well as of the Government. A modification of the Factory Acts extended the protection of women, and raised the age at which the employment of children was permitted. An Agricultural Holdings Act enabled county councils to advance three-fourths of the money required for the purchase of small holdings, and a Tithes Act made the tithe payable by the landlord instead of by the tenant. Nothing was thereby affected except the method of collecting the charge. Since 1835 the tenant had paid the tithe, and had paid the landlord his rent less the amount of the tithe; now he paid the landlord the full rent and the landlord paid the tithe. But the Nonconformist tenant was relieved from the feeling that he was being compelled personally to contribute to the maintenance of a Church to which he did not belong, a fiction which had been kept in being by the old method.

When Mr. Gladstone formed his last administration, the new Home Rule Bill held the stage until its rejection by the House of Lords. The Government, however, declined to admit the right of the House of Lords to dictate a dissolution of parliament. They proceeded with the process which was called "filling up the cup," introducing measures which the Lords amended past recognition. An Employers' Liability Bill made employers in certain cases responsible for injuries suffered by their employees, and abolished the doctrine of "common employment." The meaning of this doctrine was that the employer was not responsible for injuries suffered by a workman in consequence of the negligence of a fellow-employee. But the bill was made nugatory by an amendment of the Peers, which permitted contracting out; consequently it was withdrawn. A new Local Government Bill establishing parish councils was carried, though at the cost of accepting two amendments which appear to have convinced Mr. Gladstone that the time was close at hand when the constitutional position of the House of Lords would become a question too critical to be deferred. At the age of eighty-four, with eyesight and hearing impaired, he felt himself no longer fitted to enter upon so grave a contest. The aged statesman resigned, and the leadership of the Liberal party passed to Lord Rosebery.

The new administration which endured for fifteen months, ending in June 1895, was signalled by only one domestic measure of first-rate importance. This was Sir William Harcourt's budget, which provided a lucrative source of revenue by the new imposts called the "Death Duties," whereby the state appropriated a substantial proportion of property left on decease. The principle was old enough, since in feudal times the heir had

to pay fees to his feudal superior on entering upon his inheritance ; but it remained for Sir William Harcourt to apply it so as to add materially to the revenue, though the abstract justice of doing so had long been maintained by theorists. This was the one measure in which the Government got its own way, since the Lords considered themselves warranted in refusing to recognise the composite majority in the Commons as representing the national will. The futility of the situation had become obvious ; and when Ministers were defeated on a snap vote concerning the supplies of ammunition, they took the opportunity of resigning. The Opposition took office, at once appealed to the country, and were returned to power with an overwhelming majority, which was maintained without being greatly impaired for ten years.

In India the close of 1895 had witnessed a further extension of dominion, though not within the limits of the peninsula, by the final annexation of Burmah in consequence of the persistently impracticable attitude of the Burmese government. Mandalay was occupied in November 1885, and the formal annexation was carried out in the following year. Relations with the Amir of Kabul continued to be satisfactory, and the completion of the delimitation of the Afghan, Russian, and British frontiers removed that question from the danger sphere. Perhaps the most important feature of the period now under review was the appearance and development within the British dominion of the body which named itself the Indian National Congress. Representing almost exclusively one particular class, it claimed to represent the voice of India. The persistent view of the Indian Government that the National Congress is not representative of real native opinion is difficult of acceptance in the British Isles, because it is the only articulate voice that comes from the natives of India ; and the action of Government has been considerably complicated in consequence.

Lord Beaconsfield's attitude of emphatic self-assertion on the part of the British Empire was not maintained by Lord Salisbury in his relations with foreign Powers. On the contrary, it was his guiding principle to avoid participation in the complications of European continental politics and to attend strictly to British interests. His ascendancy over his own party was sufficient to enable him to adopt a policy of "graceful concessions" which would have been extremely difficult for a Liberal Government. Lord Salisbury stood without a rival in his knowledge of foreign affairs, and it was not easy to charge the diplomatist who had shared with Lord Beaconsfield the honours of the Berlin Treaty with readiness to pay an excessive price for peace. In fact at this period the European power whose interests were most difficult to reconcile with our own was France, and the source of friction lay in Egypt, from which France had been ousted by the events leading up to the British occupation. The preservation of a free hand in the control of Egyptian affairs was of first-rate importance, and Lord Salisbury was denounced chiefly by the organs of his own party for yielding to the demands both of France and of

Germany in other regions, virtually as the price for the free hand in Egypt.

In most cases there was justification for the concessions. The European Powers had awakened to the fact that Africa was the only quarter of the globe which was not under the dominion of highly organised states, and a scramble had set in for the partition of the Dark Continent. The partition into spheres of influence was carried out between 1885 and 1892, and it was freely declared that Lord Salisbury surrendered to Germany much which ought to have been claimed for the British Empire. In the view, however, of German expansionists, Germany came very badly out of the bargaining. The only plausible ground for condemning the African bargain from the British point of view was the failure to obtain complete territorial continuity from North to South of the Continent. Canada, however, and Newfoundland, had warrant for declaring that their interests were neglected by the Imperial Government in the settlement with France of the long-standing disputes as the Newfoundland Fishery rights. Canada also was ill-pleased over another Fisheries Treaty with the United States. The treaty, however, collapsed, because both the great American parties sought popularity by denouncing it in view of an approaching presidential election. More satisfactory was the settlement through arbitration of a seal-fishery quarrel with the United States, which had twenty years before acquired Alaska from Russia, and now sought to impose limitations against which they had protested vigorously at an earlier stage; the arbitration was decisively in favour of the British claims, although concessions were made outside the award of the arbitrators, with the intention only of preventing practices which threatened to exterminate the seals altogether.

But while specific questions were creating some degree of friction between mother country and colonies, the conception of imperial unity had been gaining ground considerably, and an epoch was marked in the relations of the different parts of the Empire when the celebration of Queen Victoria's Jubilee in 1887 gave occasion for a conference in London for the first time between the chiefs of the imperial government and representatives of the colonies. There was no premature attempt to bring forward schemes of federation, or indeed to formulate schemes at all; but an immense impulse was given to the conception of imperial unity by the mere recognition of the fact that the whole Empire has common interests and common burdens in which the whole Empire should be consulted, and in which the whole Empire should share. Between 1885 and 1895 events were taking place in one portion of that Empire which were about to issue in startling developments. During the decade Ireland had been the absorbing topic; in the next period the primary interest was to be transferred to South Africa.

III

THE STORM CLOUD IN SOUTH AFRICA

When Lord Salisbury took office for the second time the Liberal Unionists no longer declined a coalition. They were powerfully re-



Mr. Joseph Chamberlain.

[From a drawing by W. Hodgson, 1895.]

presented in the new Cabinet. Lord Hartington had some time previously succeeded to the dukedom of Devonshire, and the leadership of the party in the Commons had passed to Mr. Chamberlain, whose former militant Radicalism was being rapidly merged into an equally militant Imperialism, which caused his appointment to the Colonial Office to be hailed with satisfaction by all those who were inclined to condemn the indifference of colonial policy in the past. The now unqualified alliance of Lord Salisbury and the Duke of Devonshire in the Lords and Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamber-

lain in the Commons formed an exceedingly powerful combination, which was the more effective as there were dissensions among the Liberal leaders and Mr. Gladstone had now completely withdrawn from parliament.

Colonial affairs were no longer to permit of indifference. Before the ministers met parliament in January 1896 came news from South Africa that Dr. Jameson had entered the Transvaal at the head of an armed force, and that after a short engagement he and all his men had become the prisoners of the Boer government. Since the retrocession in 1881 the British public had very nearly forgotten South Africa; but this unexpected incident, coupled with an impassioned war song from the pen of the poet

laureate, startled it into a renewed interest which was rapidly intensified as the situation developed.

The retrocession had been followed by the London Convention in 1884, which, while unfortunately indefinite on certain points, expressly precluded the Transvaal government from forming relations of its own with any foreign Powers, or from territorial expansion. In the old days any determined disposition on the part of the Boers to extend their borders in the interior would have probably been allowed entirely free play. But a new spirit was abroad, incarnate in the person of Mr. Cecil Rhodes, an Englishman who had gone to South Africa in search of health and remained there in pursuit of empire. Mr. Rhodes dreamed of a vast African dominion under the British flag stretching from the Cape to Cairo. His energy created a chartered company which acquired territorial rights, overthrew the Matabele king Lobengula, and cut off the Boer state from all expansion northwards. When the republic endeavoured to find an outlet to the sea, its enterprise was again checked, when the intervening territory was brought under direct British administration.

Now the Transvaal Republic might, like the Orange Free State, have simply remained as a small shut-in self-governing state without creating any disturbance. But the Transvaalers were the sons of the stalwarts who fifty years before had sought to escape from all British control. They looked upon South Africa as a Dutch not a British inheritance; they resented the limitations imposed on them by the British, and their experience had not taught them any respect for the British Empire. Their president, Paul Kruger, had himself gone on the great trek in his boyhood. It is not possible to doubt that President Kruger dreamed his own dreams of a United South Africa, but a South Africa under a Dutch flag, not under the Union Jack; though how far those dreams were shared by others is not equally clear. But whatever his ambitions outside the Transvaal, within the borders of the republic he intended to go his own way.

In 1885, however, the discovery was made of valuable goldfields within the territories of the republic; aliens, Uitlanders as they were called, for the most part British subjects, whatever their actual nationality might be, poured into the Transvaal to exploit the mines. The Boer government had no objection to the exploitation of the mines on its own terms, which did not include the concession of citizenship to the Uitlanders till after a very prolonged residence. All the burdens of citizenship were laid on the Uitlanders without its privileges. The Uitlanders began to feel that they had no security for justice, and to demand approximately the opportunities for acquiring citizenship in the Transvaal which were readily accorded to the Transvaaler who migrated into British territory. The objection of the Boer to admitting the Uitlander to political power was natural for obvious reasons. The Boer population was small; if residence there was made too attractive to the aliens they would soon outnumber the legitimate

inhabitants and, possessing full political privileges, would come to control the government. But there was an obvious retort also, that the Uitlanders' demand for political rights would cease to be active if in other respects they received fair play. The strength of the Uitlanders' case lay in the unjust burdens which were imposed on them.

Superficially, then, the attitude of the two sides may be stated thus. The Uitlanders complained that they were admitted to the Transvaal only under grossly oppressive conditions, which could be remedied only by the ready concession of full citizenship. The Boers replied that the Uitlanders came unasked, and if they disliked the conditions on which they were admitted they might stay away; to which the only possible answer was that the conditions imposed were such as no civilised state is warranted in imposing upon civilised immigrants. But behind the direct issue between Boers and Uitlanders events demonstrated that other motives were at work. President Kruger was aiming at consolidating a Boer state which should take the lead in establishing a Dutch ascendancy in South Africa, while Mr. Rhodes and his associates were planning to utilise the trouble in the Transvaal in order to establish a British ascendancy within the Transvaal itself. The rash haste of Dr. Jameson, the administrator of Mashonaland on the western border of the Transvaal, brought on a crisis prematurely and, in the historic phrase of Mr. Rhodes, "upset the applecart." Misled into the belief that the Uitlanders were ready to rise in arms, Dr. Jameson made his dash on Johannesburg. The Uitlanders were not ready to rise, the invaders were enveloped by a superior force of Boers, and the Jameson Raid ended in a complete fiasco.

The first news of the raid excited enthusiasm in England, for there was a general belief that the raiders had nobly taken their lives in their hands and rushed upon their fate in the desperate hope of rescuing their countrymen and countrywomen in Johannesburg from the vindictive brutality of the Boers. The excitement was increased by the publication of a telegram of congratulation from the German Kaiser to the President of the Transvaal. But the gradual realisation of the character of the blunder which had been committed created in place of the first sentiment a sense of indignant impotence. A very strong case for intervention had been given away by sheer recklessness, and Mr. Kruger took full advantage of the situation. The raid was a piece of absolutely lawless aggression on the part of a responsible British official, for which it was quite impossible to produce reasonable justification. The Uitlanders' lives had not been in danger; the raid had not been the outcome of a generous impulse; all the principles of international law would have warranted the sternest treatment of all the participators. But the politic president handed over the raiders to be tried by the British, and imposed no excessive penalties upon the Uitlanders who were concerned. He had been gratuitously furnished with a complete answer to all appeals, protests, or demands; and his position was still further strengthened when a public enquiry was held in England, in which

it appeared impossible to question that the chiefs of both political parties connived at the suppression of any really searching investigation. If the British public felt dissatisfied, the Boers only saw a more convincing proof that the raid had been the abortive outcome of a great conspiracy against their liberties, with the British Government at the back of it. That conviction, it may be remarked, was generally shared on the European Continent.

On the face of it, if Mr. Kruger wanted nothing more than to secure himself against British interference in the administration of the Transvaal, it merely remained for him to make some small concessions to the Uitlanders as a further demonstration of magnanimity. Instead of this, however, he apparently resolved to use the raid as a lever for obtaining complete independence. In defiance of the Convention, he despatched missions to Europe and made treaties with Portugal, Holland, and the Orange Free State. By so doing he lost the advantage he had hitherto possessed of claiming that the British had, and he had not, overstepped the limitations imposed upon them respectively by recognised law. His treatment of the Uitlanders became more high-handed than ever. But even the raid could not be reckoned as a permanent counterpoise to all British and Uitlander grounds of complaint. Feeling, moreover, was running high in South Africa between the races, many of the Dutch in Cape Colony having become much more sympathetic towards the Transvaal government than they had been at an earlier stage. There was, therefore, very general satisfaction when the British Government despatched to South Africa a new High Commissioner, Sir Alfred Milner, who bore the universal reputation of an experienced and exceptionally capable administrator, clear-headed, liberal-minded, sympathetic, and self-reliant.

Sir Alfred set about his task of investigation without haste and without prejudice. Nevertheless, it took him no very long time to form certain definite conclusions. The grievances of the Uitlanders were intolerable, and the only remedy for them was political enfranchisement. The Boer government was arbitrary, oppressive, and corrupt. There was something in the nature of a conspiracy to establish a Dutch ascendancy. It was time for the British Government to assert itself and to insist upon reforms. Any hesitation would only be attributed to weakness. If a firm front were shown it was not likely that the Boers would resort to arms; if they did, they would very promptly be taught the futility of resistance.

These views were adopted by the home Government in spite of urgent warnings from the principal military authority at the Cape, Sir William Butler, that immense forces would be required to make compulsion effective. Sir William had on other occasions advocated unpopular views, and bore in official circles the reputation which can only be expressed by the term "crank," and his advice was ignored. At the close of May 1899, then, Sir Alfred met President Kruger at the Conference of Bloemfontein, the capital of the Orange Free State. The negotiations failed. In effect Sir Alfred's

demand was that Uitlanders should be entitled to the franchise after five years' residence; President Kruger was only prepared to submit to the "Volksraad" a proposal for enfranchisement after seven years' residence if, as a preliminary, the British gave an unqualified undertaking to abstain entirely from further intervention in the future.

In England the belief was perhaps general that the Transvaal would not fight, and that if it did the Orange Free State would stand neutral. In the Transvaal there was a general belief that the British would give way after one or two reverses, and that even if they did not Europe would intervene and compel them to submit. On October 9th President Kruger delivered an ultimatum requiring the immediate withdrawal of the British troops which had been assembled at points on the frontier. On the 12th the Boers crossed the Natal border in force and the great South African War began.

IV

THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR

The British Government entered on the struggle upon the basis of a huge miscalculation. There appears to have been a general impression that the Boers, on a liberal estimate, could not put as many as thirty thousand efficient men in the field, and that thirty thousand farmers armed with rifles would by no means be a match for fifty thousand British regulars armed with superior artillery. As a matter of fact the two republics could take the field with armies numbering not far short of eighty thousand; and for years past the Transvaal had been utilising the wealth extracted from the gold-mines to accumulate war-stores and to purchase guns which completely outranged those of the British. Their forces were exceedingly mobile, being almost entirely mounted infantry, amply provided with horses which were accustomed to the country, while they themselves were consummate horse-masters and dead shots. Moreover, the strategical advantages enjoyed by the Boers were immense. Their frontier was an elongated semicircle guarded by mountain ranges exceedingly difficult for regular troops to penetrate; while they themselves, holding the interior lines, could with great rapidity transfer large masses of troops from point to point of the frontier, an operation entirely impossible for the British. Also at the moment chosen for the declaration of war the British regular troops, of which the great bulk were merely infantry, numbered not much more than twenty thousand men; and, for political reasons, two-thirds of these had been massed with complete disregard of strategical considerations at Ladysmith and Dundee in the northern angle of Natal. On the opposite side of the Orange Free State a strong garrison held Kimberley, the centre of the diamond mines, and to the north of Kimberley, on the Transvaal

frontier, Colonel Baden-Powell was at Mafeking with some nine hundred combatants under his command—volunteers and irregulars. Other points at the south were held by Generals French and Gatacre, but co-operation between these various forces was quite impossible.

Though the Boer commanders showed no little ability in the field, their conceptions of strategy were happily of an elementary character. The sound policy for them would have been to leave containing forces sufficient to check active operations from Ladysmith and Kimberley, and to strike at once in force at the Cape itself, a policy which, with the greatly superior numbers which they controlled at the outset, would have been entirely practicable. An invasion of the Cape would probably have brought to their standard large numbers of the disaffected Cape Dutch, and the British would in that case have had to reconquer the Cape itself. Instead of this, however, the Boers concentrated their energies upon the sieges of Ladysmith, of Kimberley, and of Mafeking.



The Terrace Mountain Ranges of South Africa.

At the very outset it became obvious that the British position at Glencoe near Dundee was untenable. By October 26th the force there had effected its retreat to Ladysmith, where the army remained shut up for four months. In November reinforcements arrived at the Cape under command of General Buller. The fact that Mr. Rhodes was at Kimberley had been extremely useful, because it had filled the Boers with an intense desire to capture that post and the person of the man whom they regarded as their arch enemy; so that Kimberley for them acquired a wholly fictitious importance. General Buller decided that both Ladysmith and Kimberley must be relieved; he himself undertook the campaign on the east, while that on the west was entrusted to Lord Methuen. The Boers contented themselves with occupying the ground beyond the Tugela, blocking the way to Ladysmith, while advanced forces were thrown out from the neighbourhood of Kimberley to block the progress of Lord Methuen.

In the second week in December came a series of disasters. After a sharp struggle, Methuen forced the passage of the Modder River, and on the night of the 10th he attempted to surprise the Boer General Cronje in the strongly entrenched position which he occupied at Magersfontein. The task was entrusted to the Highland Brigade. But the Highlanders advancing in the dark in close order, which in a night attack must be preserved

till the last moment, reached the enemy's lines before they knew they had done so. Suddenly, without warning, a storm of fire belched forth from the Boer entrenchments; in three minutes six hundred of the Highlanders had fallen. They broke, only to rally the moment they reached cover, but an advance was impossible. Though reinforcements presently arrived, to carry the entrenchments by a frontal attack was out of the question. The advance to the relief of Kimberley was completely blocked.

On the previous day General Gatacre in the south had attempted to strike at a Boer force which was at last invading Cape Colony. His force was cut in two at Stormberg, and six hundred British soldiers became prisoners of war. In the east on the 15th Buller attempted the passage of the Tugela, and was repulsed with heavy loss at Colenso. The whole offensive movement was entirely paralysed.

The "black week" aroused the nation to the consciousness of the immensity of the task which it had undertaken, but with grim determination it resolved to carry it through. The call to arms met with an eager response not only in the British Isles but from Canada and from Australasia. The veteran Lord Roberts, the hero of the Afghan War, was despatched to take the supreme command, having as his Chief of Staff Lord Kitchener, who had achieved the highest reputation by the reconquest of the Soudan, of which the story will presently be told.

It was not till the second week in February that Lord Roberts was ready to put his new plan of campaign in operation. In the meantime Ladysmith had been subjected to a fierce attack, beaten off with dogged valour. Again General Buller had carried a large force across the Tugela to storm and carry the Boer position at Spionkop—for it would seem that at the end of the day the Boers believed that the British were established on the crest, and were preparing to beat a retreat. But so deadly had the struggle been that the exceptionally gallant officer, who had taken the command when General Woodgate fell mortally wounded, believed that the position was wholly untenable; and it was the British, not the Boers who retreated. Yet Ladysmith still held out with grim resolution, Kimberley defied its besiegers in the west, while the lively and resourceful defence of Mafeking gave even a flavour of comedy to the great tragedy.

From the moment of the opening of Roberts' campaign the tide turned completely. Buller was left to fight his way to Ladysmith, but except for this the whole of the now large force collected in South Africa was to be engaged in a sweeping movement of invasion, taking Kimberley by the way. While attention was concentrated on the advance of the main army, General French, with a strong column of cavalry, was despatched on a race by a more easterly route to ensure the envelopment of the Boers before Kimberley. On the fourth day the siege was raised. The besiegers made a dash for the gap which the slower movements of Roberts with his infantry force had not yet closed up. But one British detachment was able to hang on the rear of the retreating Cronje, while the cavalry again issuing from

Kimberley headed him off the line on which he was retiring. At Paardeberg Cronje was trapped after a furious fight, and in spite of the obstinacy with which he held out in a position elaborately entrenched, his whole force was reduced to surrender nine days after the battle of Paardeberg, on February 27th.

While these successful operations were being carried on in the western theatre, Buller had at last found a practicable line of advance. This time the turning movement was successful, and on the day after Cronje's surrender the Boers were on the retreat from before Ladysmith. In seventeen



The surrender of General Cronje at Paardeberg.

[From a photograph, by permission of the "Graphic."]

days the entire aspect of the war had been changed. A fortnight later Lord Roberts was in Bloemfontein. A great epidemic of typhoid delayed further operations until May 1st, when the march upon Pretoria began. On May 17 Mafeking was relieved, a piece of intelligence which sent the entire population at home temporarily off its head. On June 5th Lord Roberts was in Pretoria.

The sweeping advance met with occasional resistance, but the Boers were unable to attempt a pitched battle. Still, however, a detached force of Free-Staters, generally commanded by Christian De Wet, carried on perpetual raids upon the British communications and snapped up isolated

detachments; while the rapidity of De Wet's movements and the completeness of his information enabled him to evade pursuit. President Kruger had himself departed from Pretoria, but his official Government and the Transvaal army were still in being. A severe defeat was inflicted on this force at Diamond Hill on June 11th, which may be regarded as the last pitched battle of the war. And yet it was not till September that Mr. Kruger had so far despaired of the republic that he withdrew to the coast and took ship for Europe.

Lord Roberts, with a somewhat premature optimism, was able to announce that the war was practically over, and departed, leaving Lord Kitchener to complete the subjugation of the rebels who still remained in arms—rebels in the exceedingly technical sense that they were in arms against the power which had formally proclaimed its sovereignty. The chief political authority was still in the hands of Sir Alfred, who had now become Viscount Milner. At home Lord Salisbury took the opportunity for appealing to the country by a dissolution, when the electorate definitely pronounced that the work of settling South Africa should be completed by the Government which had entered upon the war. The attitude of a section of the Liberal party had produced an impression that whatever might be the sins and shortcomings of the Unionists it would be dangerous to entrust the government to a party which was suspected of an unpatriotic sympathy with the country's enemies. The Unionist majority after the general election still stood at 130.

Yet for another eighteen months the war remained particularly lively. The Boer leaders, so long as they were able to maintain a guerilla warfare, declined to consider themselves beaten or to accept anything short of that complete sovereign independence for which they had been fighting from the beginning. The brilliant audacity and resourcefulness of several leaders, and, above all, of the ubiquitous and irrepressible De Wet, inspired the hearty admiration of the British; while the conduct of many of the farm people, who acted as combatants or non-combatants according to the convenience of the moment, kept alive an acute irritation. The severities involved were angrily denounced; and while the population was to a great extent gathered into "concentration camps" by the British Government, and there maintained and kept in security, fictitious stories of British brutality were freely circulated and believed all over the European Continent. From first to last, however, one fact had been conspicuous. While the press of nearly all Europe united in denouncing the British, the Powers had recognised the futility of any intervention in a war which would involve fighting not with British armies but with British fleets. The British command of the sea was so decisive that the Powers, whatever their inclinations might be, had no choice but to leave the Boer States to take care of themselves.

Meanwhile Lord Kitchener, with imperturbable persistency, drew the lines of his block-houses across the country until he had at last formed an

impenetrable net, pressing ever closer and closer upon the Boers, who still fought on until at last that indomitable people recognised that extermination was the only alternative to submission. In March 1902 they opened negotiations, which were conducted on behalf of the British with unflinching tact and firmness by Lord Kitchener. On May 31st the provisional government signed the treaty which terminated the war. The republics were incorporated in the British Empire, in the first instance as Crown colonies, but with the promise or at least the hope that before long they might be placed in the same position as the colonies which enjoyed responsible government. Great Britain provided them with £3,000,000 in order to establish them on a working financial basis; and the use of the Dutch language was to be permitted in the schools and law courts. Broadly speaking, it was resolved that the conquered states should not be treated as subject nationalities which must be kept in subjection with a strong hand; the way was prepared instead for accepting them as free and loyal denizens of the British Empire.

V

THE SECOND SALISBURY ADMINISTRATION

The return of the Unionists to power in 1895 enticed one of the rising statesmen of that party to prophesy that there would be no more troubles with foreign Powers, which only took advantage of the weakness of Liberal Governments. The prophecy was hardly uttered before it was falsified. A dispute was already in progress with France in regard to Siam; and it was settled peacefully at the beginning of 1896 only because Lord Salisbury judged that the subject in dispute was not worth a war. In fact his diplomacy was habitually open precisely to the charge levelled against Liberals of making concessions in preference to insisting upon every claim for which a plausible justification could be brought forward. The plain fact was that the responsible leaders of both parties usually took very much the same view as to the general principles of action in foreign affairs. British interests were to be safeguarded, but an aggressive tone was to be avoided, and practical considerations were not to be over-riden by abstract objections to the methods which other nations chose to adopt, or by a desire to check the natural craving for expansion on the part of other peoples than the British. The rule of avoiding isolated intervention was to be strictly observed. And these principles were not always to the taste of the advanced members either of the one party which was unduly hasty in discovering that British interests were involved, or of the other which was too eager that Britain should constitute herself not only the advocate but the fighting champion of oppressed populations and nationalities.

Thus in 1896 a grave situation was created by the threatening language of the United States, which in effect claimed the right to dictate the settlement of a boundary dispute between Britain and Venezuela; and extremists were far from being pleased when the case was submitted to arbitration. Lord Salisbury's justification was complete, when after long delays the award of the arbitrators confirmed the British view in practically every detail. Again in 1896 there was a great outburst of popular indignation over ugly stories of massacres by the Turks in Armenia. In spite of the agitation, however, Lord Salisbury refused an isolated intervention, wherein he was warmly supported by Lord Rosebery, who, partly in consequence of the line adopted by a large number of Liberals, at this time resigned the leadership of the Liberal party and assumed the rôle of a candid and independent critic. But if Lord Salisbury declined to send armies to Armenia, Britain could take a definite lead in another case, in virtue of her position as the premier naval power. In effect it was British interposition which saved Greece from paying the full penalty for challenging Turkey to a war in which she was very decisively worsted, and compelled the Turks to concede the establishment of an autonomous government in Crete with a Greek prince at the head of it in 1897. On the other hand, British diplomacy appeared to come off badly when the victory of Japan in a struggle with China led to a scramble among the European Powers for Chinese territory, and Russia appropriated some of the fruits of the war to which the Japanese seemed legitimately entitled. Lord Salisbury, in fact, did not want Chinese territory, though he desired and obtained from the Powers concerned the open door for commerce. Japan was to prove later that she was very well able to take care of her own interests.

Of much more importance than the remote East in the eyes of the Government was the position of affairs of Egypt. Since 1885 the Egyptian government had left the Sudan to itself. The Mahdi died in that year, to be succeeded by the Khalifa Abdullah, who continued to organise a sort of empire among the wild Sudanese. Now it was still in theory the desire of the British Government to withdraw from Egypt, but it was entirely obvious that a British withdrawal would leave Egypt a prey to the Khalifa. In 1896 it was resolved that in order to curb the dervishes, as the Khalifa's followers were called, it was necessary to push the Egyptian frontier to the south, up the Nile to Dongola. The jealousy of Russia and France caused those Powers to exercise their legal rights in restraining the Egyptian government from providing funds for a campaign. The money was therefore advanced by the British Government, and before the end of the year Dongola was occupied without serious resistance. But the advance had only made it clear that the time had really arrived for the reconquest of the Sudan. With systematic precision Sir Herbert Kitchener prepared his plans not merely for a campaign of victories, but for an effective strategic occupation. In 1898

the regular advance began, and in September the Khalifa's forces were completely shattered at the decisive battle of Omdurman. Abdullah, however, escaped, and it was not till the end of 1899 that the last resistance of the dervishes was finally crushed.

Omdurman itself was followed by an incident which threatened to bring about a war with France. A French expedition, commanded by Major Marchand, had started some two years before from the French Sudan. In the summer of 1898 the intrepid explorer and his party penetrated into the Egyptian Sudan and reached Fashoda, where they hoisted the French flag



The Palace of the Governor-General of the Sudan at Khartum.

and repulsed an attack on the part of the dervishes. It is impossible to question that but for the advance of Kitchener the little party would very soon have been annihilated. Hearing a report that there were troops commanded by white officers at Fashoda, Sir Herbert proceeded up the Nile, found Major Marchand at Fashoda, complimented him on his brilliant enterprise, and hoisted the British and Egyptian flags. The indignant Frenchman declared that Fashoda was French territory, on which the French flag had been hoisted before it was in occupation by the British; and French sentiment became greatly excited. But the fact was too obvious that Fashoda had not been in effective French occupation, and that Marchand would never have been heard of again if the dervish forces had

not been shattered by the British and Egyptian army. The French claims were ultimately withdrawn and the respective frontiers delimited.

In the sphere of foreign politics, as actively affecting this country, one



Egypt and the Sudan.

other event remains to be chronicled during this period. China had received a very rude shock in the Japanese War, and a series of further shocks when one after another of the European Powers forced treaties and conces-

sions upon her. At the same time a progressive party, which was becoming alive to the advantages possessed by Europeans, was temporarily dominant, and set about the introduction of a series of reforms by no means to the taste of the conservative Manchus, the dominant race to which the reigning dynasty belonged. A *coup d'état* restored the ascendancy of the Dowager

Empress and the old régime, and very soon afterwards began what was called the Boxer rising, directed largely against Christians and "foreign devils." There was very little doubt that the movement was fomented by the government, although nugatory edicts were issued against the insurgents. The legations of the European Powers at Peking were besieged and cut off from all communication with the outside world; and the attempt to effect a relief by means of an entirely inadequate mixed force under Admiral Seymour failed. The relieving force itself had to be relieved. The Powers, working in reasonable concert, at length collected a sufficient force which marched on Peking under the command of the German Marshal Count Waldersee. Happily it was found that the legations had held out successfully. A heavy war indemnity was imposed upon the Chinese, and the incident terminated without any rupture among the Powers.

In India the most prominent events were the two disastrous famines of 1897 and 1900, a severe and prolonged outbreak of the bubonic plague, and a somewhat exceptionally severe period of campaigning among the tribes in the north-west frontier presently followed by the organisation of a frontier province separate from the Punjab.



Queen Victoria, 1837-1900.

[From a photograph by Bassano.]

In the sphere of domestic legislation Ireland again had its turn. Home Rule was for the time being put entirely out of court, and the still unhealed division in the ranks of the Irish Nationalists kept that party comparatively inactive. It was the main business of the Unionists to demonstrate that the people of Ireland could still be sympathetically and satisfactorily governed without having a legislature of their own at Dublin. Mr. Chamberlain had not departed from his old desire to extend to Ireland methods of self-government which should not involve the separation of the legislatures. On the land question, while there was sufficient variety in the ideal solutions which individuals were inclined to propound, everyone wanted to improve the lot of the tenants without inflicting undue loss upon landlords. The main difference between the two parties was that one was somewhat more anxious on the landlords' behalf and the other on that of the tenants. Hence the Government introduced a Land Bill with the usual object of improving the facilities for land purchase. Being favourably received by the Nationalists, it was denounced by the Irish landlords as a betrayal of their interests. Being modified in their favour, it was denounced again with equal fervour by the Nationalists. Ultimately the withdrawal of sundry amendments left the landlords sore and the Nationalists on the whole pacified. This Land Act of 1896 was followed by the Local Government Act of 1898, which established elective county councils and district councils. The working of the Act in Ireland has not differed conspicuously from the working of the earlier Local Government Act in England.

Here, however, the Unionists were not altogether satisfied with their own handiwork. The London County Council had exercised the powers bestowed upon it with an activity which inspired alarm in Conservative quarters. A new Act broke up the great municipality into a number of boroughs, to which a portion of the powers of the London County Council were transferred.

Three other measures demand brief notice. In 1896 an Agricultural Rating Act was passed to diminish the pressure of the rates upon the land. Ostensibly it was intended to relieve the tenant; in actual practice it was no doubt the landlords who benefited. A comprehensive Education Bill was introduced in the same year, but its extremely complicated character compelled its withdrawal, and a simpler bill was introduced in the next year. In effect the intention was to free the voluntary or denominational schools from the disadvantages under which they stood as compared with those schools which were entirely supported out of public funds. The schools were relieved from liability for the rates, and were given a substantial capitation grant, while the Church authorities still retained complete control of the management. The Opposition denounced the measure as appropriating public money practically in order to foster the denominational teaching of the Established Church, as they denounced the Agricultural Rating Act as a "dole" to the landlords.

The third measure was an Employers' Liability Bill, making the employers in certain trades responsible in case of injury to their workmen, but this also was denounced by the Opposition on the ground that it permitted contracting out and was therefore practically valueless to the workmen.

The clamour of the general election of 1900 had hardly died down when the nation was plunged into mourning by the death of Queen Victoria in the sixty-fourth year of her reign, the longest in our annals. The parliamentary situation however was not affected. The Liberal party was virtually paralysed by the extreme divergencies among both leaders and rank and file on the subject of the Boer War; and although on all sides there were wrathful denunciations of the blunders and miscalculations of which the administration had been guilty in the first stages of the struggle, the country had very definitely refused to displace ministers in favour of a party so divided on the most important issue of the hour. When at the end of 1901 Lord Rosebery emerged again into activity, it seemed for the moment that the bulk of the Liberals and a large proportion of those who had only supported the Government *faute de mieux* would be ready to unite under Lord Rosebery's banner, but that statesman had no wish to create a party of his own. When it became clear that it would not be possible for him to act in harmony with the official Liberal chief, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, he reverted to the position of candid friend. But his intervention had not been without effect in emphasising the general feeling that more serious and more tactful efforts must be made to bring the hostilities to an end.

Though Lord Rosebery had failed to re-unite the Liberals, their differences were in fact connected very much more with the past than with the future. When once the war was over there was nothing really to prevent a reunion, since the imperialist section had rejected the temptation to organise itself as a separate party. The Government made haste in 1892 to provide the Opposition with a bond of union by bringing in a new Education Bill, which was unanimously condemned by every section of the Liberals. More decisively than ever the bill asserted the principle of retaining the entire management of voluntary schools under clerical control, of preserving religious tests for the teachers, and of paying the greater part of the expenses out of public funds. But before the measure became law Lord Salisbury had retired from office and Mr. Arthur Balfour had become Prime Minister.

Here must be added the record of an important step on the part of the colonies, taken in the last year of the century. The Australian group federated themselves as the Australian Commonwealth, on the analogy of the Canadian dominion; although, as Newfoundland continued to stand outside the Canadian federation, so New Zealand continued to stand outside the Australian federation. This may perhaps be taken as the moment when it began to be recognised that the term "colony" was ceasing or had ceased to be properly applicable to the autonomous states of the British


Empire. Thenceforth it gradually became customary to speak of them not as the Colonies but as the Dominions.

VI

TRANSITIONAL

Until the accession of Queen Victoria, the longest reign in our history had been that of her grandfather, King George III., which had covered a period of sixty years. During the last ten of those years he had suffered a living death and had taken no part in public affairs. Queen Victoria had reached her eighty-second year when she died with faculties unimpaired and in the enjoyment of a popular loyalty which had perhaps never been higher. The celebration of her jubilee, the fiftieth year of her reign, thirteen years before, had been the occasion of great public enthusiasm; and it had been used to assemble together from all parts of the empire such a gathering of her subjects as had vividly impressed the people of England with the sense of imperial splendour. That impression had been more than confirmed ten years later by the celebration of what was called the Diamond Jubilee. The pageantry of these great functions appealed to the general imagination, and perhaps did more than any amount of reasoned discourse to give life to the new spirit of imperialism—a sense that the British Empire is something more than a number of red spots on a map. That consciousness was still further vitalised when the South African War displayed the deep-seated devotion of the dominions overseas to the British flag. The Great Queen died before the war-cloud was dispersed, while the future of one great section of her vast dominions was still gloomily uncertain; but she had lived to see the old indifferentism pass, and to know that her empire was united as it had never been before. When she came to the throne the Crown had lost its hold on the affections of the people; it had been her task to regain for it the loyalty of the nation. She had made no attempt to recover for it the powers of control which had passed for ever to parliament, but she created for it a moral influence which remains a vital factor in the national life. Her personal withdrawal from public functions after the death of the Prince Consort diminished for a time the ornamental value of the monarchy; but even when she was least before the public eye her ministers relied upon her political sagacity, and her judgment influenced the councils of the monarchs of Europe. England has known four queens regnant in the course of a thousand years; it is noteworthy that the reigns of three out of the four have covered some of the most conspicuously brilliant periods of the national history. Queen Anne indeed can claim little credit for the glories of her age, but Elizabeth and Victoria both stand beside and perhaps above the greatest of all our kings.

Less than three years before Queen Victoria died Mr. Gladstone, who had first entered parliament five years before the queen's accession. He attained Cabinet rank in Peel's ministry fifty years before he formed the last administration of which he was himself the head. For very nearly thirty years he was the acknowledged chief of one of the two great parties, at least if we disregard his temporary abdication during Lord Beaconsfield's rule. In the last three years of his life he had only once been stirred to public utterance, and sufficient time had elapsed for his political opponents to discover in him virtues previously unsuspected. Endowed with an extraordinarily persuasive eloquence, an extreme intellectual subtlety, and an intense moral fervour, he applied ethical standards to political life with a surprising courage which it would be difficult to parallel. Like his master Peel, he spent his life in assimilating one after another ideas to which he had at first been strongly antagonistic. His weakness lay in that excessive intellectual subtlety which made it easy for him to persuade himself that what he had come to regard as morally right was demonstrably expedient, and that what he realised as expedient was warranted by the highest moral sanctions. But whatever judgment future generations may pass upon his wisdom or upon his powers of self-deception, it will always be recognised that he imported into politics an insistence upon the doctrine that the highest morality is also the highest expediency, which has given him a unique position among the practical politicians of history.



Alfred Lord Tennyson.
[After the painting by G. F. Watts.]

Six years earlier passed away his great contemporary, Alfred Tennyson. It may well be that future ages will not recognise Tennyson as the greatest literary figure of his time in England; but this is certain, that he will always be the poet most representative of the Victorian Era. A consummate artificer in verse, his merely technical skill would give him high rank among the poets of any age; he taught to lesser men a style which made his own age peculiarly rich in minor poets, imitators of the master, who learnt to dress thoughts which did not rise above the commonplace in dainty and musical phrases. As distinctively as Pope he was the typical poet of his own day, not because he was a particularly profound thinker or a particularly deep student of humanity, but because he gave an almost perfect expression to the prevalent philosophy and the prevalent ideals of the time.

All the three great figures which have just been described were representative of the transitional period which politically was that of the passage from oligarchy to democracy. The arrival of democracy, the acquisition of political power by the hitherto unenfranchised masses of the community, was the essential change attained in the closing years of the nineteenth century, and the great problem now becoming of vital importance was how those newly enfranchised masses would organise themselves. One thing was certain, that for a hundred years past they had ceased to acquiesce in the existing distribution of the wealth of the community. They did not recognise the justice of the principles on which that distribution had been arrived at by practically unmitigated individual competition. They did not accept the theory that to disturb that distribution was an unwarrantable interference with the sacred rights of property. But for half a century the more intelligent of them, those who were employed in trades which required skill and intelligence, had been learning to organise themselves, and their leaders, the men who had organised them while they were still unenfranchised, were no revolutionaries. They relied upon combination to secure a gradual rise in wages, a gradual diminution in the hours of labour.

But a prolonged period of trade depression set in not long after the trade unions won their legal recognition in 1875. The result was that wages fell instead of rising, and the unions repeatedly found themselves unable to hold their own when they challenged conflicts with the masters. The result again was discontent on the part of large numbers of the working men with the acquiescent attitude of the trade union leaders, and that "new unionism" developed which not only called for much more aggressive action outside the legislature, but also demanded active state intervention; not as in the past to secure liberty of action for the workman, but to impose restrictions upon the employer. Labour in effect was to fight to obtain actual control of the materials and methods of production. In other words, the definitely socialistic doctrine that the democratically governed state, not private individuals, should own and control the materials and methods of production in the interests of the workers, began to challenge the old individualism on which the old unionism rested; the individualism which professed at least to desire nothing more than the right of unfettered combination for the workmen. As yet, however, socialistic doctrine was confined to a small though exceedingly active section; the old leaders still in the main held their own.

CHAPTER XXXVIII


EPILOGUE

I

UNDER KING EDWARD VII

THE first phase of present-day party politics began with Mr. Gladstone's declaration in favour of Home Rule for Ireland; the second began in 1903 with Mr. Chamberlain's challenge of the principles of Free Trade, which had been held by the country practically unquestioned for half a century. The parliamentary year opened pacifically with an Irish Land Bill, which achieved the apparent miracle of being accepted as satisfactory both by Irish landlords and Irish tenants. The miracle was accomplished because the British taxpayer provided the money and took the risks of the adjustment. But in the meanwhile the Colonial Secretary had been paying a visit to South Africa, whence he returned in the spring of 1903 with one altogether predominant idea in his mind—that the supreme task of statesmanship was to draw closer the bonds which held the great British Empire together. In comparison with this everything else sank into insignificance.

In May Mr. Chamberlain startled the world by proclaiming that one thing was needful to the consolidation of the Empire. The strength of the bond of sentiment had been nobly demonstrated by the gallant bands of volunteers who had rallied to the flag in the war now happily over. But the bond of sentiment was not sufficient; it must be strengthened by interest, by what Thomas Carlyle called the "cash nexus." The United



King Edward VII.

[After a photograph by Lafayette, Dublin.]

Kingdom must be prepared to make some economic sacrifice in the interest of the Dominions. The new bond was to be provided by the creation of a preferential market in Great Britain for colonial goods.

No one in effect for fifty years had dreamed of reviving tariffs on imports. Tea, alcohol, and tobacco, and a few other articles, continued to be taxed for purposes of revenue, but no advantage was given to home or colonial producers of the taxed articles. In pathetic isolation Mr. Chaplin had pleaded for the protection of agriculture, and for a brief moment an attempt had been made to raise the cry of fair trade, retaliation, and "making the foreigner pay." No one had taken these things seriously. But when Mr. Chamberlain spoke it was impossible not to take him seriously. Covert Protectionists emerged from their despairing silence, men who had been bred if not born Free-Traders began to reconsider the arguments which they had never thought of disputing. Others whose economic faith was unshaken began to think that the economic sacrifice might after all be less than the political gain. The few Liberals who became immediate converts became also the most uncompromising and enthusiastic of the advocates of fiscal reform.

But after the first shock of surprise there were no more defections among the Liberals from economic orthodoxy. Nothing perhaps could have been conceived better calculated to close up the ranks of an Opposition which as yet had only partly recovered from its disintegration. The salient fact fastened upon was that no preferential tariffs would be of appreciable value to the dominions unless food-stuffs and raw materials were taxed in their favour, since their manufactures were practically a negligible quantity. To tax food-stuffs and raw materials would raise the price of the working man's food and the cost of production to the home manufacturer, who was dependent on foreign supplies for his raw material. There were many Unionists as well as Liberals to whom that argument appealed with great force. But when once Mr. Chamberlain had broken with the principle of Free Trade the attack upon it was developed all along the line. First it was urged that the tariffs would provide a revenue which might be appropriated to a scheme for granting Old Age Pensions, which Mr. Chamberlain had long advocated in the abstract. Then Mr. Balfour began to perceive a possibility that tariffs, though undesirable in themselves, might be used as battering-rams for breaking down the tariff walls raised against British goods by other countries. Moreover, it was not so clear that tariffs would raise prices. It was argued that the foreigner would pay; he would lower his prices in order to keep his goods on the British market. Finally, the unqualified argument for Protection was brought into play. The competition of cheap foreign goods was on the verge of bringing to ruin the British producers. The industries which were thus suffering could only be saved by a tariff on the foreign articles—especially such as were "dumped" at less than cost price by bounty-fed producers—which would enable the British producer to sell at a profitable rate. Thus these in-

dustries would provide increased employment for the British working-man. The answers given to these respective arguments were that as a matter of experience retaliation does not reduce hostile tariffs ; that we already purchase from the foreigner at bottom prices, and therefore he would not reduce them in order to meet the tariff ; that the argument for pure Protection came to nothing at all if the foreigner paid the tariff and supplied us as cheaply as before ; whereas, if Protection was rendered effective because it raised the price of the foreign product, it would also raise the price of the home product to the consumer. As for the argument that by protecting British industries employment would be increased, it was replied that the increased cost of all articles of consumption and especially of food would far more than counterbalance the supposed benefits to the workers.

From 1903 till the end of 1905 the battle raged. The Liberals grew daily more united, while Mr. Balfour vainly endeavoured to avert a complete split among the Unionists. Four prominent supporters of the Government, including the Duke of Devonshire, retired from the Cabinet. At last in December 1905 Mr. Balfour resigned ; Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman accepted office, and immediately afterwards appealed to the electorate. The result was overwhelming. The Liberals were returned with a solid majority of eighty-four over all the other parties put together ; and even of those parties they could count generally on the support of more than eighty Irish Nationalists and more than fifty members who had been returned by the Labour party which for some years past had been steadily organising itself. The whole body of the Unionists numbered less than one hundred and sixty. But it must be remarked that the Liberal leaders were expressly pledged not to use their majority to deal with the question of Irish Home Rule ; while the fiscal reformers declared that the battle had been won largely on a false issue through the prominence given to the question of employing Chinese labour in South Africa.

It was admitted, then, by the Opposition that the country had for the moment pronounced decisively against fiscal reform, but only because it had not become thoroughly accustomed to the idea. It was not admitted that the country had intended to authorise any positive item in the Liberal programme. This view was naturally not accepted by the Liberals, who for precisely twenty years had had practically no voice in legislation, since in their last brief period of office all their measures with the exception of the budgets had been either eviscerated or thrown out by the House of Lords. Almost at once they embarked upon an extensive programme of reforms. They began by accepting a bill from the labour party for the protection of trade unions. It will be remembered that the Act of 1874 was supposed to have protected trade unions from being sued as corporate bodies ; but in 1903 a judgment of the law courts known as the Taff Vale Decision had shattered this impression. The Act of 1906 was intended simply to establish as law what the world at large had supposed to be the law for nearly thirty years.

The next step was a bill to abolish plural voting ; that is, to prevent one person from recording a vote in more than one constituency. On the ground that this was merely a party move, since it was notorious that the great majority of plural voters were Unionists, and also on the ground that such a change should not be introduced except in association with other changes readjusting the existing unfair distribution of voting power, the bill was thrown out by the Lords.

Then the Government attacked the education question, in accordance with the demands of nonconformists. Voluntary schools where the education was conducted on a denominational basis were not to be supported out of public funds. If they could not be maintained, the local authority was to have power to take them over, to assume the control, and to give the undenominational teaching which, from the point of view of Anglicans and Roman Catholics, was rather worse than purely secular education. The Lords made drastic amendments which the Government would not accept, and the bill was dropped.

In 1907 the programme was less aggressive. The budget however had two new features. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Asquith, for the first time dropped what had long been the fiction of professing to regard income tax as a source of revenue with which the country might presently dispense. Accepting it then as a permanent source of revenue, Mr. Asquith modified it by reducing the amount to be paid on incomes which were directly earned as compared with incomes derived from real property and from investments.

The great measure of the year was Mr Haldane's scheme of army reform, which aimed at producing the maximum of efficiency without departing from the principle of voluntary recruitment. No party in the state had hitherto ventured to commit itself to approval of any of those schemes for compulsory service which were in general urgently demanded by military men in view of the huge armies controlled by the European nations. The main point of the scheme was the reorganisation of the militia, the yeomanry, and the volunteers into the body known as "territorials." So far the scheme was viewed with very general favour except by those who were prepared to denounce any scheme which failed to provide for compulsory service. Criticism was mainly directed against certain reductions in the regular army for foreign service, and in the garrison artillery ; while it was urged on the other side that the reductions meant nothing more than the removal of inefficient, and that in effect the regular army was rendered not a less but a more efficient striking force. This appears to have been admitted by the experts, even although they resented the actual reductions as unnecessary. A more aggressive warning note was struck by the Government resolutions pronouncing that the powers of the House of Lords in rejecting and delaying legislation ought to be restricted.

In 1908 the party battle again waxed furious. The retirement and

death of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman removed a leader whose tact and management had during his term of office won for him an admiration and affection such as no one had previously looked for. His successor, Mr. Asquith, had been the acknowledged chief of the imperialist section of Liberals, and for the moment there were doubts whether the party would retain its solidarity under his captaincy. Very soon, however, it became apparent that there was to be no abatement in the Liberal demand for reforms. The reconstructions of the Cabinet gave an increased instead of diminished prominence to the more Radical element, while there was no sign that the so-called Whigs were at variance with their colleagues.

The first measure was indeed hardly controversial, since Unionists even more than Liberals had been pledged to provide pensions for the aged poor so soon as the national revenue should be able to bear the burden. Such opposition as the Old Age Pension Bill met with was based on the argument that the money would be better applied to strengthening national defence, or else upon the view that the scheme ought to be contributory—that the pension should be a reward of thrift, not bestowed on the thrifty and thriftless alike.

The Government returned to the attack on the Education question, a subject on which it was a sheer impossibility to take a popular line. The attempt was made to find a middle way which both denominationalists and undenominationalists could conscientiously accept. The proposal was that in areas where there was only one available school the regular religious instruction should be of the undenominational order, with facilities for denominational instruction to be given outside the school hours. But, in spite of prolonged negotiations, it was found to be impossible to arrive at any scheme which could command general assent, and the bill was after all withdrawn.

Fiercer still was the controversy over a bill which was to reduce systematically the number of houses licensed to sell alcoholic beverages. In a period of fourteen years one-third of the existing licenses were to be extinguished, but compensation was to be provided by a fund levied from the trade itself. After the fourteen years it was to be recognised that the licence would be granted for one year only, carrying with it no sort of right to count upon its renewal. The whole energies of the licensed trade were devoted to a vehement campaign against the measure; ministerialists lost seats at several bye-elections; the House of Lords were encouraged to believe that the Government had lost the confidence of the country and would be defeated in a general election, and the Peers rejected the bill.

Still the Government, like its Unionists predecessor, refused to regard bye-elections as a proof that it ought to resign, or, still more positively, to admit the title of the House of Lords to force an appeal to the country. In 1909 the gage of battle was flung down more emphatically than ever in the Budget introduced by the new Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr.

Lloyd George. The announcement that the naval programmes of foreign Powers necessitated an immensely increased expenditure on armaments met with an extremely reluctant assent from the economists in the Liberal ranks, while the programme put forward was stormily denounced as utterly insufficient by the Opposition. The Government stood to their view that their demands did not go beyond what was required by a reasonable prudence, but were at the same time adequate.

But the increased expenditure demanded an increased revenue. The rejection of the last year's Licensing Bill was met by greatly increasing the cost of licenses; thus the liquor traffic was to be laid under contribution. An increase of the duties on tobacco and on spirits would levy a contribution from the working man. Wealth was to contribute by an increase of the tax upon incomes exceeding £5000 a year, and of the death duties. But above everything else a new tax was to be laid upon land by the appropriation of a portion of what is called the Unearned Increment; that is, the increased value of property brought about not by the action of the proprietors but by external circumstances—a scheme which involved an immense and complicated system of revaluation. The Budget, warmly applauded by Radicals who since the days of John Stuart Mill had claimed that the unearned increment was a fair and just source of taxation, was received with a storm of indignation by the landholders and the licensed trade. The House of Peers accepted the Government's challenge. It was admitted that they could not amend a money bill; it was admitted, on the other hand, that they had the constitutional right to reject such a bill in its entirety. They acted upon their technical right, in spite of strong protests from Lord Rosebery and others who detested the Budget itself, and threw out the Finance Bill.

Ministers, then, were obliged either to remodel the Budget so as to make it acceptable to the Peers or else to appeal to the country. But the question was no longer one as to what were the constitutional powers technically possessed by the hereditary chamber; now it was, whether it should be permitted to retain those powers. If the rejection of the Budget were to be accepted as a precedent, the Lords would at all times be able to force a dissolution. The Lords, it was argued, had ceased to exercise their proper function as an independent revising chamber, and had become simply an instrument of one party. While the Conservatives were in office they could legislate to their heart's content; while Liberals were in office they could carry no legislation which did not command the assent of the Opposition. Ministers appealed to the country, with an emphatic declaration that no Liberal Government could in future remain in office until the powers of the Lords were so curtailed that finance should be removed entirely from their control, and that they should no longer be able to prevent the expressed will of the House of Commons from becoming law within the period of a single parliament. The general election was fought on the triple issue, the Budget, Tariff Reform, and the Abolition of the

Veto of the House of Lords. The result was a considerable increase in the number of Unionists, since many of the Free-Traders who had voted against them at the last election considered that in the choice of evils Tariff Reform was less dangerous than Mr. George's financial methods. Nevertheless the Unionists were still outnumbered by the Liberal party itself, while for practical purposes that party could count on the solid support of the Labour members and of the now thoroughly reunited Irish Nationalists.

The advanced Radicals undoubtedly supposed that the first measure of the Government would be a bill abolishing the veto of the House of Lords, and that the king had given a guarantee that the Lords would, if necessary, be compelled to yield by an overwhelming creation of peers. There was some indignation when it was announced that the government of the country must be carried on and the Budget must be passed before anything else could be done. Resentment grew among the extremists when it became known that the guarantees had not been given, and that ministers would formulate their plan before seeking to obtain them. In the great crisis which had now arrived it was felt that everything turned upon the profound political sagacity of King Edward VII., a sagacity which had won universal recognition. But even at that momentous hour the hand of death fell. The strain of anxiety had broken the king's health. On May 5th men read with startled alarm the announcement that he was seriously ill. The next day bulletins announced that his condition was critical, and just before midnight he passed away.

In South Africa after the treaty of 1902 British supremacy was no longer in question. Nevertheless the war appeared to have been only the culminating phase of a long period of racial antagonism. A very large proportion of the British in those regions were still naturally suspicious of the Dutch, and were strongly opposed to any early extension to them of real political power. In the view of Unionists at home, and of the former High Commissioner, Lord Milner, it was only by slow and tentative steps that it would become safe to place the Dutch colonies on an equality with the British. With the Liberals however it had become an axiom, a cardinal article of belief, that among the white races restrictions upon political liberty are a disintegrating factor; that the loyalty of a people was to be won not by a cautious distrust but by a generous confidence, bestowed even at a considerable risk. The Liberals were no sooner in power than they resolved to take the risks in South Africa, and to bestow on the states with a mainly Boer population the full status of colonies with responsible government—it had not yet presented itself to the mind of any one that there was anything derogatory in the name of "Colony." Lord Milner's place had before this been taken by a prominent Unionist, Lord Selborne, who was nevertheless prepared loyally to give effect to the policy of the new Government. In spite of warning protests from the Opposition leaders, who declined to share the responsibility, Sir Henry

Campbell-Bannerman took the risks, and conceded responsible self-government to the Boers who had so recently been engaged in a desperate struggle against the might of the Empire into which they were now incorporated. Whether the act was recklessly rash or courageously magnanimous, it was justified by the event, at least so far as the experience of seven years can justify the formation of a definite conclusion on the subject. It was not misinterpreted like the retrocession of 1881, and it converted a people with an emphatically hostile tradition into loyal citizens of the British Empire. How far antagonistic elements had been harmonised was seen when the South

African dominions, after prolonged deliberation, formulated a scheme for the federation of the Union of South Africa—like the Canadian and Australian groups—which was sanctioned by the imperial parliament in 1909.

In India the vigorous viceroyalty of Lord Curzon continued to be productive of much controversy. Suspicions that Tibet was entering into dangerous relations with Russia led to demands for a treaty with that mysterious state, whose conduct necessitated a military expedition which was completely successful in achieving its objects. Native sentiment was greatly excited by the partition of the province of Bengal. The reasons for the



British Possessions in Africa, 1903.

excitement caused are not easily intelligible to any one who has not an intimate knowledge of Indian affairs. But the effect was to set on foot an agitation, not among the Mohammedans but among the Hindus of Bengal, which provided the Indian government with very grave problems of administration for at least five years to come. Lord Curzon's retirement, however, was brought about not by this but by very serious friction between the Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief, Lord Kitchener, in which the Unionist Government supported the latter. Lord Curzon's place was taken by Lord Minto, who, like Lord Selborne in Africa, found himself able to work in admirable harmony with Mr. John Morley, who became Secretary of State for India when the Liberals came into power. The agitation among the Hindus became so active, and the language of the native press so seditious, that there were loud outcries for severe repressive measures. Strong measures were, in fact, taken by Lord Minto and Mr. Morley, of a character much more drastic and arbitrary than could be

dreamed of in dealing with the Press in England. They were accordingly condemned by all those persons who declined to recognise any warrant for applying different governmental principles in India and in England; while they were condemned with equal vehemence by another school as far too lenient, and a virtual encouragement of sedition. The Indian Government, however, went on its way undisturbed by the attacks of either wing, and again its conduct appears to have been justified by the results.

During the reign of King Edward VII. a remarkable change took place



Mr. John Morley in 1894.

in the relations between the United Kingdom and the European Powers. Almost unanimously Europe had accepted as undoubted facts the wildest of fabrications concerning the doings of the British in South Africa. Largely owing to the genial personality of the king himself, there was now a general disappearance of the prevalent sentiment of hostility. Hitherto the two Powers with whom the dangers of collision had been most serious were Russia and France. Almost throughout the nineteenth century antagonism between the British Empire and Russia had been a dominating factor in politics, while ever since the British occupation of Egypt there had been perpetual friction between British and French. At an early stage

of the great war between Russia and Japan, the extraordinary behaviour of a Russian squadron, bound for the Far East, in firing upon an innocent British fishing fleet, seemed almost to have made war inevitable. But the war was avoided, perhaps because of an unmistakable demonstration of the efficiency of the British Navy. The terrible disasters of the Russian struggle with Japan did much to dissipate the belief in Russian military power. The attitude of the two empires to each other became less suspicious, and there was a new inclination on both sides to attain the adjustment of clashing interests in a spirit of goodwill. This took shape in the most marked manner when an agreement was arrived at as to the treatment of Persia, which on the whole had the approval of both parties in England.

A visit of the king to Paris had an extraordinary effect in dissipating a popular French impression that British sentiment was actively hostile. An agreement with regard to Morocco and Egypt removed the most serious among the remaining causes of friction, and a spirit of warm friendship grew up between the two countries. Unhappily it has to be admitted that a less cordial spirit was engendered with another of the great Powers. The sudden determination of Germany in 1905 to develop a powerful navy aroused British alarm and suspicion; while the increasing goodwill between Britain, France, and Russia developed among the Germans a belief that the British were pursuing a deliberate policy of isolating Germany with presumably sinister intentions. The result was that each nation urged forward naval programmes manifestly with an eye to the suspected aggressive intentions of the other, while to each it appeared that the motive of the other was not self-defence but aggression. In well-informed quarters the idea that the German Emperor desired a war of aggression for the purpose of breaking up the British Empire was never credited; but in both countries a portion of the Press persistently maintained an inflammatory tone which greatly increased the difficulty of attaining a mutual understanding.

II

1910-1912

At the moment of the accession of King George V. the country was in the throes of an acute constitutional crisis. The general election had proved that in Great Britain, apart from Ireland, there was a large majority of the electorate which demanded a modification in the character of the House of Lords. From all quarters schemes were being propounded for the composition of an ideal Second Chamber, since it was admittedly unsatisfactory that such a chamber should by its constitution be the instrument of one party. In the view of the Government the curtailment of the powers of the House of Lords was the first question, though its settle-

ment would have to be followed in due course by a reconstruction of the chamber itself. To those, however, who regarded it as a primary necessity that the Second Chamber should act essentially as a barrier to the flood of democratic legislation, the great need seemed to be a reconstruction eliminating those elements which deprived its judgments of weight—the strengthening rather than the diminution of its authority. When the Lords made it clear that they would not accept the Government scheme except under compulsion, the Government resolved that the king should not be called upon to apply compulsion until the country had definitely pronounced its approval of the scheme itself. At the end of the year parliament was dissolved, and the scheme was approved by a majority of the electorate practically identical with that which had returned the ministry to power in January.

The Parliament Bill of 1911 left the composition of the Second Chamber untouched, while pronouncing that the reconstruction was required. It touched the Commons only by reducing the life of a parliament to five years instead of seven, the period set by the Septennial Act almost two hundred years ago. It dealt directly with the veto of the House of Lords. For the future the rejection by the House of Lords of a bill passed by the House of Commons was to be effective for two years. If at the end of the two years the House of Commons again passed the bill it was to become law, whether there had or had not been a dissolution in the interval. It was made known that the king had been advised and had agreed to create a sufficient number of peers to secure the Government majority in the event of the bill being rejected by the hereditary chamber. A section of the Peers were prepared to die fighting, to reject the bill and to throw upon the Government the onus of destroying the traditional character of the Peerage. The calmer counsels of the leaders of the party prevailed, and the Parliament Bill became law. But the constitution of the hereditary chamber remained unaltered, and the Unionists very expressly declared their intention of dealing with the question on their own lines whenever they should return to power. The Parliament Act, therefore, can only be regarded as a temporary settlement pending the reconstruction of the Second Chamber.

That reconstruction the Government deferred in spite of the declarations of the Opposition that their doing so would be a breach of faith. Two other measures of constitutional importance were to take precedence of the next measure dealing with the House of Lords. One was to reorganise the distribution of votes among the electorate. This was to be effected in two ways, first by the abolition of plural voting, so that no one might vote in more than one constituency, secondly by reducing the term of residence necessary in order to enable a man to vote after changing his abode from one constituency to another. It was assumed on all hands that by the first the Unionist vote in the electorate would be reduced, and by the second the Liberal vote would be increased on

the hypothesis that many more of the shifting labouring population would be enabled to exercise the franchise.

The other measure was a bill for conferring at once upon Ireland a legislature of her own, but upon lines compatible with the ultimate introduction of similar measures for Scotland, Wales, and England, while retaining the supremacy of the imperial parliament. The presumed end in



King George V.

[After a photograph by Lafayette, Dublin.]

view was the substitution of a federation of the four nationalities in place of the unitary system, giving self-government to each and a common central government to all, analogous to the systems already established in Canada, Australia, and South Africa. This scheme met with a fervid opposition from the Protestant division of Ulster which feared a Roman Catholic ascendancy. It was certain that the second if not the first of these two bills would only become law if the Liberals should still be in office at the

end of two years and should again pass the bill without regard to the House of Lords.

The same expectation applied to a bill for the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Wales, which followed generally the precedent of the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Ireland; the theory in both cases being that an Established Church is warranted only while it is unmistakably a National Church, whereas in Wales, as in Ireland, the majority of the population belonged to other communions. In both cases the opposition to disestablishment rested on the principle first that only through an Established Church can the state express its Christianity, and next that in any case the state has no right to appropriate ecclesiastical endowments which belong to the Church and not to the state.

While the Government were shouldering the responsibility of introducing a series of immense and far-reaching modifications in the constitution, they were zealous also in proceeding with the social legislation for ameliorating the condition of the masses, of which the necessity was studiously affirmed by all parties in the state. Following up the bill for conferring old age pensions, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. George, introduced in 1911 a great scheme of National Insurance for wage-earners. Since a scheme for national insurance was in theory eminently desirable, all parties declared themselves ready to extend a provisional welcome to the bill; but any scheme would of necessity be exceedingly complicated, while in the nature of the case only a very limited number of persons in the country could be capable of forming a competent judgment on its financial soundness. There were moreover three fundamental questions on which the widest divergency of opinion was possible. Should such a scheme be compulsory? To what classes of the community should it apply? Should the whole cost be borne by the state, or should employers contribute, or should employees contribute as well? The Government decided that it should be compulsory, inclusive, and contributory. Consequently every detail of the bill met with strong opposition from one quarter or another, while almost the entire medical profession proclaimed that the medical benefits could not be provided at the scale of payment to which the Government declared themselves limited by the financial conditions. From the outset it was evident that the measure would not be popular; since the classes for whose benefit it was intended resented its contributory character, which would touch their pockets immediately, while only a prolonged experience would enable them to realise such benefits as they would obtain in exchange. Nevertheless the bill was carried and came into operation during 1912. The old Chartist demand for payment of members of parliament was at last realised by the provision of an annual stipend of £400.


Meanwhile the new unionism had been gaining ground among the working classes. The leaders of the movement would appear to have had the double aim of consolidating a Socialist vote in parliament, and of co-ordinating aggressive action on the part of trade unions, so that the battle

should no longer be between isolated employers and their dissatisfied employees, but that the whole forces of associated trades should be brought to bear to force the whole body of employers to accept the men's demands. A series of great trade disputes were adjusted by the disputants' acceptance of the mediation of the Board of Trade and the arrangement of compromises between masters and men. But in 1911 it began to be realised that in certain cases the general public as well as the particular antagonists were materially affected by the disputes. This began to be brought home by a strike of the railway men in the summer of that year, when it became evident that in certain employments a cessation of work might paralyse industries other than the one directly affected. Still more impressive was the great coal strike at the beginning of 1912, followed as the spring was passing into summer by a strike of transport workers. The public supply of fuel was cut off by one, and its supply of food was in danger of being cut off by the other. There was a general acquiescence in the principle that masters and men should be left to fight out their own private battles; but it began to be very seriously questioned whether that principle could be applied when those private battles threw out of work businesses which had no means of protecting themselves, and reduced the supply of the necessities of life for the general public. In the two former cases named the action of the Government brought the disputes to a close for the time being. In the third, Government merely tendered advice which was not accepted, and the strife was left to work itself out. In all three cases there was a commendable absence of disorder of the kind which is apt to accompany extensive trade disputes; but the successful treatment of two particular emergencies was not a solution of the questions which lay at the root of those emergencies, and ministers before long felt it necessary to pledge themselves to introduce legislation, probably on the lines of compulsory arbitration.

Outside the British Isles, but within the Empire, the most notable event was the visit of the king and queen to India. In that great dependency, what may be called the concluding act of the régime of Lord Morley and Lord Minto was the admission of natives of India to a larger share in the executive councils both of the central government and of the presidencies. The continuity of their policy was maintained by their successors, Lord Crewe at the India Office and Lord Hardinge in the vice-royalty. The disaffection which at one time seemed so threatening ceased to be prominently active, and the presence of the Emperor of India in the Peninsula appealed forcibly to the imagination of the natives, giving rise to very encouraging demonstrations of loyalty. The visit was signalised by the announcement that the ancient capital of the Moguls, and of imperial dynasties long before the Moguls, the city of Delhi, was to be restored to its old position.

On the subject of relations with the European Powers only a few words can be added. Russia, formerly feared as an aggressive military power,

when she was the special object of imperialist denunciation, had become instead the special aversion of advanced Radicals, chiefly because of the tyrannical methods of her domestic administration. She now adopted a



The British Empire to-day.

dictatorial attitude towards the Persian government, which appeared to be in contravention of the recent agreements, and it was chiefly from Radical quarters that the diplomacy of the British Government was denounced for

weakness in seeking to preserve friendly relations with a reactionary power at the expense of a helpless nation.

In 1911 there was a moment of intense anxiety when it appeared that relations with Germany had been strained almost to the breaking-point. A war between France and Germany seemed almost inevitable, the subject of contention being Morocco, until it became generally understood that in certain eventualities Great Britain would feel herself bound to give France effective support. Although the quarrel was adjusted before the public realised how great had been the danger of a general conflagration, in certain quarters in Germany the British attitude was resented; but the Governments both of Britain and Germany directed determined efforts to attaining a better understanding between the British and German nations. While the presence of chauvinistic elements made it impossible to view the European situation without grave anxiety, there were signs that the common sense of both nations would triumph, that the tension would be relaxed, and that mutual suspicions would gradually pass away.

Here our history closes, at a moment when solutions had been offered of two critical constitutional questions, and of one critical international question, while it would be rash to say that any one of the three had been definitively solved. At the same moment the industrial question appeared also to be reaching a critical point, and of that question it cannot be said as yet that any solution holds the field. This, however, may be said, that the British people has shown during these crises a temper, a power of self-control, and a disregard for inflammatory rhetoric, in which lies the best augury for the future.

INDEX

- ABBOTT, Archbishop, 408
 Abdul Hamid, Sultan of Turkey, 903
 Abdur Rahman, Amir of Kabul, 907, 908, 919
 Aberconway, treaty of, 124
 Abercrombie, Sir Ralph, defeats the French in Egypt, 735-736
 Aberdeen captured by Montrose, 433
 Aberdeen, Lord, 831; coalition ministry of, 857
 Abhorers, 483
 Aboukir Bay, battle of, 732-733
 Absenteeism, 689, 691
 Abyssinia, expedition of 1868, 887
 Acadia, expulsion of the French from, 615
 Aclea (Ockley or Oakley), battle of, 17
 Acre, siege of, 734
 Addington, Henry, Prime Minister, 737; fall of, 745. *See also* Sidmouth
 Addison, Joseph, 703
 Addled Parliament, the, 391
 Adrian IV., Pope, 90
 "Adullamites," the, 884
 Ælfgar, Earl of East Anglia, 32, 33, 34
 Ælfhryth, 26
 Æthelbald, King of Mercia, 14
 Æthelbald, King of Wessex, 17
 Æthelbert, King of Kent, 11, 12
 Æthelred, King of Wessex, 17
 Æthelflæd, the Lady of Mercia, 22
 Æthelfrith, King of Northumbria, 11
 Æthelgifu, evil influence of, 25
 Æthelred, King of Wessex, 17; defeated by the Danes at Basing, 18
 Æthelred the Redeless or Unready, 26, 28
 Æthelric, King of Northumbria, 11
 Æthelric of Deira dethroned, 12
 Æthelstan, 17
 Æthelstan, King of England, 23-24
 Æthelwulf, King of Wessex, 17
 Afghanistan, diplomatic relations with, 765; first war, 845-846, 887, 904, 905; second war with, 906; the Penjdeh incident, 919; frontiers defined, 928
 Africa, partition of, 929
 Africa, South, 799, 841, 908-911; first Boer War, 911-913; the Jameson Raid and Second Boer War, 930-939, 955; Union of, 956
 Agincourt, battle of, 195-196
 Agra, 868
 Agrarian troubles during minority of Edward VI., 301, 302; strife in Ireland, 689, 832-835
 Agricola marches through Scotland, 2
 Agricultural Holdings Act, the, 901, 927
 Agricultural Rating Act, the, 944
 Agriculture, 45, 47; labourers, 173; progress of, 219; during the Middle Ages, 233, 235; during reign of Elizabeth, 375; 535; eighteenth century, 695-697, 779; protection of, 784, 803-805
 Ahmed Khel, battle of, 907
 Ahmed Shah, 655, 675
 Aidan, King of Scots, defeated by Æthelfrith, 11
 Aix-la-Chapelle, treaty of, 597
 Alabama claims, the, 881, 899-900
 Alam Bagh, 871
 Alaskan seal fishery dispute, the, 929
 Albany, Duke of, Regent of Scotland, 288
 Albany, Murdoch, Duke of, Regent of Scotland, 223
 Albany, Robert, Duke of, Regent of Scotland, 222; alliance with France, 223
 Alberoni, Cardinal, machinations of, 576
 Albuera, battle of, 759
 Alcuin, 14
 Alexander I., King of Scotland, 78
 Alexander II., King of Scotland, 115
 Alexander III., King of Scotland, 115, 127, 132
 Alexander VI., Pope, 253; baseness of, 270
 Alexander I., Tsar of Russia, 735, 751; and the Holy Alliance, 776, 777-778
 Alexandria, siege of, 736; bombardment of, 915
 Alfred the Great, 17; defeated at Wilton, 18; forms nucleus of a Navy, 18; defeats Danes at Ethandune, 19; captures London, 19; genius and character of, 20; treaty with the Danes, 22; inventor of trial by jury, 43, 44; literary work of, 49
 Aliwal, battle of, 849
 Allahabad, 868
 Allectus, 4
 Alma, battle of the, 860
 Almanza, battle of, 561
 Almaraz, 761
 Almeida, siege of, 759
 Alsace and Lorraine lost by France, 893
 Althorp, Lord, 791; sponsor of the First Factory Act, 817, 819

- America, 591; Anglo-French struggle for, 612, 615; resistance to Grenville's policy, 643-646; resistance to Townshend's taxes, 651; estrangement of, 658-661; the War of Independence, 661-673; confederation of states, 667
 America, United States of, the, 721-722; war with, 766; Civil War in, 880-882, 929
 Amherst, Lord, captures Louisbourg, 624
 Amherst, Lord, Governor-General of India, 796-797
 "Amicable Loan" proposed by Wolsey, 268
 Amiens, Mise of, 105
 Amiens, Peace of, the, 724; treaty of, the, 737, 743
 Amin Chand, 631
 Amirs, Napier's quarrel with the, 847
 Anarchy among the Britons, 8, 11
 Ancrum Moor, battle of, 295
 André, Major, captured and executed by the Americans, 671
 Angles settle in Britain, 6-8
 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 6, 11, 17, 23, 37, 49, 236
 Anglo-Saxon polity, 38-47
 Angus, Earl of, Archibald "Bell-the-Cat," treasons against James III. and IV. of Scotland, 260, 288
 Anjou, Counts of, 71
 Anlaf or Olaf, Norse leader, 23
 Annates Act, the, 281
 Anne of Cleves married to Henry VIII., 286
 Anne, Queen, reign of, 554-570
 Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, 69, 71, 72
 Anson, Commodore, 593, 596
 Anti-Corn-Law League, the, 820, 821, 823
 Antoinette, Marie, execution of, 725
 Antoninus, Wall of, 2
 Anwar-ud-Din, 604, 605
 Appellant, the Lords, 180, 181
 Apprentices, Statute of, 375, 535, 816
 Appropriation of supplies, 165, 472
 Arabi Pasha resists European control of Egypt, 915
 Arakan, annexation of, 797
 Archers, the English, 48, 76, 125; superseded by use of gunpowder, 234
 Architecture of the Middle Ages, 236
 Arcot, capture and defence of by Clive, 606-607, 864

- Argyle, Archibald, Earl of, 433, 436, 440; execution of, 485
 Argyle, Archibald, Marquis of, rebellion and execution of, 493
 Argyle, John, Duke of, 570; opposes Mar at Sheriffmuir, 573
 Argyle, Duke of, 911; retires from the Gladstone Ministry, 914
 Aristocracy, Anglo-Saxon, 39
 Arkwright, Richard, inventor of the water-driven spinning-jenny, 698
 Arlington, member of the Cabal, 474
 Armada, the Spanish, 346-350, 352
 Armed Neutrality, the, 671, 735
 Armenia, Turkish massacres in, 940
 Armour, obsolescence of, 234
 Arms, Assize of, 82, 88
 Army, Standing, beginnings of, 468; reorganisation of, 899; Haldane's reforms, 952
 Arni, battle of, 607
 Arnold, Benedict, 663, 671
 Arnold, Matthew, 888
 Arran, Earls of, 289
 Arran, Earl of, 355
 Arras, Conference at, between the English and French, 200
 Art of the Middle Ages, 236
 Arthur, King, 6
 Arthur of Brittany defeated by John, 94
 Arthur, Prince of Wales, son of Henry VII., married to Katharine of Aragon, 247
 Articles, Lords of the, 186, 415
Articuli super Cartas, 132
 Arts, industrial, introduction of, 169
 Arundel, Archbishop, 182
 Arundel, Earl of, 181
 Aryans, the, 4
 Asaf ud-Daulah, 680
 Ashanti, expedition of 1864, the, 878; second, 900
 Ashbourne's Act, Lord, 919, 924
 Ashdown, Saxon victory at, 18
 Ashley. *See* Shaftesbury
 Aske, Robert, leader of the Pilgrimage of Grace, 285; execution of, 286
 Assam, annexation of, 797
 Assandun, battle of, 28
 Assize of Arms, 82, 88; of Northampton, 86
 "Association," the, 342
 Asquith, Herbert H., Chancellor of the Exchequer, 952; Prime Minister, 953
 Attacotti, 4
 Attainder, Acts of, 208, 209, 217, 524
 Auckland, Lord, Governor-General of India, 845, 846
 Auerstadt, battle of, 750
 Augsburg, Interim of, 300
 Augustine I., introduces Latin Christianity, 11
 Aurangzib, Emperor, 537
 Aurangzib dynasty of India, the, 603
 Aurelianus, Ambrosius, 6, 8
 Austerlitz, battle of, 749
 Australia, 722; colonisation of, 799-800; constitution and government of, under Victoria, 838-840; discovery of gold in, 839; Commonwealth of, 945
 Austria, British alliance with, 614; French Republic's war with, 724; successes of, against the French Republic, 728; makes treaty of Campo Formio with Napoleon, 730; joins second coalition against Napoleon, 734, 735, 827; intervention of, in the Crimea, 859; and Northern Italy, 879; rivalry with Prussia, 892-893
 Austrian Succession, War of the, 590, 593
 Ayslabie, Chancellor of the Exchequer, disgraced, 581
 Azores, Sir Richard Grenville's engagement with the Spanish fleet off the, 352
 BACON, Francis, Lord Verulam, 354, 382, 394; impeachment, 395
 Bacon, Nicholas, 354
 Bacon, Roger, the father of modern science, 235
 Badajoz, siege of, 759, 760
 Baden-Powell, Sir Robert, defender of Mafeking, 935
 Badon, Mount, battle of, 6, 8
 Bagesag attacks Wessex, 18
 Bahamas, colonisation of, 533
 Balaclava, 860, 861
 "Balance of Power," the, 231, 613
 Balance of Trade, 372
 Balfour, Arthur James, Chief Secretary for Ireland, 923, 924; Prime Minister, 945
 Balkan States, revolt of, 903
 Ball, John, the Lollard, 177
 Balliol, Edward, wins Scottish crown, 151; deposed, 152; attempts to regain Scottish crown, 185
 Balliol, John, 127, 133-134, 136
 Ballot, introduction of the, 899
 Balmerino, Lord, imprisonment of, 419
 Baltic, the battle of the, 735
 Bank of England, foundation of, 543; the goldsmiths' attempt to ruin, 543, 578; the run on, 730
 Bannockburn, battle of, 143
 Barbour, Bishop, his poem *The Bruce*, 238
 Barclay's plot against William III., 523
 Barebones Parliament, the, 454
 Barham, Lord, 745
 Baring, Major Evelyn. *See* Cromer, Lord
 Barlow, Sir George, Governor-General of India, 765
 Barnett, Yorkist victory at, 212
 Barons, origin of, 391
 Barons, the, revolt against William I., 54, 66; under Henry II., 87; refuse to fight for John, 95; resistance to John, 96, 97, 98; the, and Henry III., 102, 103, 104, 117, 120, 130, 135, 136; and Edward II., 142, 146; and Edward III., 172; position of, under Henry VI., 206; power of, broken, 219; resistance of, to absolutism, 232; decline of the power of, 364
 Bartholomew, St., massacre of, 324, 328
 Basing, Danish victory at, 18
 Basing Hall, Royalist defence of, 437
 Basle, treaty of, 728
 Bastille, storming of the, 715
 Batavian Republic (Holland), 728
 Bate's Case, 390, 401
 Bauge, battle of, 198; Scots at, 223
 Bavaria, 756
 Bavaria, Charles, Elector of, claims Austrian Empire, 593
 Baylen, capitulation of, 753
 Beachy Head, French victory over English and Dutch fleets off, 511
 Beaconsfield, Lord, administration of, 901-905; death of, 914. *See also* Disraeli
 Beaton, Cardinal, 290, 294; assassination of, 295, 296
 Beaufort, Henry, Cardinal, Bishop of Winchester, becomes Chancellor, 202
 Beauforts, the, descendants of (John of Gaunt), 202
 Becket, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, 82; becomes Chancellor, 82; opposes the king, 83, 84; murder of, 85, 110
 Bedchamber Question, the, 822
 Bede, Venerable, 6, 7, 11, 14, 49
 Bedford, John, Duke of, Regent of France, 198, 200
 Bedford, Russell, Duke of, minister of George III., 641
 Begums of Oudh, the, 680, 681
 Belle Ile, capture of, 638
 Bellingham, Sir Edward, Deputy-Lieutenant of Ireland, 302, 330
 Benares, acquisition of, by Hastings, 679
 Benefit of Clergy, 85
 Benovolences invented by Edward IV., 213; resorted to by Henry VII., 251; demanded by James I., 396
 Beresford, General, 759
 Bengal, Hastings's administration in, 680; under Lord Cornwallis, 720-721; partition of, 956
 Bentinck. *See* Portland, Duke of
 Bentinck, Lord George, 826
 Bentinck, Lord William, Governor-General of India, 797
 Beorn, Earl, murder of, 32
 Beornwulf, King of Mercia, invades Wessex, 15
 Beowulf, 49, 236
 Berkeley, Bishop, 705
 Berlin Congress, the, 904
 Berlin Decree, Napoleon's, 751
 Bermudas, colonisation of, 533
 Bernicia, kingdom of, 11
 Bernicia, 69
 Berwick, massacre of, 134; fall of, 144; captured by the Scots, 159
 Berwick, Duke of, commands French forces at Almanza, 561
 Bhartpur, hostilities with, 797
 Bhonsla, the, 676, 678, 680, 736, 764, 795

- Bible, the, William Tyndale's translation of, 378; authorised version, 378
- Bigod, Roger, Earl of Norfolk, 138
- Bishops, ejection of, under Elizabeth I, 317
- Bishops restored to the House of Lords, 470
- Bishops' Book, the, 286
- Bishops' War, the, 420
- Bismarck, Prince, 892-894
- Black Death, the, 174-179, 219
- Black Hole of Calcutta, the, 620, 630
- Black Sea Treaty, 899
- Blackwater, battle of, 359
- Blackwood's Magazine*, 811
- Bladensburg, battle of, 766
- Blake, Admiral, 449, 451, 461
- Blenheim, battle of, 553
- Bloemfontein Conference, the, 933
- Blood feud, the, 44
- "Bloody Assize," the, 493
- Blorë Heath, battle of, 208
- Blücher, Marshal, 769-771
- Boelcland, 46
- Boers, the, 799, 842-843; disputes with the, 908
- Boer War, 1880, 911; second, 930-939
- Boleyn, Anne, 275, 276; married to Henry VIII., 280; execution of, 286
- Bolingbroke, Henry St. John, Lord, 555, 563, 566; intrigues with the Jacobites, 569; joins the Pretender, 572
- Bombay, 676, 678
- Boniface of Savoy, Archbishop of Canterbury, 104
- Boniface VIII., Pope, 129
- Bonner, Bishop, imprisonment of, 299; deprived of his see, 304; persecution of Protestants, 311
- Bordars, 65
- Border raids, 292
- Borodino, battle of, 762
- Boroughs, 23; development of, 111, 140; creation of councils, 926; London, 944
- Boscawen, Admiral, attacks Pondichery, 605, 624, 625
- Bosnia, revolt of, 903
- Boston "massacre," the, and "tea riots," 658-659
- Boswell, James, 705
- Bosworth, battle of, 218
- Botany Bay, convict settlement of, 722
- Bothwell, James, Earl of, 322; marries Mary Queen of Scots, 324
- Bothwell Brig, battle of, 487
- Boulogne captured by Henry VIII., 295; surrender of, 305
- Bourbons, the, 588-590, 667; the struggles with, 672, 714; restoration of, in France, 767
- Bouvines, battle of, 98
- Bow, the, use of, by the English, 48
- Bowring, Sir John, 863
- Boycott, Captain, 913
- Boyle, Robert, 548
- Boyne, battle of the, 511
- Braddock, General, defeat of, 615
- Bradford, John, martyr, 311
- Bramham Moor, battle of, 189
- Brand, President of Orange Free State, 909, 912
- Brandywine Creek, battle of, 665
- Breda, declaration of, 465; treaty of, 472, 534
- Brest, battle of, 522; blockade of, 625, 729
- Bretigny, treaty of, 160
- Brewalda, 16
- Brian Boroihme defeats Danes at Clontarf, 89
- Bridgewater, Duke of, pioneer of the canal system, 699
- Brigantes, repression of, 2
- Brigham, treaty of, 133
- Brihuega, surprise and capture of Stanhope's force at, 564
- Brindley, James, engineer of the Worsley-Manchester canal, 699
- Bristol, 111
- Bristol merchants, maritime activity of, 253
- Britain, early inhabitants of, 1; Roman occupation of, 2; dialects of, 2; Roman evacuation of, 4
- British North America Act, 888
- Brittany, 156
- "Broad-Bottomed" Administration, the, 608
- Bronkhorst Spruit, battle of, 911
- Brougham, Henry, Lord, 779, 791
- Brown, John, martyrdom of, 513
- Browne, Sir Thomas, 545
- Browning, Robert, 856
- Brownists, 371; emigrate to Holland, 372
- Bruce, Edward, 142; accepts offer of Irish crown, 145
- Bruce, Robert, 128, 133; wins Scottish crown, 136-138, 141; death of, 144
- Bruce, General, 679
- Brunanburh, battle of, 23
- Brut*, poem of Layamon, 236
- Brythonic invasion, 1
- Buckingham, Edward Stafford, Duke of, condemned for treason against Henry VIII., 266
- Buckingham, George Villiers, Duke of, favourite of James I. and Charles I., 394, 397-399, 401; murder of, 404
- Buckingham, George Villiers (2), Duke of, 474, 479
- Buckingham, Henry Stafford, Duke of, insurrection against Richard III., 216-217
- Budget, Liberal, of 1909 rejected by the Lords, 954
- Buenos Ayres, expedition to, 750
- Building, great expenditure on, in fifteenth century, 221
- Bulgaria, revolt of, 903
- Buller, General Sir Redvers, assumes chief command in South Africa, 935
- Bulwal, battle of, 849
- Bunker's Hill, battle of, 661
- Bunyan, John, 544
- Buonaparte, Jerome, made King of Westphalia, 752, 772
- Buonaparte, Joseph, made King of Naples, 750; of Spain, 753, 762
- Buonaparte, Louis, made King of Holland, 750; deposed by Napoleon, 756
- Buonaparte, Napoleon. *See* Napoleon I.
- Burgh, Hubert de, justiciar, 100, 101, 102
- Burghs. *See* Boroughs
- Burgoyne, General, 664; surrenders at Saratoga, 665
- Burgundy, Philip, Duke of, makes truce with Henry V., 198
- Burgundy, Philip, Duke of, 210
- Burh, the, 47
- Burke, Edmund, 648, 653, 684; introduces his Economic Reform Bill, 684, 705; denounces the French Revolution, 714
- Burleigh, Lord, 351; death of, 353
- Burleigh, William Cecil, Lord, minister of Elizabeth, 315, 317, 319, 325, 344, 351; character of, 353-354
- Burmah, Amherst's war with, 796-797; annexation of Upper, 864; annexation of Lower, 928
- Burnell, Robert, Chancellor, 119
- Burns, Robert, 809
- Burnt Candlemas, the, 159
- Burrard, Sir Harry, 754, 755
- Busaco, battle of, 759
- Bussy, M. de, 606, 608
- Bute, John, Earl of, chief adviser of George III., 637; Prime Minister, 638-640; resignation, 641
- Butler, Sir William, views on the situation in South Africa, 933
- Buxar, battle of, 657
- Bye Plot, the, against James I., 386, 387
- Byng, Admiral, defeats Spanish fleet off Cape Passaro, 577, 617; execution of, 618
- Byron, Lord, 787, 811
- CABAL, the, 474
- Cable, the first submarine, 853
- Cabot, John and Sebastian, 253
- Cade, Jack, rebellion of, 205, 802
- Cadiz, Drake's expedition to, 347; taken by Howard and Essex, 352; Buckingham's expedition to, 398; Sir George Rooke's expedition to, 552
- Caedmon, 49, 236
- Caermarthen, Marquis of. *See* Danby
- Cæsar, Julius, invades Britain, 1
- Cæsarism in France, 776
- Cairns, Lord, 895
- Cairo, occupation of, 915
- Calais, siege of, 158; treaty of, 160; loss of, by Mary I., 313
- Calcutta, 603; the Black Hole of, 620, 630
- Calder, Admiral, 746
- Calendar, reform of the, 610
- Calvinism, 406, 415
- Cambridge, Adolphus, Duke of, 781
- Cambridge, Richard, Earl of, conspiracy of, against Henry V., 194, 203
- Cambuskenneth, battle of, 135
- Camden, Lord, Viceroy of Ireland, 739

- Cameronians, the, 487
 Campbell, Sir Colin, Commander-in-Chief in India, 871
 Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Henry, leader of the Liberal Party, 945; administration of, 951-953; death of, 953
 Camperdown, battle of, 730
 Campian, Robert, the Jesuit, 339
 Campo Formio, treaty of, 730
 Canada, English and French struggle for, 534; French colonists in, 612; Anglo-French struggle for, 622, 624, 626-629, 640, 659; invasion of, by Americans, 663; the Canada Act, 722; American invasion of, 766; affairs of (1815-1832), 799-800; discontent in, 836; Act of Reunion of, 837; Dominion of, 888
 Canal system, origin of, 699
 Canning, George, Foreign Secretary, 752; resigns, 758, 761; policy of, 782-783, 786; becomes Prime Minister, 786; death of, 787, 795
 Canning, Lord, Governor-General of India, 868, 872; becomes Viceroy, 872; 887
 Canons, Book of, Scottish, 419
 Canton, capture of, 872
 Cape Colony, 737; reoccupation of, 750, 775; Dutch settlers in, 841, 844
 "Cape to Cairo" project of Cecil Rhodes, 931
 Capital and labour, relations of during eighteenth century, 695; antagonism of, 802; conflicts, 853-854, 948
 Capitalism, beginning of, 220
 Carausius, 4
 Carham, battle of, 30
 Carleton, Sir Guy, author of the Quebec Act, 659, 664
 Carlyle, Thomas, 856, 888
 Carnarvon, Lord, 909
 Carnatic, the, 678, 764
 Carnot, Lazare N. M., French statesman, 726
 Carolinas, colonisation of, 534
 Caroline, Queen, 584
 Caroline of Brunswick, wife of George IV., 781
 Cartagena, repulse of British fleet at, 592
 Carteret, George Granville, Lord, 586; minister for foreign affairs, 594, 608
 "Cartridge Incident," the, 866, 868
 Cartwright, Edmund, inventor of the power-loom, 698
 Casket Letters, the, 326
 Castillon, English defeat at, 207
 Castlebar, Race of, 741
 Castlereagh, Lord, 742, 758; Foreign Secretary, 761, 767; policy of, 778; suicide of, 782
 Castles, 66
 Câteau Cambresis, treaty of, 316
 Catherine "Bar-lass," 224
 Catherine, Tsarina, aggression of, 713, 733
 Catherine de Medicis, 319, 321
 Catholic Association, the, 789
 Catholic Emancipation, 737, 750, 786, 789-790
 Catholic Relief Act, 683; Ireland, 692
 Cato Street Conspiracy, the, 780
 Cavagnari, Sir Louis, 907
 Cavendish, Lord Frederick, murder of, 915
 Cavour, Count, 878, 880
 Cawnpore, massacre of, 868-870
 Caxton, William, 214, 240
 Ceawlin, King of Wessex, 11, 12
 Cecil. *See* Burleigh and Salisbury
 Celts, 1-6, 10
 Ceolwulf, King of Mercia, deposed by Beornwulf, 15
 Ceorls, 39, 43, 46, 48, 55, 64
 Cerdic, 9; house of, 35
 Cetewayo, King of the Zulus, 908
 Ceylon, 737; acquired by Britain, 775
 Chamberlain, Joseph, 911, 921, 925; Colonial Minister, 930; adops Protection, 949
 Chamberlain, Sir Neville, 906
 Chanda Sahib, 605, 606, 607
 Chandernagur, 603; captured by Clive, 621, 631
 Chaplin, Walter, champion of protection for agriculture, 951
 Charles I., accession of, 397; marries Henrietta Maria, 397; arouses antagonism in Scotland, 418; surrender and imprisonment of, 437; renews hostilities, 441; trial and execution of, 444;
 Charles II. accepts the Solemn League and Covenant, 448; accession of, 465; character of, 467; foreign policy of, 471; marries Catherine of Braganza, 471; war with the Dutch, 472; secret treaty with Louis XIV. of France, 476; religious policy of, 476-477; intrigues with Louis XIV. of France, 479, 483; policy of, 488; death of, 490; founder of the Royal Society, 548
 Charles V., Emperor, alliance of, with Henry VIII., 265, 300
 Charles VI., Emperor, 590, 593
 Charles IV., King of France, 149
 Charles V., King of France, 161
 Charles X. of France, abdication of, 791
 Charles IV. of Spain, abdication of, 753
 Charles XII. of Sweden, 561
 Charles, Archduke of Austria, defeats General Jourdan, 728
 "Charlies" superseded by policemen, 784
 Charmouth, battle of, 17
 Charter of Henry I., 98
 Charter, the Forest, 131
 Charter, the Great, 99, 101, 120, 126, 131
 Charter, the People's, 853
 Chartered Company, South Africa, the, 931
 Charters, municipal, 95, 112
 Chartists, the, 820, 821, 823, 824, 827, 854
 Chatham, Earl of. *See* Pitt
 Chatham, Earl of, commander of military in Walcheren expedition, 758
 Chaucer, Geoffrey, 238
 Chelmsford, Lord, Commander-in-Chief in Zulu War, 910
 Cheriton, battle of, 432
Chesapeake and *Shannon*, duel of, 766
 Chester, battle of, 10, 11; Fenian plot at, 886
 Chesterfield, Lord, 588, 610
 Chevy Chase, ballad of, 187
 Cheyete Singh, deposition of, 680
 Chhillianwalla, battle of, 851
 China, war with, 863, 872, 877; war with Japan, 940; Boxer rising, 943
 Chinese labour in South Africa, 911
 Chippenham, Peace of, 19
 Choiseul, Duke of, plans invasion of England, 625; negotiations with William Pitt, 628
 Christianity in Britain, 4; spread of, 11-12
 Church, the, 13-14, 40; and State, relations of, 55; under William I., 57-58, 79, 82, 109; under Edward I., 121, 129; and Commons under Henry IV., 190; during the Middle Ages, 226, 228; organisation of, in England, 232; degraded state of, at time of the Reformation, 270; and the Reformation, 299-301; Protector Somerset's dealings with, 302-303; during the Tudor period, 307-372; 855
 Church of Ireland, 831, 832
 Churchill, John. *See* Marlborough
 Churchill, Lord Randolph, resignation of, 925
 Cintra, Convention of, 755
Circumspecte Agatis, royal ordinance, 121
 Ciudad Rodrigo, 759, 760
 Civil List, the, 779
 Civil War, the, 428-444
 Clanship, 40, 41
 Clare, Earl of, 739
 Clarendon, Assize of, 88
 Clarendon Code, 470
 Clarendon, Constitutions of, 83
 Clarendon, Edward Hyde, Earl of, chief adviser of Charles II., 469; fall of, 473
 Clarendon, Lord, Foreign Secretary, 858, 862, 872
 Clarence, George, Duke of, arraignment and death of, 214-215
 Class war, 802-807
 Claudius, Emperor, annexes Britain, 2
 Claverhouse, John Graham of, Viscount Dundee, 487, 488, 514
 Clavering, General, 676
 Clement VII., Pope, and Henry VIII., 276
 Clergy, celibacy of, 58
 Clergy, the, and Edward I., 129-131; relations of Henry VIII. with, 282; cease to be an Estate of Parliament, 152; refuse to take the oath to William III., 506
Clericis Laicos, 129
 Clerkenwell gaol, Fenian attempt to blow up, 886
 Cleveland, Duke of, 803

- Clifford, Lord, 474
 Clinton, General, 665, 668, 669, 670
 Clive, Lord, 602; and the conquest of India, 606, 615, 620, 624, 629-635; administration of, 657; attack on, in Parliament, 675
 Clontarf, battle of, 89
 Closure, Parliamentary, introduction of, 921
 Cloth of Gold, Field of, 265
 Coal strike, 1912, the, 962
 Coalfields, development of, 700, 801
 Coalition against Napoleon, (i.) 725, (ii.) 733, 768
 Coalition Ministry, the (George III.), 685-686
 Coalition Ministry, Lord Aberdeen's, 831, 857
 Cobden, Richard, 875
 Cobham, Lord, execution of, 193
 Coenwulf, King of Mercia, 15
 Coercion Bills, Ireland, 832, 834, 835, 913
 Coinage, debasement of, 295, 543
 Colbert, French statesman, 537
 Colborne, Sir John, Governor of Canada, 837
 Colchester, siege of, 442
 Coleman, Father, implicated in Oates' plot, 480
 Colenso, battle of, 935
 Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 810
 Colet, John, Dean of St. Paul's, 270
 Colley, Sir George, defeated at Laing's Nek and Majuba, 912
 Collieries Bill, the, 824
 Collingwood, Lord, 746
 Collins, William, 703
 Colonies, development of, under Victoria, 835
 Colonisation, beginnings and growth of, 531, 612-636, 799
 Colt Brigg, Canter of, 599
 Columbus, Christopher, 253
 Combination Laws, 802; repeal of, 806
Comes, 41, 59
 Commendation, 60
 Commerce, 46, 47, 111, 118, 140-141; between England and France, 155; growth of, 166, 220-221; under Henry VII., 252; under the Tudors, 372; in seventeenth century, 535; Scottish impetus of the Union to, 559; under George II., 586-588; expansion of, during the eighteenth century, 695; depression of, after the Napoleonic wars, 778
 Committees of the Articles, abolition of, 516
 Commons, House of, growth of power, 118, 165; and Henry IV., 190-191, 219; authority of the, 232; power over finance, 364; conflicts with the House of Lords, 927, 952, 953, 954
 Commonwealth, the, 445; war with Holland, 451; foreign policy of, 460
Commune Concilium, 59
 Commutation, 82, 173, 174
 Compton, Bishop of London, 495, 498
 Comyn, John, claimant to Scottish throne, 133, 137.
Confirmatio Cartarum, 131, 135, 136, 139
 Confians, Admiral, 625
Congé d'élire, 282
 Congregation, Lords of the, 319
 Congress, American, 660, 661, 663; rejects British overtures, 667
 Conservatives, the, 813, 814
 Consols created by Pelham, 609-610
 Consort, the Prince, 878
 Conspiracy Law, the, 898, 901
 Conspiracy to Murder Bill, Palmerston's, 873
 Constantine, King of Scots, 23
 Constantius Chlorus, 4
 Constitution, development of the, 232
 Constitutional crisis, the, 955, 958
 Continental system, Napoleon's, 749
 "Convention of London," the (1884), 912, 931
 Convention of Westminster, 616
 Convention, the Scottish, 557
 Convention Parliament, the, (1) 467 (2) 502
 Convention Parliament, Scottish, 514
 Convict settlements in Australia, 839
 Convocation. *See* Church, and Clergy
 Cook, Captain, voyages of, 722
 Coote, Sir Eyre, defeats the French at Wandewash, 634; routs Haidar Ali, 679
 Cope, Sir John, defeat of, at Prestonpans, 600
 Copenhagen, battle of, 735; bombardment of, 752
 Corn Law, the, 779, 784, 805; repeal of the, 814, 823
 Cornishmen, rising of, under Henry VII., 246
 Coroners, 94
 Corporation Act, the, 470; abolition of, 788
 Corporations, 214
 Corruption, Parliamentary, by Walpole, 584
 Corsica offered to Britain, 650
 Corunna, battle of, 755
 Cornwallis, Admiral, 746
 Cornwallis, Lord, his operations in America, 668, 670, 671; Governor-General of India, 719; Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, 740, 741, 746; returns to India as Governor-General, 765
 Cottars, 65, 695; extinction of, 696, 803
 Cotton famine, the, 882
 Cotton industry, introduction of, 375
 Cotton-mule, invention of, by Samuel Crompton, 698
 Council, the Great, 58, 59
 Council of Executors nominated by Henry VIII., 297
 Council of Executors favour reformed doctrines, 299
 Council of Twelve, 164
 Courts of Law, 86
 Coutances, Walter of, Justiciar, 93
 Covenant, National League and, 420
 Covenant, Solemn League and, 431, 434, 438; publicly burnt, 470
 Covenanters withdraw from England, 438; routed at Rullion Green, 486; routed at Drumclog, 487; persecution of, 488, 559
 Cowper-Temple Clause, the, 898
 Crafts, growth of, 141; progress of, 219
 Cranborne, Lord. *See* Salisbury, Marquis of
 Cranmer, Archbishop, 291; and the divorce of Katharine of Aragon, 279-281, 303, 309; martyrdom of, 311-312
 Crécy, battle of, 157
 Crefeld, battle of, 623
 Crépy, Peace of, 295
 Cressingham, Hugh, 134
 Crete, autonomy of, 940
 Crévant, battle of, 199; the Scots at, 223
 Crewe, Chief Justice, 399
 Crimean War, the, 859-862
 Crimes Act, Ireland, 922, 924
 Crimes, punishment of, under the early English, 43-44
 Criminal Code revised by Peel, 784
 Criminal Law Amendment Act, 898, 901
 Cromer, Lord, Agent and Consul-General in Egypt, 916
 Crompton, Samuel, inventor of the cotton-mule, 698
 Cromwell, Oliver, 429; raises his "Ironsides," 431; at Marston Moor, 432; and the New Model, 435; victory at Preston, 442; succeeds Fairfax, 448; victory at Dunbar, 449; victory at Worcester, 449; character of, 450; becomes Lord Protector, 455; policy of, 456; declines title of king, 459; war with Spain, 460; alliance with France, 461; death of, 462
 Cromwell, Richard, Protector, 463
 Cromwell, Thomas, 278, 279; appointed Vicar-General, 283; fall and execution of, 288
 Cronje, General, surrender of, at Paardeberg, 937
 Cropredy Bridge, battle of, 433
 Crown, powers of the, 219; and people, conflict of, 383; and Parliament, 581
 Crusades, the, 69, 86
 Culloden, battle of, 600
 Cumberland, 114
 Cumberland, Ernest, Duke of, popular detestation of, 781; becomes King of Hanover, 815
 Cumberland, William, Duke of, defeated at Fontenoy, 596; defeats Young Pretender at Culloden, 600; signs Convention of Kloster Seven, 621
 Curia Regis, 74, 86
 Currency, lack of, in early England, 46; growth of, 74, 111
 Curzon, Lord, Viceroy of India, 956
 Customs duties, 120
 Customs, "Great and Ancient," 139, 167, 169

- DACOTS, suppression of, in India, 798
- Dalhousie, Lord, Governor-General of India, 850-851, 864
- Dalrymple, Sir Hew, 754, 755
- Dalrymple, Sir John, Master of Stair, 517
- Danby, Thomas Osborne, Earl of, minister of Charles II., 478; impeachment and imprisonment of, 481; release of, 490; 498, 503, 508, 522
- Danegeld, 64, 66, 74
- Danelagh, the, 19
- Danes, descent of the, 15-16; defeat of, at Aclea, 17; conquer Northumbria, 18; invade Wessex, 18; defeat Saxons at Basing, 18; defeated at Ethandune, 19; seize Exeter, 19; invasions of, 27; general massacre of, on St. Brice's Day, 27; attack on Ireland, 89
- Danton, 716, 725
- Darien Scheme, the, 539
- Darnley, Henry Lord, marries Mary Queen of Scots, 322; murder of, 323
- Darwin, Charles, 888
- David, King of Scotland, 75, 76
- David I., King of Scotland, 75, 76, 78, 79, 114
- David II., King of Scotland, 150; sent to France, 152; defeated by English and taken prisoner, 158; released, 159; captive in England, 185; death of, 186
- David ap Griffith captures Hawarden, 124, 125
- David, John, explorer, 335
- Death Duties, creation of, 927
- Death penalty almost abolished by William I., 56
- De Bohun, Henry, 144
- Decan, the, 764
- Declaration of Independence, American, the, 663
- Declaration of Right, the, 503
- Declaration of Rights, American, 660
- Declaratory Act, 648
- Declaratory Act (Ireland), 689; repeal of, 694
- Defoe, Daniel, 555, 704
- De Grasse, Admiral, co-operates with George Washington, 671; defeated by Rodney in the West Indies, 672-673
- De Grey, John, 96
- Deira, kingdom of, 11
- De Lacey, Hugh, justiciar of Ireland, 91
- Delhi sacked by Nadir Shab, 675; 863; Sindhia's and Holkar's attack on, 764; siege of, 869; capital of India, 962
- Demesne, the, 46
- Democratic movement, the, 777, 946
- Denmark, Canning's coercion of, 752, 880
- Deorham, battle of, 10, 11
- Derby, Lord, Prime Minister, 829, 830, 873; third administration of, 884-886; resignation of, 903
- Derby, Lord, Colonial Secretary, 918. *See also* Stanley, Lord D'Erton. *See* Drouet
- Dermot, King of Leinster, 90
- Derry, siege of, 511
- Desmond's rebellion, 338
- Despenser, Hugh, favourite of Edward II., 148
- D'Estaing, French Admiral, 668
- Dettingen, battle of, 594
- Devon Commission, the, 833-834
- Devonshire, Duke of, Prime Minister, 618
- Devonshire, Duke of, 930; resignation of, 951
- Devonshire, Earl of, 498
- De Wet, General Christian, 937-938
- Dialogue on the Exchequer, Fitz-Neal's, 55
- Diamond Hill, battle of, 937
- Dickens, Charles, 856
- Dilke, Sir Charles, 911
- Dinapur, the mutiny at, 870
- Dingan, King of the Zulus, 843
- Diplomacy, international, rise of, 243, 244
- Directory, the French, 725
- Disraeli, Benjamin, 822, 826; Chancellor of the Exchequer, 829; novels of, 856; leader of the Commons, 873-874, 884, 894; Prime Minister, 901; foreign policy of, 901-904; death of, 914
- "Divine right of kings," the, 383-384
- Dogger Bank, battle of the, 671; incident of the, 958
- Domesday Book, 64-66
- Donalbane, King of Scotland, 70
- Donald, Lord of the Isles, claims Earldom of Ross and is defeated at Harlaw, 223
- Dongola, occupation of, 940
- Donne, John, 544
- "Dooms," or Laws, 42, 43
- Dorchester, Lord. *See* Carleton
- Dost Mohammed, ruler of Kabul, 845, 846; restored, 846, 863
- Douglas, Bishop Gavin, poet, 378
- Douglas, Catherine "Barless," 224
- Douglas, Lord James, "the Black," 142, 224
- Douglas, Lord William, 224
- Dover, riot at, 32; loyalty of, to John, 100; treaty of, 476, 488
- Drake, Sir Francis, harries the Spaniards, 334-335; Darien expedition, 335; expedition to the West Indies, 342; expedition to Cadiz, 347, 349; Lisbon expedition, 351; expedition to the West Indies, 352
- Dresden, battle of, 762
- Drogheda stormed by Cromwell, 446
- Drouet D'Erton, Marshal, 770, 773
- Drumclog, rout of Covenanters at, 487
- Dryden, John, 546
- Dudley, Lord Guildford, marriage to Lady Jane Grey, 306; execution of, 310
- Dunbar, battle of, 449
- Dunbar, William, poet, 378
- Duncan, Admiral, wins battle of Camperdown, 730
- Duncan, King of Scots, 33
- Dundalk, battle of, 145
- Dundee. *See* Claverhouse
- Dunes, battle of the, 461
- Dunkeld, battle of, 516
- Dunkirk, 461; sold to France by Charles II., 471
- Dunning's resolution, 684
- Dunsinane, battle of, 33
- Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, 25-26
- Dupleix, 602-608
- Dupplin Moor, battle of, 151
- Durban, Sir Benjamin, Governor of Cape Colony, 842
- Durham, Lord, Governor of Canada, 837
- Dutch wars with the Commonwealth, 451; with Charles II., 472
- Duties, reduction of, 785, 875, 876
- Dynamite outrages, 918
- EADRED, King of England, subdues the Danes, 25
- Eadric Streona, 27
- Ealdormen, position and duties of, 41, 59
- East India Company, the, 374, 472, 522, 531, 536, 537, 538, 541, 578, 602, 605-608, 656, 676, 681, 686, 717; abolition of, 718, 815, 872
- East India Company, Dutch, 472
- East India Company, the French, 537, 541; struggle with British East India Company, 597, 602, 605
- Eastern, or Prussian Company, 374
- Eastern Question, the, 902
- Eastern rising, the, 301
- Ecclesiastical Commission, Court of, created by James II., 495
- Ecclesiastical Regulations, Scottish, 419
- Egbert, King of Wessex, 15-16
- Egfrith of Northumbria, defeated at Nechtansmere, 14
- Economic Reform Bill, Burke's, 684
- Edgar, King of England, reign of, 25-26, 32
- Edgar, King of Scotland, 70
- Edgar the Ætheling, 29
- Edgar the Æthling, 35
- Edgar the Ætheling, elected king, 50, 53
- Edgehill, battle of, 429
- Edict of Nantes, the, revoked by Louis XIV., 494
- Edinburgh captured by the forces of Bruce, 142; 294; sacked by Protector Somerset, 299; treaty of, 319
- Edinburgh Review, The*, 811
- Edington, or Ethandune, battle of, 19
- Edith, wife of Edward the Confessor, 31
- Edmund "the Deed-doer," King, 24
- Edmund Ironside, 28
- Edmund, St., 18, 22
- Education, reform of, 270
- Education, 854-855; Forster's Act, 897; Act of 1891, 926
- Education Bill, 944, 945; defeated by the Peers, 952; Asquith's, 953
- Edward the Black Prince, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164
- Edward the Confessor, 31
- Edward the Elder, King of Wessex, reign and policy of, 22-23

- Edward the Martyr, 26
 Edward I. defeats de Montfort at Evesham, 107; reign of, 117-141; character of, 118; policy of, 119; and the Church, 121; conquers Wales, 122; defeated near Menai Strait, 125; and the Constitution, 126; conquest of Scotland, 127-128; policy of, 128; relations with Philip IV. of France, 128; Flemish Expedition, 131; continental relations, 136; policy of, 137, 138-141; and finance, 139-140; commercial developments under, 141
 Edward II. invades Scotland, 142; follies of, 145-148; forced to abdicate, and murdered, 149-150
 Edward III. proclaimed and crowned, 149; overthrows Mortimer, 150; defeats Scots at Halidon Hill, 152; war with France, 154; his claims to the French throne, 154-155; invades Normandy, 157; military prowess of, 160; renews his war with France, 162; disasters of his later years, 163; policy of, 166; strains royal prerogative, 167; and the baronage, 172
 Edward IV. proclaimed king, 209; marriage of, 211; captured by Warwick and released, 212; flees to Burgundy, 212; regains the throne, 212-213; character and policy of, 213-215; proposed war upon France, 215; death of, 215
 Edward V. accession of, 215; murder of, 216
 Edward VI., death of, 306
 Edward VII., reign of, 949; death of, 955
 Edwardes, Herbert, 850, 851
 Edwin, Earl of Mercia, 34; defeated at York, 37; 51
 Edwin, King of Northumbria, 12
 Edwy appointed king, 24; division of his kingdom, 25
 Edwy, son of Æthelred, 29
 Egypt, Napoleon's expedition to, 731-734; British relations with, 915; Britain takes control of, 916; Salisbury's policy in, 928-929, 940
 Elections, borough and shire, under Edward IV., 214
 Elgin, Lord, 878; Governor-General of India, 887
 Eliot, George, 888
 Eliot, Sir John, 399, 400, 410
 Elizabeth, Queen, accession of, 314; policy of, 315; and the Church, 316; and the national finances, 317; supports Lords of the Congregation, 319; plots to murder, 324; prosperous rule of, 325; diplomatic relations with Spain, 329; administration of Ireland under, 330-332; alliance with the Dutch, 342; helps Henry of Navarre, 352; relations with Scotland, 356; death of, 361; character of, 361
 Elizabeth, Poor Law of, 695
 Elizabeth, Tsarina, 613, 614, 616
 Elizabethan Age, the, 543
 Ellandune, battle of, 15
 Ellenborough, Lord, Governor-General of India, 846, 848
 Elliott, Sir George, defender of Gibraltar, 673
 El-Teb, battle of, 917
 Emancipation of Slaves Act, 838, 841
 Emmet, Robert, insurrection of, 745
 Employers' Liability Bill, 927, 945
 Enclosure of land, 301, 695
 Encumbered Estates Act, the, 835
 Enghien, Duc d', murder of, 746
 Engineers, strike of, 1852, 854
 Engineers' Society, the, 890
 English people, traits of the, 117
 Enniskillen, siege of, 510
 Entail, 122
Entente cordiale, the, 958
 Episcopacy in Scotland, 416; Act abolishing, 516
 Episcopate, Scottish, restoration of by, James VI., 356
 Erasmus, 270
 Eric, King of Norway, 115, 132
 Escheat, 63
 Essex, Earl of, captures Cadiz, 325, 354; fall of, 357-359; failure in Ireland, 360; execution of, 360
 Essex, Robert Devereux, Earl of, commands the Parliamentary forces, 429; commits suicide in the Tower, 489
 Étapes, Peace of, 246
 Ethandune, battle of, 19
 Eugene, Prince, commander of the Austrian forces, 552; joined by Marlborough, 553; drives the French out of Italy, 560
Euphues, John Lyly's, 379
 Europe, state of, during the Middle Ages, 230-232; condition of, during reign of Elizabeth, 320-321, 327; settlement of, after Waterloo, 775
 European Concert, the, 903
 Eustace, Count, of Boulogne, 32
 Eustace, son of Stephen, 77
 Exchequer, Court of, 74
 Exchequer, "Stop" of the, 477, 541
 Excise, 540
 Excise Bill, Walpole's, 587
 Exclusion Bill, the, 481, 482
 Exeter, Danes occupy and retire from, 19
 Exeter, Marquis of, executed for treason, 287
 Export trade under Edward III., 169
 Evesham, battle of, 107
 Eylau, battle of, 751
 Eyre, Sir George, Governor of Jamaica, 887
 FACTORIES and Workshops Acts, 1867, 890; modification of, 927
 Factory Act, first, the, 815, 816-818, 824, 825; Fielden's, 827
Faërie Queen, The, 380
 Fairfax, Lord, holds Hull against Royalists, 430, 432
 Fairfax, Sir Thomas, Commander-in-Chief of the Parliamentary forces, 435, 442, 448; joins Monk, 465
 Falaise, treaty of, 85, 92, 114
 Falkirk, battle of, 127 136, 600
 Falkland, Lucius Carey, Lord, 469
 Family Compact, the, (i.) 589; (ii.) 638
 Family Compact, Canadian, 799
 Fashoda incident, the, 941
 Fawkes, Guy, 388
 Federation League, the, 917
 Felonies Act, 305
 Felton, John, assassin of Buckingham, 404
 Fenianism, 885-886, 896
 Fenwick, Sir John, discloses Jacobite intrigues, 524
 Ferdinand of Aragon makes alliance with Henry VII., 244-245
 Ferdinand of Spain, 596
 Ferrar, Bishop, martyred, 311
 Feudal System, 51, 53, 60
 Fielden's Factory Act, 827
 Fielding, Henry, 705
 Fifth Monarchy Men, the, 457, 468
 Finance, national, 74, 126, 139; Commons assert exclusive right over, 191; chaos of, during reign of Edward VI., 305; in the seventeenth century, 540
 Finch, Speaker, 410
 Fire of London, the Great, 472
 Firozpur, 849
 Firozshah, battle of, 849
 Fiscal Policy, the problem of, 950-951
 Fisher, John, Bishop of Rochester, 270; committed to the Tower, 282; executed, 283
 Fitz-Neal, Richard, 55, 109
 Fitz-Osbern, Roger, insurrection of, 56
 Fitz-Osbern, William, 51
 Fitz-Peter, Geoffrey, justiciar, 93, 94, 95, 97
 Fitz-William, Lord, Viceroy of Ireland, 739
 Five Articles of Perth, the, 417
 Five Members, impeachment of the, 427
 Five Mile Act, the, 470
 Flambarð, Ranulf, 68, 71
 Flamsteed, 548
 Flanders, 130, 154
 Fleetwood, General, 463
 Fletcher, Andrew, of Saltoun, 558
 Fleury, Cardinal, minister of Louis XV. of France, 589
 Flodden, battle of, 263, 264
 Flood, Henry, 693
 Florentines, financial relations with Edward I., 140; banishment of, 147
 Florida, 673
 Fly-shuttle, invention of, by John Kay, 697
 Folc-land, 46
 Folc-moot, 54, 55, 60
 Folk-moots, 43
 Fontenoy, battle of, 596
 Forbes, Duncan, 600, 601
 Foreign commerce 22x

- Forest Law, 56
 Forfeiture, 63
 Formigny, battle of, 204
 Forster, William Edward, his Education Act, 897; Chief Secretary for Ireland, 913-914
 Fort Duquesne, capture of, 624
 Fort St. David, 604
 Fort St. George. *See* Madras
 Fort William. *See* Calcutta
 Forty Articles, the, 304
 "Forty-shilling freeholders," the, 789
 "Forward Policy" (India), the, 887
 "Four days battle," the, 472
 Fox, Charles James, 684; coalition with North, 685, 707; alliance with Pitt, 745; death of, 750
 Fox, Henry, 617, 618
 Foxe, John, author of the *Book of Martyrs*, 378
 France, relations and wars with, 56, 71, 81, 82, 93, 94-96, 97, 98, 101, 104, 108, 128, 130-131, 149; the Hundred Years' War, 152-163, 167, 181, 192-200, 204; 210, 218, 219, 230-232, 243, 245, 254, 262, 265, 266-268, 291-295, 313, 319-321, 328, 340-342, 386, 399, 461-462, 468, 471, 476, 479, 494-495, 498-500, 518-519, 523-524, 526-530; in Canada, 533; in India, 537, 541; 550-554, 560-563, 566-568, 575-577, 588-591, 592-596; in India, 597, 602, 605-608, 622-635; in Canada, 612-613; 614-629, 638-641; supports America in her War of Independence, 666; Pitt's commercial treaty with, 709; the Revolution, 714-717, 724; the war with the Republic, 724; under the Republic, 731; sends force under Hoche to assist Wolfe Tone's rebellion, 740; Cobden's commercial treaty with, 875; and Italian unity, 879; war with Prussia, 892-893
 Franchise, extension of, in 1832, 792
 Franchise Bill, the, 918
 Francis I., Emperor of Austria, 596
 Francis I. of France meets Henry VIII. at the Field of the Cloth of Gold, 265; ally of the Scots, 292
 Francis, Philip, 676
 Franklin, Benjamin, 659
 Franks, 4
 Fraser, General, expels Holkar from Northern India, 765
 Frederick, Elector-Palatine, 385; marries Elizabeth, daughter of James I., 392
 Frederick the Great of Prussia and the Austrian Succession, 593, 594, 596, 612; his war with Austria, 613-614, 616-622, 628-638; designs on Poland, 638
 Free Kirk, the, 856
 Free Trade, 568, 784, 813, 821, 825, 826, 834; Gladstone's Budgets, 874, 875; challenged by Joseph Chamberlain, 949
 Freeman, the, 48, 65, 110-111
 French Canadians, the, 836
 French, General, 935
 Frere, Sir Bartle, High Commissioner for South Africa, 909
 Friars, 110
 Friedland, battle of, 751
 "Frith," the, or Saxon-Danish treaty, 22
 Frobisher, Martin, Arctic voyages of, 335, 349
 Fuentes d'Onoro, battle of, 759
 Fulk, Count of Anjou, 71
 Fyrd, the, 48, 55
 GAEKWAR, the, 676, 678, 680, 795
 Gaelic invasion, 1
 Gaels, the, 2, 5
 Gage, General, 660
 Gama, Vasco da, 253
 Gardiner, Stephen, Bishop of Winchester, 278, 291; imprisonment of, 299, 303; released by Mary, 309; 310
 Garibaldi, 880
 Garrisons, Roman, in Britain, 2
 Gascony, campaign in, 157
 Gatacre, General, 935
 Gaunt, John of. *See* Lancaster
 Gaveston, Piers, favourite of Edward II., 145; death of, 147
 Geddes, Jenny, 419
 General Assembly of the Kirk, 415; defies Charles I., 420; introduce Presbyterianism, 355, 516
 Geoffrey, Count of Anjou, 75
 Geoffrey of Monmouth, 236
 George I., accession of, 571-572; alliance with France, 575
 George II., 584; at the battle of Dettingen, 594; death of, 628
 George III., character of, 636; opposition to the Whigs, 641; madness of, 647, 711, 758; thwarts Fox's India Bill, 687; death of, 780; his character, 781
 George III., 851
 George IV., accession of, 790; treatment of his wife, Caroline of Brunswick, 781; death of, 790; his character, 790
 George V., reign of, 958 *et seq.*
 George, David Lloyd, Chancellor of the Exchequer, 953-954; his National Insurance Act, 961
 German Empire, the, 892-894
 German's Town, battle of, 665
 Germany, popular risings in, 827; recent naval development of, 958
 Gesiths, 41
 Ghazni, 846
 Ghent, treaty of, 766
 Ghorukas, friendly relations with, 765
 Gibbon, Edward, 706
 Gibraltar captured by Sir George Rooke 554; besieged by Spain, 670; siege of, 671, 672; relieved by Howe, 673
 Gilbert, Sir Humphrey, 374; pioneer of Imperialism, 531
 Gilbert's Act, 803, 818
 Gildas, 6, 11
 Gild-merchants, 112
 Gilds, growth of, 141; the craft, 220, 375, 376
 Ginkel, General, Commander in Ireland, 512
 Girondins, the, 725
 Gladstone, William Ewart, 822; Chancellor of the Exchequer, 857, 874, 885; proposes disestablishment of Church of Ireland, 886; becomes Liberal leader, 894; Prime Minister, 905; second administration, 911; Irish measures, 913; third administration of, 920; fourth administration of, 924; retirement of, 924, 927; death of, 947
 Glencoe, massacre of, 517; battle of, 935
 Glendower, Owen, leads Welsh rising against Henry IV., 189, 190, 191
 Gloucester, Earl of, 138
 Gloucester, Gilbert, Earl of, chosen elector, 106
 Gloucester, Humphrey, Duke of, Regent of England, 198, 203, 204
 Gloucester invested by Charles I., 430
 Gloucester, Richard, Duke of, 215. *See* Richard III.
 Gloucester, Robert, Earl of, 75, 76, 77
 Gloucester, Statute of, 120
 Gloucester, Thomas Duke of, opposes Richard II., 180; arrest and death of, 181
 Goddard, Captain, 678
 Goderic, Frederick Robinson, Lord, Prime Minister, 787
 Godfrey, Sir Edmund Berry, murder of, 481
 Godiva, Lady, 34
 Godolphin, Lord, 492, 502, 522; retirement of, 524; returns to the ministry, 528, 563, 564
 Godoy, Don Manuel de, minister of Charles IV. of Spain, 753
 Godwin, Earl, 30, 31, 32
 Goldsmith, Oliver, 697, 704
Gorboduc, by Nicholas Udall, 380
 Gordon, General, sent to the Sudan, 916; death of, at Khartum, 917
 Gordon, Lord George, leader of the "No-Popery" riots, 684
 Gordon, George William, inciter of Jamaican insurrection, 887
 Goschen, G. J., Chancellor of the Exchequer, 921
 Gough, Lord, 849, 851
 Government, continuity of, after the Norman Conquest, 54, 59; evolution of, 118
 Gower, John, author, 239
 Grace, Act of, 508
 Grafton, Augustus Fitzroy, Duke of, colleague of William Pitt, 649; his administration, 650-654
 Graham, General, defeats the Mahdi at El-Teb, 917
 Graham, Sir James, 822
 Granby, Marquis of, 625
 Grand Alliance, the, 524-530, 561
 Grand Remonstrance, the, 426
 Granville, Lord, 895, 911

- Grattan, Henry, 693, 694; leader of the Irish Parliament, 738, 740
- Gravelines, defeat of the Spanish Armada off, 349
- Gray, Thomas, 704
- Great Contract, the, 391
- Great Council, the, 94, 104, 106
- Great Trek, the, 842-843
- Greece, War of Independence, 787; war with Turkey, 940
- Greene, Robert, 580
- Gregory VII., Pope, conflict with William I., 57
- Grenville, George, Prime Minister, 641; his colonial policy, 643-647; 743, 745
- Grenville, Lord, ministry of, 750
- Grenville, Sir Richard, engages Spanish fleet off the Azores, 352
- Gretna Green, 611
- Grey, Charles, Lord, Prime Minister, 791, 814, 815, 829
- Grey, George, 841
- Grey, Lady Jane, 306; execution of, 310
- Grey, Lord Leonard, Deputy-Lieutenant of Ireland, 291
- Griffith, King of North Wales, 34
- Grossetête, Bishop of Lincoln, 110
- Grouchy, Marshal, 771
- Guadeloupe, capture of, 625
- Gualo, Papal legate, 101
- Guesclin, Bertrand du, 161
- Guienne, loss of, 207
- Gujerat, battle of, 851
- Gunpowder, adoption of, in war, 234-235
- Gunpowder Plot, 388
- Guthenberg, John, inventor of the printing-press, 240
- Guthrum, defeat of, by, and treaty with, Alfred, 19-20
- Gwalior, capture of, 679; campaign against, 847
- HAAKON, King of Norway, invades Scotland, 115
- Habeas Corpus, writ of, refused by Charles I., 400
- Habeas Corpus Act, 482; Irish demand for, 690; suspension of, 779, 884, 885
- Hadrian's Wall, 2
- Haidar Ali, 656; Hastings's war with, 678
- Hal, Prince, 189; and Judge Gascoigne, 191
- Haldane, Lord, Army reforms of, 952
- Hales, Colonel, 495
- Hales, Treasurer, murder of, 177
- Halfdan attacks Wessex, 18
- Halidon Hill, battle of, 152
- Halifax, 502, 508
- Halifax, George Savile, Earl of, 483
- Halifax, Charles Montague, Lord, 562
- Hamilton, William, Duke of, 558
- Hampden, John, 427, 430
- Hampton Court Conference, the, 387, 405
- Hanover, severance of, from Britain, 814
- Hanoverian Succession, the, 557, 558, 568-571
- Hanseatic League, 254
- Hapsburgs, the, 777
- Harald Hardrada, 36, 37
- Harcourt, Lord, Viceroy of Ireland, 691
- Harcourt, Sir William, creates Death Duties, 927
- Hardinge, Henry, Lord, Governor-General of India, 848, 850
- Harleur, siege of, 195
- Hargreave, Robert, inventor of the spinning-jenny, 697
- Harlaw, battle of, 222
- Harley, *See* Oxford, Earl of
- Harold Godwinson, chief minister, 32-33; his promise to William the Conqueror, 34; elected king, 35; difficulties of, 36; defeat and death of, 38, 50
- Harold "Harefoot," 31
- Harthacnut, King of England, 31
- Hartington, Lord, 911, 921. *See also* Devonshire, Duke of
- Harvey, William, discoverer of the circulation of the blood, 547
- Hasting the Viking, 20
- Hastings, John, claimant to Scottish throne, 133
- Hastings, Lord, execution of, by Richard III., 216
- Hastings, Marquess of, Governor-General of India, 765, 794-796, 864
- Hastings, Warren, Governor of Bengal, 674; made Governor-General of India, 674; impeachment of, 718-719
- Havelock, Sir Henry, 869, 870
- Havre bombarded by Rodney, 625
- Hawarden captured by David ap Griffith, 124
- Hawke, Admiral Lord, 596, 621; defeats French fleet at Quiberon Bay, 626
- Hawkins, Sir John, 333, 349; harries Spanish shipping, 351; expedition with Drake to the West Indies, 352
- Hawley, General, defeat of, at Falkirk, 600
- Heathfield, battle of, 12
- Heavy Brigade, charge of, at Balaklava, 861
- Hedgely Moor, battle of, 210
- Helvetian Republic, the (Switzerland), 731
- Hengist, Jutish chief, 6, 8
- Hengston Down, battle of, 17
- Henry I., character of, 70; marries Edith, 71; wars with Normandy, 71, 72; and the Church, 72; policy of, 73-75, 109
- Henry II., accession of, 81; continental possessions of, 81; character and policy of, 82-83; quarrel with Becket, 83, 84; insurrections against, 85, 87; invasion of Ireland, 90, 109
- Henry III., accession of, 101; assumes the Government, 102; character of, 103; and the Papacy, 103-104; expeditions in France, 104; war with Wales, 104; confirmations of the Charter, 105, 117; struggle with de Montfort, 105; death of, 107
- Henry IV., accession of, 188; rebellions against, 188-190; death of, 190
- Henry V., character of, 192; persecutes the Lollards, 192; his war with France, 192-198; conquest of Normandy, 197; death of, 198
- Henry VI., marriage of, 204; captured by the Yorkists, 207, 208; imbecility of, 207; restored to the throne by Warwick, 212; death of, 213
- Henry VII., crowned on Bosworth field, 218; accession of, 241; insurrections against, 243; alliance with Spain, 244-245; occupation of Brittany, 245; character of, 248; domestic policy of, 249; foreign policy of, 249; methods of filling his treasury, 250-251; policy of, 252
- Henry VIII., marries Katharine of Aragon, 262; attacks Guienne, 262; relations with James IV. of Scotland, 263; alliance with France, 265; wars with France, 266; obtains title of Defender of the Faith, 269; divorce of Katharine of Aragon, 275; conflict with the Papacy, 278-281; despoils the monasteries, 283-284; marries Jane Seymour, 286; marries Anne of Cleves, 286; suppresses the monasteries, 287; his designs on Scotland, 289; continental and Scottish relations, 291; marries Catherine Howard, 291; marries Catherine Parr, 291; alliance with Emperor Charles, 294; wars with Scotland and France, 294-295; and finance, 295; fixes the succession, 296; death of, 297
- Henryson, Robert, Scottish poet, 239
- Heptarchy, the, 9-10
- Herat, siege of, 846; captured by the Persians, 863
- Herbert, George, 545
- Hereditary succession, 119
- Hereford, Duke of, banished by Richard II., 183; claims the crown, 184
- Hereford, Earl of, conspiracy against William I., 54
- Hereford, Humphrey de Bohun, Earl of, 128, 130, 138
- Heretico Comburendo, Statute de, 190
- Hereward the Wake, 53, 54
- Herzegovina, revolt of, 903
- Hicks Pasha, annihilation of his expedition against the Mahdi, 916
- High Commission, Court of, 316, 371; abolished, 425
- Hildebrand. *See* Gregory VII.
- Hill, General, 761
- Hindus, the, and the Mutiny, 867, 868
- Hobbes, Thomas, 547
- Hoche, General Lazare, 727; commands French expedition to Ireland, 741

- Hohenlinden, battle of, 735
 Holkar, 676, 764, 795
 Holland, war with the Commonwealth, 451; war with, under George III., 671; joins coalition against Napoleon, 726; invaded by the French, 727; Batavian Republic, 728; defeat in the Texel, 734
 Holles, Denzil, 410
 Holy Alliance, the, 776, 777
 Holy Roman Empire, the, 230; dissolved by Napoleon, 750; 892
 Home, John, 705
 Home Rule, 896-897, 904, 920, 923, 924, 949, 951, 950
 Honildon Hill, battle of, 189
 Hone, William, prosecution of, 779
 Hong-Kong ceded to Britain, 863
 Honorius III., Pope, 101
 Hood, Admiral, 726
 Hooker, Richard, *Ecclesiastical Polity* of, 372
 Hooper, John, Bishop of Gloucester, martyred, 311
 Hopton, Sir Ralph, Royalist General, 430
 Horsa, Jutish chief, 6, 8
 Hotham, Admiral, 728
 Hotspur, Harry. *See* Percy
 Hougoumont, Chateau of, 772
 Howard of Effingham, Lord, defeats the Armada, 349
 Howe, Admiral, Lord, 668; relieves Gibraltar, 673; defeats French fleet off Ushant, 727
 Howe, General, 662, 663, 668
 Hubert de Burgh. *See* Burgh
 Hubert, Walter, death of, 90
 Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln, 93
 Hughes, Admiral, 679
 Huguenots, the, 320, 385, 386; introduction of new industries by, 695, 697
 Hull besieged by the Royalists, 432
 Humbert, General, 741
 Humble Petition and Advice, the, 458, 459
 Hume, David, 705
 "Hundred Days," the, 768-774
 Hundred Years' War, the, 153, 207
 Hundred-reeve, 43
 Hundreds, 42
 Huskisson, William, President of the Board of Trade, 784; commercial policy of, 785; resigns, 788; death of, 792
 Huss, John, 269
 Hutchinson, Governor, 659
 Huxley, Professor, 889
 Hyde, Edward. *See* Clarendon
 Hyde, Laurence. *See* Rochester
 Hyde Park, demonstration of Reformers at, 884
- IBERIANS, the, 1
 Ibrahim Pasha, defeat of, at Navarino, 788
 Iconoclasm, Puritan, 429
 Imperialism, 946
 Impey, Sir Elijah, 676, 681-68
 Impositions, the, 320
 Income tax, 779, 823, 875, 952
- Indemnity, Acts of, 507
 Independence, American Declaration of, the, 663
 Independents, 371
 India, 591; the struggle for, 602, 640; consolidation of British power, 655-657; under Warren Hastings, 674-682; Fox's Bill, 686; Pitt's Bill, 717; Napoleon's designs on, 734, 736; under Wellesley, 736; under Lord Hastings, 794-796; under Amherst, 796-797; under Lord William Bentinck, 797, 844, 887; the Mutiny, 864; Queen Victoria proclaimed Empress of, 905; reforms of Lord Ripon, 917; famines of 1897 and 1900, 943; the King's visit to, 962; Delhi restored to its ancient position as capital, 962; under Curzon, 956
 India Act, 1858, 872
 Indian National Congress, the, 928
 Indulgence, Declaration of, 477; (James II.), 496
 Industrial revolution, the, 852; unrest, 963-964
 Industry, development of, under the Tudors, 372, 375; in the seventeenth century, 535; eighteenth century, 695, 801; depression of, after the Napoleonic wars, 778-780; revival of, 801
 Ine, King of Wessex, Dooms or Laws of, 14
 Infanticide, suppression of, in India, 798
 Inkerman, battle of, 861
 Innocent III., Pope, quarrel with John, 96
 Innocent IV., Pope, obtains funds from Henry III., 104
 Inquisition, the Spanish, 327
 Instrument of Government, the, 454
 Insurance Act, National, the, 961
Intercursus Magnus, treaty of, 254
 Interim of Augsburg, 300
 Invention, the era of, 801
 Inverlochy, battle of, 436
 Ionian Isles ceded to Britain, 775
 Ireland, annexation of, 88-91; Danish attacks on, 89, 144-145; government of, 257-259; Irish Parliament, restricted powers of, 259, 290-291; disturbances in, 302, 425; under James I., 389; Cromwell's campaign in, 446; under William III., 509-513; Lands Bill, the, 525; commerce and industry of, in the seventeenth century, 539; during the eighteenth century, 688-695; trade of, 693; Irish Mutiny Bill, 694; restrictions on trade of, 710; Revolution to the Union, 738; the Union with, 741; Robert Emmet's insurrection, 745; disorder in, 813; discontent in, 823, 824; the potato famine in, 825, 826, 834; Peel's Coercion Bill for, 826; insurrection in, 827; after the Reform Bill, 831; agrarian strife in, 832; emigration movement, 835; Fenianism, 883-884;
- disestablishment of Church of, 886, 894; troubles in, 895; Gladstone's Land Act, 896; Universities Bill, 900; Gladstone's Bills for relief of distress and compensation for evictions, 913; disturbances and violence in, 915; arrest of agitators, 922-923; Irish Party, 924, 927; Land Bills, 926; Land Act of 1896, 944; Local Government Act of 1898, 944
 Iron industry, development of, 700
 Ironfields, development of the, 801
 Isabella, Queen of Edward II., 144, 146, 149
 Isabella of Spain, 358
 Isandlwana, battle of, 910
 Ismail, Khedive of Egypt, 915
 Italy, Napoleon's conquests in, 728; campaigns of Napoleon, 735; War of Unity, 878; completion of Unity of, 892
- JACOBINISM, 725, 802
 Jacobite intrigues, 518, 522; rebellion of 1715, 573-575; of 1745, 596, 597-601, 608
 Jacobitism, prevalence of, in the Highlands, 559
 Jamaica, colonisation of, 460; troubles in, 837; insurrection in, 887
 James I., King of Scotland, 222, 223; assassination of, 224; poetry of, 239
 James II., King of Scotland, 222, 224
 James III., King of Scotland, 222, 225; defeat and murder of, 259
 James IV. of Scotland marries Margaret, daughter of Henry VII., 248; reign of, 259-261; defeated and slain at Flodden, 264
 James V. of Scotland, 289
 James VI. of Scotland, minority of, 329, 354; and the Church, 356; accession to the throne of England, 383. *See also* James I.
 James I., accession of, 383; his policy in religious affairs, 386; Roman Catholic plots against, 387; character of, 388-389; policy of, 389; foreign policy of, 391-397; death of, 397
 James II., accession of, 490; character and policy of, 491-498; flight of, 502; campaign in Ireland, 509; death of, 529
 James, Duke of York, gains naval victory over Dutch off Lowestoft, 472
 James, the Old Pretender, 529
 Jameson Raid, the, 930
 Japan, 878; war with China, 940; war with Russia, 958
 Jassy, peace of, 713
 Java wrested from the Dutch, 765
 Jeanne d'Arc, the Maid of Orleans, raises siege of Orleans, 199; defeats the English at Pataye, 200; crowns Charles VII., 200; military success of, 200; capture and death of, 200; loyalty of the Scots to, 223

- Jeffreys, Judge, conducts the Bloody Assize, 493; imprisoned, 502
- Jellalabad, 846
- Jena, battle of, 170
- Jenkins's ear, 592
- Jerusalem, 86
- Jervis, Admiral, 728; defeats Spanish fleet off Cape St. Vincent, 729
- Jesuits, the, 320; and Elizabeth, 338-339; mission of, to England, 371; influence of, in France, 476
- Jews, expulsion of, by Edward I., 140; readmitted by the Commonwealth, 456
- Jhansi, 866; capture of, 871
- Jingois, 903
- Joan of Arc. *See* Jeanne d'Arc
- John, accession of, 94; war with Philip of France, 95; conflict with the Papacy, 96-97; alliance with Emperor Otto, 98; character and death of, 100-101, 117
- John of Gaunt. *See* Lancaster
- John, King of France, taken prisoner at Poitiers, 159
- Johnson, Dr. Samuel, 702, 809
- Jourdan, Marshal, 727, 728; defeated at Talavera, 757, 762
- "July Revolution," the, 791
- Jumièges, Robert of, Archbishop of Canterbury, 32
- Junot, General, 752, 753, 754
- Juntas, the Spanish, 753
- Junto, the, 562, 564
- Jury, trial by, 43; selection and functions of, the, 94
- Justice, administration of, 44
- Jutes settle in Britain, 6-8
- KABUL, 846; British mission to, 906, 907
- Kaffirs, the, 841, 842
- Kandahar, capture of, 846; relief of, by Roberts, 907
- Katharine of Aragon married to Arthur, Prince of Wales, 248
- Kaunitz, Prince, of Austria, 614, 619
- Kaveripak, battle of, 607
- Kay, John, inventor of the fly-shuttle, 697
- Keats, John, 811
- Ken, Bishop, 497
- Kennedy, Bishop, governs Scotland, 225
- Kent, Edward, Duke of, 781
- Ket, Robert, rebellion of, 301
- Khalifa, operations against the, 940
- Khalsa, the, 848, 850, 851
- Khartum, fall of, 917
- Kildare, Gerald Fitzgerald, Earl of, Deputy-Lieutenant of Ireland, 257
- Kildare, Earl of, 290
- Kildare, Earl of, "silken Thomas," insurrection of, 201
- Killiecrankie, battle of, 516
- "Killing Time," the, 492, 513
- "Kilmainham Treaty," the, 915
- Kilsythe, battle of, 436
- Kimberley, siege of, 935
- Kinship, system of, 43, 44
- Kirk Sessions, Scottish, 516
- Kirke, Colonel, 511
- Kirke's Lambs, 493
- Kitchener, Lord, in South Africa, 936, 938; in India, 956
- Kloster Seven, Convention of, 621
- Knighthood, 139
- Knights of the Shire, 94, 152, 174
- Knox, John, 304, 309, 321; death of, 355; his *History of the Reformation in Scotland*, 378
- Knut (Canute) conquers England, 30; reign of, 31
- Knut, King of Denmark, threatens invasion of England, 54
- Königgratz, battle of, 893
- Kruger, Paul, President of the Transvaal, 931; flight of, 938
- Kunersdorf, battle of, 625
- LABOUR and wages, 219; beginning of conflict with capitalism, 221; struggles with capital, 802, 853-854, 948
- Labour Party, the, 951
- Labourers, the, 45, 46
- Labourers' Dwellings Act, the, 901
- Labourers, Statute of, 174, 205
- Ladysmith, siege of, 935
- Laets, 45
- Lafayette, General, 670
- La Haye Sainte, 772, 773
- Laing's Nek, battle of (1880), 912
- Laissez-faire, economic doctrine, 702, 813, 817, 834, 853, 890
- Lake, Bishop, 497
- Lake, General Lord, defeats Marathas, 764
- Lake School, the, 810
- Lally, General, besieges Madras, 634; defeated at Wandewash, 634
- Lambert resuscitates the Rump, 463, 464
- Lancaster, John of Gaunt, Duke of, heads the anti-clerical faction, 163; commands forces in France, 163; proposal as to the succession, 164; maladministration of, 179; recalled, 180
- Lancaster, Thomas, Earl of, 139; opposes Edward II., 147; execution of, 148
- Land Acts, Irish, 896, 944
- Land Bill, Irish, Gladstone's, 914
- Land Bills, Irish, 921, 922, 926
- Land League, the Irish, 904, 913, 914; attack on, by the *Times*, 923
- Land Purchase Act (Ireland), Ashbourne's, 919, 924
- Land-tax, the, 519; reassessment of, in 1692, 542; 588
- Land tenure, 44, 60-62, 176, 219
- Landen, battle of, 519
- Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, 54, 58, 67; death of, 68; 72
- Langland, William, author of the *Vision of Piers Plowman*, 175, 238
- Langport, battle of, 436
- Langside, battle of, 325
- Langton, Stephen, Archbishop, 96, 98, 99, 102, 110
- Largs, battle of, 115
- La Rochelle, British fleet defeated at, 173
- Laswari, battle of, 764
- Latimer, Lord, impeachment of, 164
- Latin language, use of, in mediæval England, 236
- Laud, Archbishop, 407, 408, 412; arrested on charge of treason, 423
- Lauderdale, Lord, Governor of Scotland, 474, 485
- Law, Saxon, 42; evolution of, 73-74, 88
- Lawrence, Sir Henry, 849, 850, 851, 866, 869
- Lawrence, Sir John, 866; Governor-General of India, 887
- Lawrence, Major Stringer, 604, 606, 607
- Lay investiture, 58
- Layamon, English poet, 236
- Learning, progress of, 149
- Leeds, Duke of. *See* Danby
- Leicester, Earl of. *See* Montfort, Simon de
- Leipzig, battle of, 762
- Leith, sack of, 294; treaty of, 319
- Lennox, Duke of, 355
- Lenthall, Speaker, and Charles I., 427
- Leo X., Pope, 265
- Leofric, Earl of Mercia, 31, 34
- Leopold of Austria, 716
- Leslie, David, 436
- Leuthen, battle of, 622
- Levant Company, the, 374
- Levellers, the, 440
- Leven, Alexander Leslie, Earl of, 420, 421, 432, 436
- Lewes, battle of, 105; *Mise of*, 106
- Lexington, battle of, 661
- Liberalism, 707
- Liberals, the, 813, 814; dissensions of, 945
- Liberal Unionists, the, 920, 925-926
- Licensing Bill, Asquith's, 953
- Liegnitz, battle of, 628
- Life Peerages, 863
- Light Brigade, charge of, 861
- Ligny, battle of, 770
- Lille, capture of, 562
- Limerick, siege of, 512; treaty of, 513
- Limoges sacked and destroyed by the Black Prince, 162
- Lincoln, 111
- Lincoln, Fair of, 101
- Lincoln, John de la Pole, Earl of, recognised heir-presumptive to the crown, 217; insurrection of, against Henry VII., 244
- Lindsay, Sir David, poet, 378
- Literature, 49; of the Middle Ages, 236; English beginnings of, 236-238; under the Tudors, 378; of the seventeenth century, 543; during the eighteenth century, 702, 808
- Liverpool, Robert Jenkinson, Earl of, Prime Minister, 761
- Llewelyn ap Griffith, 123-125
- Llewelyn ap Iorwerth, 123
- Lloyd, Bishop, 497
- Loans, Treasury, 709
- Lobau, agreement of, 730
- Lobengula, King of Matabeleland, 931
- Local Government, 42, 93

- Local Government Bill (1888), 926, 927
- Locke, John, his theory of the Social Contract, 547, 571
- Lollards, the, 181, 190, 284; repeal of Acts against the, 299
- Lombards, financial relations with Edward I., 140; banishment of, 147
- London, captured by Alfred the Great, 19; 47, 111; Great Fire of, the, 472
- London Convention, the (1884), 912, 933
- London County Council, the, 944
- Londonerry, siege of, 511
- Longchamp, William, Chancellor and Chief Justiciar, 92
- Long Parliament, the, 423, 452
- Lords, House of, 914, 918, 927, 952, 953, 954; reject the Budget of 1909, 954; proposed reconstruction of, 958-959
- Lords of the Articles, 186
- Lords Ordainers, the, 147, 148
- Lose-Coat Field, battle of, 212
- Lostwithiel, battle of, 433
- Lothian, 21; ceded to Malcolm of Scotland, 30
- Loudon Hill, battle of, 138
- Louis IX, of France, 105
- Louis XI., of France, 210; Warwick's alliance with, 211-212; pays tribute to Edward IV., 215
- Louis XIV, of France makes secret treaty with Charles II., 471, 476, 479, 483; revokes the Edict of Nantes, 494; wars of, 498, 511, 550; makes overtures for peace, 563
- Louis XV, of France, 575, 614; and the "Family Compact," 589
- Louis XVI, of France, 714; declares war on Austria, 715; execution of, 717
- Louis XVIII, of France, 763
- Louis Philippe of France, 791; deposition of, 827
- Louis the Dauphin aids the barons against John, 100
- Louisbourg, capture of, 596; exchanged for Madras, 597; captured by Amherst, 624
- Lovel, Lord, insurrection of, against Henry VII., 243
- Lowe, Robert, 897
- Lucan, Lord, 861
- Lucknow, 868; siege and relief of, 869-870
- Lumley, 498
- Lumphanan, battle of, 33
- Lunéville, treaty of, 735
- Luther, Martin, 265; denounces "indulgences," 271; condemned by the Edict of Worms, 272
- Luttrell, Colonel, 653
- Lydgate, John, poet, 239
- Lyly, John, 379
- Lynchhurst, Lord Chancellor, 876
- Lytton, Lord, Viceroy of India, 905-907
- M'ALPINE, Kenneth, King of Scotland, 21
- M'Kay, General, commands forces of William III. in Scotland, 515
- M'Lauchlan, Margaret, martyrdom of, 513
- M'Quarrie, Governor of New South Wales, 799
- Macaulay, Lord, 845, 856
- Macbeth, King of Scots, 33
- MacBeths, the, pretenders to Scottish throne, 114, 115
- MacNaghten, Resident, murder of, 846
- Macpherson, James, 809
- Macpherson, Sir John, 719
- MacWilliams, the, Scottish pretenders, 114, 115
- Machinery, introduction of, 697
- Mad Parliament, the, 104
- Madog, 126
- Madras, captured by the French and exchanged for Louisbourg, 597; 604-605, 678
- Madrid, Wellington in, 761
- Maegth, 44
- Maes Madog, battle of, 125
- Mafeking, siege of, 935; relief of, 937
- Magersfontein, battle of, 935
- Magna Carta, 99, 120
- Magnum Concilium*, 59
- Maharajpur, battle of, 847
- Mahdi, the, 916; death of, 940
- Mahé, capture of, 678
- Maida, battle of, 750
- Main Plot, the, against James I., 386, 387
- Maintenance and Livery, Statutes of, 250
- Mainwaring, 408
- Mainz, 726
- Maiwand, battle of, 908
- Majuba, battle of (1880), 912
- Malcolm I., King of Scots, alliance with Edmund, 24
- Malcolm II., King of Scotland, 30
- Malcolm Canmore, King of Scotland, 33; *entente* with William I., 51, 53, 59
- Malcolm IV., King of Scotland, surrenders his claims on Northumberland and Cumberland, 82, 114
- Male-tolie*, 130, 131
- Mallory, Sir Thomas, author of the *Morte Arthur*, 239
- Malplaquet, battle of, 563
- Malta, seized by Napoleon, 732, 733, 735; finally ceded to Britain, 775; despatch of Indian troops to, 903
- Manchester, Edward Montague, Earl of, Parliamentary General, 429
- Manchester and Liverpool Railway, the, 852
- Manchester Committees, 817
- Manchester Martyrs, the, 886
- Manchester School, the, 901
- Mandeville, Sir John, traveller and author, 239
- Manhood Suffrage, 820
- Manor, the, 43, 63, 111
- Manufactures, growth of, 220
- Maories, the, 840-841
- Map, Walter, 236
- Mar, Earl of, Regent of Scotland, 151
- Mar, John, Earl of, leads Jacobite rebellion, 522
- Marathas, the, 603, 606, 630, 632, 655, 675, 676, 678, 680, 720, 764, 794, 795, 864, 867
- March, Edmund Mortimer, Earl of, 163
- Marchand, Major, at Fashoda, 941
- Marengo, battle of, 735
- Margaret of Anjou, 208, 209, 210; defeated at Tewkesbury, 213
- Margaret of Denmark, marriage to James III. of Scotland, 225
- Margaret, daughter of Henry VII., married to James IV. of Scotland, 248
- Margaret, the Maid of Norway, 127, 132
- Maria Theresa and the War of the Austrian Succession, 593-597, 614
- Marie Louise of Austria married to Napoleon, 756
- Maritime expansion during the eighteenth century, 695
- Marlborough, John Churchill, Duke of, 508; campaign in Ireland, 512; 522, 529; ministerial supremacy of, 549-550; campaigns of, 551-555, 560; Tory opposition to, 554; campaigns of, 566; his diplomacy, 560, 561; victory of Ramillies, 560; fall of, 566, 576
- Marlborough, Sarah, Duchess of, 550, 554; loses her influence with Queen Anne, 564, 582
- Marlowe, Christopher, 380
- Marmont, Marshal, 759
- Marriage Act, 610
- Marshal, Richard, 103
- Marston Moor, battle of, 432
- Martin Mar-Prelate tracts, the, 371, 405
- Mary Queen of Scots, 294; married to the French Dauphin, 299; 314, 318; marries Henry, Lord Darnley, 322; marries Bothwell, 324; abdication of, 324; escapes from Lochleven Castle, 325; held prisoner by Elizabeth, 326, 345; trial and execution of, 344-345
- Mary of Lorraine, Regent of Scotland, 318
- Mary I. proclaimed Queen, 307; marries Philip of Spain, 309; persecution of Protestants, 310; war with France and death of, 313
- Mary II. married to William of Orange, 479; death of, 522
- Maserfield, battle of, 12
- Masham, Mrs., favourite of Queen Anne, 563
- Masséna, Marshal, 734, 759
- Masters and Servants Act, the, 891
- Masulipatam seized by Clive, 633
- Matabele, the, 841, 843
- Matilda, daughter of Henry I., recognised heir to the English throne, 72, 75; retires from England, 77
- Maud, Empress. See Matilda Maurice of Saxony. See Saxe
- Mauritius, annexation of, 765, finally ceded to Britain, 775
- Mayflower*, sailing of, the, 408, 533
- Maynooth, Peel's grant to, 834
- Mayo, Lord, Viceroy of India, 905

- Meath, Earl of, Justiciar of Ireland, 91
 Medway, Dutch fleet sails up the, 472
 Mehemet Ali, Pasha of Egypt, war with Britain, 822
 Melbourne, Lord, Prime Minister, 814, 815, 819, 832, 837-838
 Melville, Andrew, Scottish Reformer, 355, 416
 Menai Strait, Edward I. defeated near, 125
 Menschikoff, Prince, 860, 861
 Mercantile system, the, 586
 Mercantile Theory, the, 538, 701
 Mercantilism, beginnings of, 372
 Merchant Adventurers, 220, 255, 373
 Merchants of the Staple, 167, 169, 230, 373
 Mercia, 50
 Metcalfe, Lord, Governor of Jamaica, 838
 Methuen, General Lord, 935
 Methuen Treaty, the, 568
 Methven, battle of, 138
 Miani, battle of, 847
 Middle Ages, chief features of the, 226-240; social aspects of the, 232-235; intellectual aspects of, 235
 Middlesex, impeachment of, 407
 Military methods, Danish and Saxon, 48
 Militia Bill, the, 618
 Millenary Petition, 386
 Milner, Lord, High Commissioner in South Africa, 933, 938
 Milton, John, 544
 Minden, battle of, 625
 Minorca, seizure of, 562; captured by the French, 617; 640, 673
 Minto, Lord, Governor-General of India, 765
 Minto, Lord, Viceroy of India, 956-957, 962
 Mir Jafar, 631, 632, 634, 656
 Mir Kassin, 656
 Miracle plays, 380
 Mirat, the massacre of, 868
 Mise of Amiens, 105; of Lewes, 106
 Model Parliament, the, 129
 Mogul Empire, the, 602, 655
 Mogul, the, 764; proclamation of restoration at Delhi, 868
 Mohammed Ali, 606, 607
 Mohammedans, the, in India, 867
 Mohun Persad, 676
 Moltke, General von, 892
 Monarchy, 39, 40, 59; and aristocracy, conflict of, in the Middle Ages, 229
 Monasteries, valuable work of, during the Middle Ages, 234; suppression of, 287
 Money bills, 650, 876
 Monk, George, Commonwealth General, 449; Governor of Scotland, 464; assumes control of affairs in England, 465
 Monmouth, James, Duke of, 482; his victory at Bothwell Brig, 487; defeated and captured at Sedgemoor, 493
 Monopolies, trade, 168, 373, 375; abolition, 395, 541
 Monson, Colonel, 676; repulsed by Holkar, 764
 Montague, Bishop of Chichester, 408, 409
 Montague, Charles. *See* Halifax
 Montague, Henry Pole, Lord, 287
 Montcalm, Marquis de, 613
 Montenegro, revolt of, 903
 Montfort, John de, claimant of Brittany, 156
 Montfort, Simon de, 103-108
 Montfort, Simon de, the younger, 107
 Montgomerie brothers, rebellion of, 71
 Montjoy, 360
 Montreal, capture of, 629
 Montrose, James, Marquis of, defeats Covenanters at Tippermuir, 433; captures Aberdeen, 433; successes of, 436; capture and execution of, 447-448
 Moore, Sir John, 754; killed at Corunna, 755
 Moots, Shire and Hundred, 42-43
 Morality plays, 380
 Moray, Randolph, Earl of, 142; Regent of Scotland, 150, 151
 Moray, James Stuart, Earl of, 321; appointed Regent of Scotland, 325; his rule, 329
 Mordaunt, General, 621
 More, Sir Thomas, 270, 274, 280, 282; executed, 283, 366, 379
 Moreau, General, 728, 735
 Morkere, Earl of Northumbria, 34, 35; defeat of, 37, 51
 Morlaix, battle of, 156
 Morley, Lord, Secretary for India, 956-957, 962
 Moroccan Crisis, the, 964
Morte Arthur, the, 239, 378
 Mortimer, Edmund, Earl of March, 163
 Mortimer, Roger, (i.) 107; (ii.) 144; subdues Ireland, 145; 148, 149; execution of, 150
 Mortimer's Cross, Yorkist victory at, 209
 Mortmain, Statute of, 121, 181 ✓
 Morton, Archbishop, 248, 270
 Morton, James Douglas, Earl of, Regent of Scotland, 329, 354
 Morton's Fork, 251
 Moscow, burning of, 762
 Mudki, battle of, 849
 Multan, 850
 Municipal Reform Act, 819
 Munro, Major Hector, defeats Shujah Daulah at Buxar, 656-657
 Murat, Joachim, King of Naples, 753, 769
 Muscovy Company, the, 374
 Mutiny Act, 506
 Muzaffar Jang, 606
 Mysore, Warren Hastings's war with, 678
 Mystery plays, 380
 "NABOBS," the, 686
 Nadir Jang, 606
 Nadir Shah sacks Delhi, 675
 Nagpur, annexation of, 864, 865
 Namur recaptured by William III., 523
 Nana Sahib, 867, 870
 Nanda Kumar, 676
 Nankin, treaty of, 863
 Nantes, Edict of, 385
 Napier, Sir Charles, 847
 Napier, Sir Robert, 887
 Naples joins coalition against Napoleon, 726; conquered by France, 734; Bourbon dynasty of, overthrown, 880
 Napoleon I., 725; conquests of, in Italy, 728; makes treaty of Campo Formio with Austria, 730; Egyptian Campaign, 731-734; makes overtures for peace, 734, 735; his designs on India, 734, 736; closes ports to English goods, 743; projects invasion of England, 746; the Continental System, 749; successes against Austria and Prussia, 750; issues Berlin Decree, 751; invades Portugal, 752; marries Marie Louise of Austria, 756; deposes Louis from Holland, 756; Moscow Campaign, 756; Moscow Expedition, 761; abdication of, 763; escapes from Elba, 767; final overthrow at Waterloo, 771-774; sent to St. Helena, 775
 Napoleon III., 858, 875, 879, 880, 892, 893
 Napoleon, Louis, enrolled as special constable during Chartist riots, 828
 Naseby, battle of, 436
 Natal, 843-844
 National Assembly, the, 94
 National Assembly (France), the, 715
 National Debt, 519, 542, 579
 National League, Irish, 915
 Nationalist movement, the, 777
 Nationalists, Irish, demands of, 690
 Naval power under George II., 596
 Navarette, battle of, 161
 Navarino, battle of, 787
 Navigation Act, first, 221; revival of, by Henry VII., 254
 Navigation Acts, the, 373, 451, 452, 471, 534; repeal of, 785
 Navy, Alfred the Great's, 19, 20, 21; beginnings of, 47; Henry VIII.'s, 333; reorganisation of, by Vane and Blake, 451
 Neerwinden, battle of, 519
 Negapatam, capture of, 671, 679
 Nelson, 728; at battle of Cape St. Vincent, 729; victory of the Nile, 732-733; victory of Copenhagen, 735; pursues Villeneuve, 746; victory of Trafalgar, 747
 Neimius, 6
 Nepal, Hastings's war with, 765
 Netherlands, French success in the, 727; campaigns in, 518, 522, 550-554
 Neville's Cross, battle of, 158, 185
 New Brunswick, 837
 New Forest, 56

- New Model Army, the, 433
 New Orleans, British defeat at, 766
 New South Wales, 722, 799-800, 839
 New York taken by Howe, 664
 New Zealand, annexation of, 839, 840; 945
 Newburn, battle of, 421
 Newbury, first battle of, 430; second battle of, 433
 Newcastle, Duke of, Prime Minister, 611, 617; coalition with Pitt, 618; dismissed by George III., 637-638
 Newfoundland, 945
 Newfoundland Fisheries disputes, 929
 Newman, Cardinal, 855, 856
 Newton, Sir Isaac, 547
 Newton Butler, battle of, 511
 Ney, Marshal, rejoins Napoleon, 768
 Nicholas I., Tsar of Russia, 858
 Nicholas III., Pope, 121
 Nicholson, General, 869
 Nightingale, Florence, 862
 Nile, battle of the, 732-733
 Nine Hours Bill, the, 901
 Nizam, the, 678, 719, 720, 736, 764, 796, 867
 Nobility, Anglo-Saxon, 39
 Nobles, Scottish, factions of, 289
 Nonconformists, 371, 372, 470; policy of James II. towards, 496; under William III., 507; under Queen Anne, 554, 555
 Non-Jurors, 507
 Non-resistance, 496
 Nootka Sound, Spanish claim to, 713
 "No Popery" riots, 496, 684
 Nore, mutiny of the British squadron at the, 729
 Norfolk, 130, 138
 Norfolk, Earl of, conspiracy against William I., 54
 Norfolk, Ralph Guader, Earl of, insurrection of, 56
 Norfolk, Duke of, banished by Richard II., 183
 Norfolk, Thomas Howard, Duke of, charged with treason to Henry VIII., 298
 Norman Conquest, changes resulting from, 55, 60
 Norman, penalty for slaying a, 55, 60
 Norman rule, general characteristics of, 108
 Normandy, 56; lost by John, 95; conquest of, by Henry V., 196-197; retaken by France, 204
 Norse Chronicle, the, 37
 Norsemen, 21; in Cumberland and Westmoreland, 24
 North, Lord, 652; Prime Minister, 654, 658; efforts to conciliate America, 667; his Regulating Act for India, 675; administration of, 683-684; Irish policy, 692; succeeded by Pitt, 707; coalition with Fox, 685
 Northampton, Assize of, 86, 96
 Northampton, treaty of, 144, 150, 151
 Northampton, Yorkist victory at, 208
 Northbrook, Lord, Viceroy of India, 905
 Northmen, coming of the, 15-16, 17
 Northumberland, 114
 Northumberland, Earl of, rebellions against Henry IV., 189
 Northumberland, John Dudley, Duke of, Protector, 302; policy of, 303; execution of, 308
 Northumberland, Thomas Percy, Earl of, insurrection of, against Elizabeth, 327
 Northumbria, 11; Christianity in, 13; 50
 Norway, relations with Scotland, 115
 Norwich, 111
 Nott, General, 846
 Nottingham, Council of, 180
 Nottingham, Earl of, 502, 508
 Nottingham, minister of William III., 519
 Nova Scotia, 837
 Nuncomar, 676
 OATES, Titus, author of the Popish Plot, 480, 492
 O'Brien, Smith, insurrection of, 835
 Occam, William, the schoolman, 235
 Occasional Conformity Bill, the, 555; repealed by Stanhope, 577
 Ochterlony, 765
 O'Connell, Daniel, leader of the Catholic Agitation, 789; enters Parliament, 790, 819, 831, 832; imprisonment of, 833
 Octennial Act, Ireland, 691
 Oao, Bishop of Bayeux, 51
 O'Donnell, Mr., action against the *Times*, 923
 Offa, King of Mercia, 15; recognised lord of England, 15
 Olaf, Norse leader, 23, 27
 Old Age Pensions, 950, 953
 Old Guard, Napoleon's, charge of, at Waterloo, 774
 Oldenburg, annexation of, by Napoleon, 756
 Oliver, Chief Justice, of Massachusetts, 659
 Omdurman, battle of, 941
 O'Neill, Shane, Irish chieftain, 331
 "Open Door," the (China), 940
 Open Field System, 45, 695; disappearance of, the, 803
 Opium War, the, 863
 Orange Free State, the, 844, 908-990, 931; annexation of, 939
 Orangeman, the, 740
 Orainers, the Lords, 147, 148
 O'deal, trial by, 44
 Orders in Council, the, 751, 766
 Orewyn Bridge, battle of, 125
 Orford, Lord, 562. *See also* Russell, Admiral
 Orleans, Philip, Duke of, Regent of France, 575
 Orleans, siege of, 199
 Ormonde, Duke of, supersedes Marlborough, 567; impeachment and flight of, 572
 Orsini plot, the, 872
 Osbeck, Peter. *See* Warbeck, Perkin
 Ossian, James Macpherson's, 809
 Oswald, King of Northumbria, defeats Welsh at Hexham, 12; overthrown, 12
 Oswin, King of Deira, 12
 Oswy, King of Northumbria, 12; conversion of, 13; and Strathclyde, 14
 Otterburn, battle of, 187
 Oudenarde, battle of, 562
 Oudh, 633, 675, 680, 764, 796; annexation of, 866; Nawab of, *see* Shujah Daulah
 Outram, Sir James, 863, 870
 Overbury, Sir Thomas, murder of, 394
 Owen, Robert, 817; doctrines of, 853
 Oxenham, John, voyages of, 335
 Oxford, Earl of, favourite of Richard II., 179
 Oxford, Robert Harley, Earl of, intrigues of, 565; his fall, 569; impeached, 572
 Oxford Movement, the, 855
 Oxford, Provisions of, 104
 PAARDEBERG, capture of General Cronje and his force at, 937
 Pacifico, Don, 830
 Paganism, decline of, 11; of the Restoration, 544
 Palmerston, Lord, early career of, 758, 788, 791; foreign policy of, 813, 821, 829; Schleswig-Holstein affair, 830; attitude to Russia, 845; Home Secretary, 857, 858, 860; Prime Minister, 861, 862, 863, 872, 874, 876; death of, 877
 Pandulph, papal legate, 97, 102
 Paniput, battle of, 655
 Papacy, relations with, 55, 57, 73, 96-97, 103, 104, 109, 119, 121, 129, 132, 136, 171; position of, during the Middle Ages, 227-232; and the Reformation, 272, 320; "deposes" Elizabeth, 327; and the Tudors, 370; papist plots, real and imaginary, against James I., 387; Puritan view of, 407; fall of the temporal power of the, 894
 Paper tax, the, abolition of, 875-876
 Papineau's rebellion, 836
 Paris, Matthew, historian, 236
 Paris, Peace of, 639, 666; allied armies enter, 763; treaty of, 862; siege of, 893, 894
 Parker, Admiral Sir Hyde, 735
 Parliament, representative, origin of, 93; constitution and powers of, 165; under Edward IV., 214; power of, 219; under Henry VII., 252; the Seven Years, or Reformation, 278; refuses supplies to Charles I., 399; and the Crown, 581; corruption of, by Walpole, 584; the Parliament Bill (1911), 958; made quinquennial, 959; payment of members, 961. *See also* Commons, and Lords

- Parliament, Scottish, 415
 Parliaments (nickname): Addled, 391; Barebones, 454; Good, 164, 165; Long, 423, 452; Mad, 104; Simon de Montfort's, 106; Merciless, 180; Model, 118, 129; Rump, 465; Short, 421; Wonderful, 180; of Barons, 146
 Parliamentary reform, advocacy of, by the younger Pitt, 710; demand for, 790; 813
 "Parliamentary trains," 852
 Parnell, Charles Stewart, Irish leader, 904, 913, 914; overtures of, rejected by Gladstone, 919; 921; attack on, by the *Times*, 923; death of, 923
 Parnell Commission, the, 923
 Parr, Catherine, 291
 Parsons, Robert, the Jesuit, 339
 Partition Treaty, first, 528; second, 528
 Party government, origin of, 478-479; finally established, 572
 Party system, the, 519-522, 581-585
 Passaro, Cape, Admiral Byng's victory over the Spanish fleet off, 577
 Passive obedience, 496, 505
 Pathans, 794, 795
 Patna, 868
 Paul I., Tsar of Russia, alliance with Britain against Napoleon, 733; 735
 Pavia, battle of, 266
Pax Romana, 2
 Payment in kind, or barter, custom of the early English, 46, 47
 Payment of M.P.'s, 961
 Peace of Westminister, the, 478
 Peace Preservation Act, 896, 901; abandonment of, 913
 Peasantry, condition of, during the Middle Ages, 233
 Peasants' Revolt, the, 165, 172-179, 219
 Peckham, John, Archbishop of Canterbury, 121
 Pecquigny, treaty of, 215
 Pedro the Cruel reinstated by Edward the Black Prince, 161
 Peel, Sir Robert, Home Secretary, 782, 788; resigns, 791; Prime Minister, 814, 817, 819, 820, 821, 822-826; death of, 828; his work and character, 828
 Peele, George, 380
 "Peelers" (policemen), institution of, 784
 "Peep o' Day Boys," the, 740
 Peerage Bill, Sunderland's, 578
 Peers, hereditary, 172
 Peers. *See* Lords, House of
 Peishwa, the, 765, 795
 Pekin, occupation of, 878; European Legations at, besieged, 943
 Pelham, Henry, 583; Prime Minister, 608-611
 Pembroke, Aymer de Valence, Earl of, 147
 Pembroke, William, Earl of, Pro-tector, 101
 Penda, King of Mercia, 12
 Peninsula War, the, 754-763
 Penjdeh, collision of Russian and Afghan troops at, 919
 Penn, William, 534
 Pennsylvania, colonisation of, 534
 Penny Post, creation of, the, 853
 Penruddock's rebellion, 457, 458
 Pentland Rising, the, 486
 People's Charter, the, 853
 Perceval, Spencer, Prime Minister, 758; assassinated, 761
 Percy, Bishop, 809
 Percy, Henry (Hotspur), rebellion of, 189
 Persia, 765, 845; attacks Afghanistan, 863; trouble with Russia, 963
 Perth captured by forces of Bruce, 142
 Peter the Great, 562, 576, 577, 613
 Peterborough sacked by William I., 53
 Peterborough, Lord, military exploits of, in Spain, 561
 Peter's Pence abolished by Parliament, 282
 Petition of Right, the, 400, 410
 Petitioners, 483
 Philadelphia occupied by Howe, 665
 Philip Augustus, King of France, 86, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98
 Phillip, Captain, Governor of the convict settlement in New South Wales, 723
 Philip of Spain proposes marriage to Elizabeth, 316; his war with the Netherlands, 321; claims the crown of England, 346; character and policy of, 353
 Philip VI., King of France, 153
 Philiphaugh, battle of, 437
 Philippine Islands, the, 722
 Phoenix Park murder, the, 915
 Pichegru, Marshal, 727, 728
 Picts, incursions of, 4, 6, 7, 21, 69
Piers Plowman, *Vision* of, 175
 Pigott, Governor, imprisonment of, 678
 Pigott, forger in the Parnell case, 923
 Pihoforts, capture of the, 877-878
 Pilgrim Fathers, the, 533
 Pilgrimage of Grace, the, 284
 Pindaris, 794
 Pinkie Cleugh, battle of, 298
 Pirates, 4, 7
 Pitt, William, 617; coalition with Newcastle, 618; policy of, 622, 628; dismissed by George III., 637-638; refuses office, 647; accepts office with Grafton, 649; becomes Earl of Chatham, 649; policy of, 650; resignation, 654; last speech and death of, 667
 Pitt, William, the Younger, 684; becomes Prime Minister, 686; makes commercial treaty with France, 709; public loans and Sinking Fund, 709-710; domestic policy of, 707; fails to carry Parliamentary Reform Bill, 711; foreign policy of, 712, 725; wars with Napoleon, 730, 733; resignation of, 737; recalled, 745; death of, 749
 Place, Francis, 807
 Place-names, 41
 Plague, the, 470
 Plan of Campaign, the, 921
 Plantagenets, the, 81-184
 Plassey, battle of, 624, 632
 Plevna, siege of, 903
 Plural voting, question of, 959
 Plural Voting Bill rejected by the Peers, 952
 Pocket boroughs, the, 710-711, 792
 Poitiers, battle of, 159
 Poland, war of the succession, 589; dismemberment of, 713-714, 726
 Pole, Cardinal, 287
 Pole, De la. *See* Suffolk, Earl of
 Police force, institution of the, 784
 Poll-tax, the, 165, 175
 Pollock, General, 846
 Pondichery, 603; capture of, 635
 Poor Law of 1601, 377; Elizabethan, 695; Gilbert's Acts, 699, 803; reform of, 815, 818
 Pope, Alexander, 703
 Popham, Captain, 679
 Population, expansion of, 45, 47; distribution of, 233, 801-802
 Port Mahon, surrender of, 617
 Portland, William Bentinck, Duke of, favourite of William III., 523
 Portland, Duke of, minister of George III., 685; resigns, 758
 Portugal, Napoleon's invasion of, 752
 Potchefstroom, battle of, 911
 Pottinger, Eldred, 846
 Power-loom, invention of, by Edmund Cartwright, 698
 Poyning's Act, 258, 290
 Præmunire, Statute of, 171, 181
 Pragmatic Sanction, the, 590, 593
 Prayer Book, the first, 300, 302, 304; of Elizabeth, 316
 Preference, Imperial, 949-950
 Prerogative, the Royal, 167
 Presbyterians, 407, 415-420, 431; negotiations with Charles I., 438, 440; 467, 469, 516
 Preston, battle of (i.), 442; (ii.) 574
 Preston's plot against William III., 518
 Pretanes, or Britanni, 1
 Pretender, the Young, 598-601
 Prevention of Crimes Bill (Ireland), 915
 Pride's Purge, 444
 Protection, 534, 539, 568, 784, 826, 876; advocated by Joseph Chamberlain, 949
 Protectorate, the, 454
 Protestantism, rise and growth of, 273-274; struggles of, 327; on the Continent, 385; in Ireland, 688
 Provisions of Oxford, 104
 Provisors, Statutes of, 171, 181
 Prussia, alliance with, 614, 616; French Republic's war with, 725; withdraws from the coalition against the French Republic, 728; alliance with Russia against Napoleon, 762; wars with Austria and France, 892-893
 Prynne, John, 413
 Public Law of Europe, the, 752
 Pulteney, William, 588


- Puna, Peishwa of, 764
 Puniar, battle of, 847
 Punjab, the, 765, 797, 845, 848; annexation of, 851, 864; 867
 Purchase system in the Army, abolition of, 899
 Puritans, the, 372, 385, 404, 544
 Pusey, Dr. E. B., 855
 Pym, John, 400, 409, 410, 430; death of, 431
 Pytheas of Massilia, 1
- QUAKERS, the, 456
Quarterly Review, the, 811
 Quatre Bras, battle of, 770
 Quebec Act, 659
 Quebec, capture of, 626-628
 Queensland, 839
 Quetta, 908
Quia Emptores, Statute of, 122, 138
Quo Warranto, writ of, 120
- RAGLAN, Lord, 860
 Ragoba, 676, 678
 Railway, the Stockton and Darlington, 808
 Railways, 852
 Rajputana, 867
 Raleigh, Sir Walter, 354, 361; granted patent for colonisation, 374; imprisonment of, 386; execution of, 391; his attempt to colonise Virginia, 531, 543
 Ramnagar, battle of, 851
 Ramsay, Allan, 809
 Ranjit Singh, 765, 797, 845, 848
 Ranulf of Chester, 101
 Ray, 548
 Reade, Charles, 888
 Reciprocity of Duties Act, 785
 Recusancy, 388
 Redistribution Bill, the, 918
 Redistribution, electoral, 959
 Redwald, King of East Anglia, 12
 Reform Bill, the (1832), 791-794, 852; Derby's, 874; of 1866, 884, 885
 Reformation, the, 228, 268; development of the, 300; in Scotland, 318, 367, 415
 Regency Bill (George III.) (i.), the, 647; (ii.) 711, 758
 Regulating Act for India, Lord North's, 675, 718
 Religion, 855
 Renaissance, the, 268
 Renunciatory Act (Ireland), 695
 Representation, Parliamentary, 792
 Representative Parliament, origin of, 93
 Resolutions, the, 485
 Restoration, the, 467
 Restoration Law of Settlement, 695
 Restraint of Appeals Act, 281
 Retaliation, commercial, 539
 Reunion of Canada Act, 837
 Revenue, Crown, 63, 468; national, farming of the, 74, 167, 169-171, 390; and expenditure in the seventeenth century, 540; and expenditure, 875
 Revocation, Act of, 418
 Revolution, the, 384, 498-504
 Revolution, the Industrial, 805
 Revolution, the "July," 791
 Revolutions, political, 99
 Rhine, campaign of the, Napoleon's, 727
 Rhine, Confederation of the, 750
 Rhodes, Cecil, 931-932, 935
 Rich, Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, 103, 104, 110
 Richard I., "Cœur-de-Lion," 91; captive of German Emperor, 93; ransomed, 93; wars of, 93; death of, 94; 109
 Richard II., accession of, 164; meets Wat Tyler at Smithfield, 177; conference with leaders of the Peasants' Revolt, 177; subordinated by Lords Appellant, 180; asserts his authority, 180; policy of, 181; despotism of, 183; abdication of, 184; death of, 188
 Richard III. seizes the crown, 216; conspiracy against, 216; character of, 217; policy of, 218; defeated and slain at the battle of Bosworth, 218
 Richard, son of Edward IV., 215, 217. *See also* Warbeck, Perkin
 Richard of Cornwall, brother of Henry III., 104, 108
 Richardson, Samuel, 705
 Richelieu, Cardinal, 385, 411
 Richelieu, Duke of, makes Convention of Kloster Seven, 621
 Ridley, Nicholas, Bishop of London, 304, 309
 Ridolfi's plot against Elizabeth, 328
 Right, Declaration of, the, 503
 Rights, Bill of, 508
 Ripon, Lord, Governor-General of India, 907; Viceroy of India, reforms of, 917
 Rizzio, David, assassination of, 322
 Robert of Bellême, 71
 Robert of Normandy, 66, 68, 70, 71
 Robert II., King of Scotland, 186
 Robert III., King of Scotland, 187
 Roberts, Lord, march to Kabul, 906; relieves Kandahar, 907-908; takes command in South Africa, 936; enters Bloemfontein, 937
 Robertson, William, 706
 Robespierre, 725
 "Robin of Redesdale," insurrection of, 212
 Robinson, Sir Hercules, 911
 Rochambeau, General, 670
 Rochefort, failure of British expedition against, 621
 Rochelle, Buckingham's expedition to, 399
 Roches, Peter des, 102, 103
 Rochester, Earl of, minister of William III., 528
 Rochester, Lawrence Hyde, Earl of, 492
 Rockingham, Marquis of, Prime Minister, 647; second ministry, 684; opposes Irish control of Irish taxation, 692
 Rodney, Admiral, 625; successes of, 670; defeats De Grasse in the West Indies, 672-673
 Rogers, John, martyred, 311
 Rohilla War, the, 675
 Rolles, John, 409
 Roman Catholics, enactments against, 340, 525; banishment of priests, 388
 Roman subjugation of Britain, 2; influence of, 5
 Rooke, Sir George, defeats the French fleet at La Hogue, 518; expedition to Cadiz, 551-552; victory at Vigo, 552; captures Gibraltar, 554
 Root and Branch Bill, the, 425
 Rorke's Drift, defence of, 910
 Rose, Sir Hugh, 871
 Rosebery, Lord, 918; Premiership of, 924, 927; resigns the Liberal leadership, 940; 945
 Roses, War of the, 206 *et seq.*
 Ross, General, 766
 Rossbach, battle of, 622
 Rossetti, Dante Gabriel, 888
 Rotten boroughs, the, 791
 Rouen, siege of, by Henry V., 197
 Roundway Down, battle of, 430
 Roxburgh taken by the forces of Bruce, 142; siege of, 224
 Royal Proclamations Act, repeal of, 367
 Royal Society, foundation of the, 548
 Rullion Green, battle of, 486
 Rump, Parliament, the, 444, 445, 450; ejected by Cromwell, 453; dissolution of, 465
 Runnymede, 99
 Rupert, Prince, leader of Royalist cavalry, 430, 432; repulsed by Admiral Blake, 445
 Ruskin, John, 856, 888
 Russell, Admiral Edward, 498, 518, 519. *See also* Orford, Lord
 Russell, Lord John, 791; Prime Minister, 814, 826, 829, 834, 857, 873; foreign policy of, 878-880; retirement of, 883, 894
 Russell, Lord William, executed for complicity in Rye House Plot, 490
 Russia, 753; quarrels with Napoleon, 756; distrust of, in regard to India, 765, 845, 905; Palmerston's policy towards, 813, 822; the Crimean War, 858-859; war with Turkey, 903; mission at Kabul, 906; Radical denunciation of, 963; annexations in China, 940; British relations with, 957-958; war with Japan, 958
 Ruthven, Raid of, 355
 Ruyter, De, the Dutch Admiral, 472
 Rye House Plot, the, 489
 Ryswick, treaty of, 524
- SACHEVERELL, Dr., attacks the Whigs in his sermons, 564
 Sackville, Lord George, 625
 Sadler, Michael, 817
 Sadowa, battle of, 893
 Sadulapur, battle of, 851
 Salabat Jang, 606
 Saladin, Sultan, 86
 Saladin tithe, the, 86


- Salamanca, battle of, 761
 Salisbury, Robert Cecil, Earl of, minister of James I., 354, 359; proposes the Great Contract, 391
 Salisbury, Marquess of, 885
 Salisbury, Marquess of, Foreign Minister, 903, 914; first administration of, 919-921; second administration of, 925; foreign policy of, 928, 930; Siamese dispute with France, 939; foreign policy of, 939-943; retirement of, 945
 San Stefano, treaty of, 903
 Sancho, Archbishop, 497
 Sand River Convention, the, 844
 Sanquhar, Declaration of, 487
 Santa Lucia, capture of, 669
 Saratoga, capitulation of Burgoyne at, 665
 Sardinia, 725, 878
 Sarsfield, Patrick, 512
 Satara, 795, 866
 Sati, abolition of, in India, 798
 Sauchie Burn, battle of, 259
 Saunders, Governor of Madras, 606
 Savoy, 725, 879
 Savoy Conference, the, 469
 Sawtre, William, sent to the stake, 190
 Saxe, Marshal, wins battle of Fontenoy, 596
 Saxe-Weimar, Duke of, occupies Quatre Bras, 770
 Saxon kings, policy of, 42
 Saxons, the, 4; settle in Britain, 6-8
 Schiplka Pass, defence of the, 903
 Schism Act, the, 569; repealed by Stanhope, 577
 Scheldt, French Republic's threat to force navigation of the, 716
 Science, progress of, during the seventeenth century, 546
 Schleswig-Holstein, Palmerston's interference with, 830, 880
 Scotland, early inhabitants of, 5, 21; English claim to suzerainty of, 23; early relations with, 30, 33, 69, 78-80, 113-115, 126-128, 131, 141-145; invasion of, by John of Gaunt, 179, 185-187; affairs of, 222-225, 259, 288; the Reformation in, 318; affairs of, during reign of Elizabeth, 321-325, 354; affairs of, under Charles I., 444; under the Restoration, 485-488; under James II., 513; the Union, 556; commerce of, in the seventeenth century, 539; after the Jacobite insurrection of 1745, 608
 Scots, 69; raid north of England, 187; loyalty of, to Joan of Arc, 223; plantation of, in Ulster, 390; negotiations with Charles I., 438-439
 Scott, Sir Walter, 810-812
 Scotus, Duns, the "Subtle Doctor," 235
 Scutage, 82
 Sea power, England's, 128; growth of, under Elizabeth, 333
 Security, Scottish Act of, 557
 Sedan, French capitulation at, 894
 Seditious meetings, suppression of, 779-780
 Selborne, Lord, 955
 Self-denying Ordinance, the, 435
 Senlac, battle of, 38
 Sepoy army, the, 736
 Sepoy Revolt, the, 864
 Septennial Act, the, 575
 Septennial Parliaments, Irish demand for, 690
 Serfdom, 110; gradual disappearance of, 173-179, 219
 Serbia, revolt of, 903
 Settlement, Act of, 504, 528
 Settlement, Restoration Law of, 695
 Sevastopol, siege of, 860-862
 Seven Bishops, trial of the, 497
 Seven Weeks War, the, 886, 893
 Severn bridge (1779), the, 700
 Severus, campaign against Scotland, 4; Wall of, 4
 Seymour, Admiral, bombards Alexandria, 915
 Seymour, Jane, married to Henry VIII., 286
 Seymour, Thomas, Lord Admiral, execution of, 301
 Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley, Lord, 474
 Shaftesbury, Earl of (1), 479, 481, 482, 483; attempts to exclude James II. from the succession, 482-484; fall of, 483-489
 Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper, 7th Earl of, 817, 825
 Shah Shuja, 845-846
 Shakespeare, William, 381, 544
Shannon and Chesapeake, duell of, 766
 Sharp, James, Archbishop of St. Andrews, 486; murder of, 487
 Shaw, Dr., declares marriage of Edward IV. null and void, 216
 Shelburne, Lord, 654; Prime Minister, 684-685
 Shelley, Percy Bysshe, 811
Shepherd's Calendar, The, 379, 380
 Shepstone, Sir Theophilus, 909
 Sher Ali, Amir of Kabul, 887, 906
 Sher Ali, governor of Kandahar, 907
 Sher Singh, 850, 851
 Sheridan, Richard Brinsley, 704
 Sheriff, functions of, 41, 59, 74, 87
 Sheriffmuir, battle of, 573
 Sherpur, battle of, 907
 Ship money, demand for, by Charles I., 413; abrogation of, 425
 Shipping, growth of, under the Tudors, 373
 Shire-moot, 42-43
 Shire-reeve, 43, 59
 Shore, Sir John. *See* Teignmouth Short Parliament, the, 421
 Shrewsbury, Charles Talbot, Earl of, 498; intrigues with Jacobites 524; recalled, 565; foils Bolingbroke, 570, 576
 Shrewsbury, 182; treaty of, 123
 Shujah Daulah, 656, 675
 Siam, Anglo-French dispute over, 939
 Sicily, 880
 Siamouth, Lord (Addington), 780, 782
 Sidney, Algernon, execution of, 490
 Sidney, Sir Henry, suppresses Shane O'Neill, 331
 Sidney, Henry, 498
 Sidney, Sir Philip, death of, 343
 Sikhs, the, 765; rise of, 848; wars with, 849-851; loyalty of, 867
 Silesia, 613
 Silk, duties on, 786
 Simnel, Lambert, pseudo-Earl of Warwick, rebellion of, 244
 Sindh, annexation of, 847
 Sindhiya, 676, 678, 680, 736, 764, 795, 847, 867
 Sinking Fund instituted by Walpole, 579
 Siward, Earl of Northumbria, 31, 33, 34
 Six Acts, Lord Sidmouth's, 780
 Six Articles, Act of, 288, 299
 Skelton, John, poet, 378
 Slave Emancipation Act, 838
 Slave trade, abolition of, 750
 Slavery in the West Indies and South Africa, 816
 Slavery, abolition of, 815-816; in America, 881
 Slaves, English, 45, 46
 Sleeman, Colonel, suppresses Thuggee, 798
 Sliding Scale, the, 789, 823
 Sluys, battle of, 155
 Smerwick, siege of, 339
 Smith, Adam, political economist, 701, 705, 708, 709, 784
 Smith, Captain John, 532
 Smith, Sir Sidney, baffles Napoleon at Acre, 734
 Smollett, Tobias, 705
 Smuggling, 708
 Social Contract, the, John Locke's theory of, 547, 571
 Social Reforms, Liberal Party's, 951
 Socialism, 948, 961
 Soemen, 65
 Solway Moss, battle of, 292
 Somers, Lord, 562
 Somerset, 204
 Somerset, Edward, Duke of, Protector, 298; makes war on Scotland, 298; policy of, 299, 301; deposed, 301; execution of, 305
 Somerset, John, Earl of, popular indignation against, 205; death of, 207
 Somerset, Robert Kerr, Earl of, favourite of James I., 394
 Sophia, Electress of Hanover, nominated heir to throne of England, 528
 Soudan, reconquest of by Kitchener, 940
 Sout, Marshal, 755, 757, 759, 771
 South Australia, colonisation of, 839
 South Africa. *See* Africa
 South Sea Bubble, 579-581
 Spafelds riot, the, 779

- Spain, the Great Armada, 346-350; relations of James I. with, 392-397; war with Cromwell, 460; wars with, under George I., 576; Walpole's war with, 590, 592; war with, under George III., 639; alliance with France and America against Britain, 669-670; joins coalition against Napoleon, 726; alliance with the French Republic, 728, 731; withdraws from the coalition against the French Republic, 728; seized by Napoleon, 753; the Peninsula War, 754-763
- Spanish plots against Elizabeth, the, 328, 340
- Spanish Succession, the, 526, 550
- Speenhamland Board, the, and the application of the Poor Law, 804
- Spencer, Herbert, 889
- Spenser, Edmund, 379, 380
- Spice Islands, the, 722
- Spinning industry, the, 695, 697-698
- Spinning-jenny, Robert Hargreave's, 697
- Spionkop, battle of, 936
- Spithead, mutiny of the British fleet at, 729
- St. Alban's, assembly of barons at, 98
- St. Albans, battle of, 207; Lancastrian victory at, 209
- St. Arnaud, Marshal, commander of the French forces in the Crimea, 860
- St. Bartholomew, massacre of, 324, 328
- St. Brice, massacre of, 27
- St. Iago, repulse of British fleet at, 592
- St. Leger, successful administration of Ireland, 291, 330
- St. Vincent, Cape, defeat of Spanish fleet off, 729
- Stamford Bridge, battle of, 37
- Stamp Act (1765), the, 643; repeal of, 648, 650
- Standard, battle of the, 76
- Standing army, the, reduction of, under William III., 525
- Stanhope, James, Earl of, 562, 564, 576; his administration, 577
- Stanley, Lord, 822, 886. *See* Derby, Lord
- Stanley, Sir William, conspirator against Henry VII., 246
- Star Chamber, Court of, 251; abolished, 425
- States General (France), the, 715
- Steam engine, invention of, by James Watt, 700
- Steam power, application of, 801, 807
- Steamships, 852
- Steele, Sir Richard, 704, 705
- Steinkirk, battle of, 519
- Stephen, 72; elected king, 75; character of, 75; quarrel with the Church, 76; taken prisoner, 77; death of, 78; 109
- Stephenson, George, 808
- Sterne, Lawrence, 705
- Stewart, Sir Donald, at Kandahar, 907
- Stigand, Archbishop, 35, 57
- Stirling invested by the forces of Bruce, 142; besieged by the Young Pretender, 600
- Stirling Bridge, battle of, 135
- Stockton and Darlington Railway, 808
- "Stop of the Exchequer," 477, 541
- Stormberg, battle of, 935
- Strachan, Sir Richard, 758
- Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of, 400; supports Charles I., 403, 409; policy in Ireland, 412; impeachment and execution of, 423-424
- Stratford, Archbishop, trial of, 156, 170
- Strathclyde, 14
- Strikes, 854, 962
- Strongbow, Earl of Leinster, 90
- Stuart, Arabella, 359
- Stuart, General, commands British expedition to Southern Italy, 750
- Submarine cable, the first, 853
- Submission of the Clergy, 280
- Succession, Act of, 282, 528
- Succession, hereditary, 119
- Succession, principle of the, 35
- Suchet, Marshal, 759, 760
- Sudan, the, 915-917, 940
- Sudbury, Archbishop, murder of, 177
- Suez Canal, the, purchase of shares of, 902
- Suffolk, Michael de la Pole, Earl of, 179, 180
- Suffolk, Duke of, executed for complicity in Wyatt's rebellion, 310
- Suffolk, William de la Pole, Earl of, negotiates truce with France, 204; popular indignation against, 205
- Suffren, Admiral, duels with Admiral Hughes, 679
- Sugar duty, the, 824
- Sunderland, Charles Spencer, Earl of, 562, 564; minister of George I., 576
- Sunderland, Robert Spencer, Earl of, minister of James II., 492, 519
- Supplies, appropriation of, 472
- Supremacy, Act of, Elizabeth's, 316
- Supreme Head, Act of (Henry VIII.), 282
- Suraj ud-Daulah, 630
- Surat, 764
- Surrey, Earl of, appointed by Henry VIII. to govern Ireland, 290; execution of, 297; his poetry, 379
- Suvarov defeats the French in Italy, 734
- Sweyn Godwinson, 31, 32
- Sweyn of Denmark, 27, 28; invades England, 52
- Swift, Jonathan, 689, 704, 705
- Swinburne, Algernon Charles, 888
- Switzerland conquered by France, 731
- TABLES, the, 420
- Tacitus, 7, 40
- "Tacking," origin of, 525
- Taff Vale decision, the, 951
- Talavera, battle of, 756, 757
- Tallage, 87, 131, 170
- Tallagio non Concedendo, 131
- Tallard, Marshal, 553
- Talmass, General, 522
- Tamburlaine, Marlowe's, 380-381
- Tamworth Manifesto, 819
- Tangier abandoned, 490
- Tanjur, 678, 764
- Tantia Topi, commander of the Gwalior army, 871
- Tarif Reform, 949-951, 954-955
- Tariffs, reduction of, by the younger Pitt, 708
- Tasmania, 799
- Taxation, 64, 65, 66, 120, 126; under Edward III., 158; a main cause of the Revolution, 385; settlement of, under Charles II., 468; 874-876
- Taxation, Irish, control of, 691
- Taxes, war, 87
- Taylor, Alexander, 869
- Taylor, Bishop Jeremy, 545
- Taylor, Rowland, martyred, 311
- Tea tax, American resistance to, 651, 654, 658
- Teignmouth, Lord, Governor-General of India, 721, 736, 763
- Telegraph, electric, introduction of, 853
- Tel-el-Kebir, battle of, 915
- Temple, Lord, 638, 647
- Temple, Sir William, 476, 481
- Ten Articles, the, 284, 369
- Tenants' Relief Bill, Parnell's, rejected, 921
- Tenasserim, annexation of, 797
- Tenchebrai, battle of, 71
- Teneriffe, Blake's victory at, 461
- Tennyson, Lord, 856, 947
- Tenserie, imposts on the towns, 77
- Terouanne, battle of, 263
- Territorials, creation of the, 952
- Terror, Reign of, the, 724
- Test Act, the, 478; abolition of, 788
- Teutons, 4, 7, 8
- Tewfik, Khedive of Egypt, 915
- Tewkesbury, Yorkist victory at, 213
- Texel, capture of the Dutch fleet in the, 734
- Textile industry, growth of, 697
- Thackeray, William Makepeace, 856
- Thegnhood, 39, 40, 41
- Thegns, 43, 45
- Theobald, Archbishop, 77, 82
- Theobald of Blois, 72, 75
- Theows, 39, 46
- Thirty-nine Articles, the, 369
- Thirty Years' War, the, 385; 411, 461
- Thomson, James, 705
- "Three Estates," the, 165, 166
- Throgmorton Plot, the, 340
- Thuggee, suppression of, in India, 798
- Thurlow, Lord Chancellor, 685

- Thurstan, Archbishop, 76
 Tibet, military expedition to, 956
 Ticonderoga, 626
 Tien-tsin, treaty of, 872, 877
 Tilsit, Peace of, 751
Times newspaper, the, action against, by Mr. O'Donnell, 923
 Tippermuir battle of, 433
 Tippu Sultan, or Sahib, 679, 719-720, 734, 736; overthrown by Wellesley, 763
 Tithe war (Ireland), the, 831
 Tithes, commutation of, 832
 Tithes Act, 927
 Tithing, 44
 Todleben, General, 860
 Toleration Act, 507, 555
 Tone, Wolfe, rebellion of, 739
 Tonnage and poundage, 170, 399, 401, 402, 409; abrogation of, 425
 Torgau, battle of, 628
 Tories, 483, 489, 493; and William III., 525, 528, 529; opposition to Marlborough, 554; under Queen Anne, 566; 707, 813
 Tories, American, 722
 Torres Vedras, lines of, 759
 Tostig, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37
 Toulon, siege of, 726
 Toulouse, battle of, 763
 Tournai, battle of, 263
 Tourville, Admiral, defeats English and Dutch fleets off Beachy Head, 511; defeated at La Hogue, 518
 Town-reeve, 43
 Towns, early English, 42, 44, 47; charters and trading rights, 95, 111
 Townshend, Charles, Lord, ally of Sir Robert Walpole, 576, 578, 580, 581
 Townshend, Charles, proposes new taxes on America, 650
 Townshend, Lord, Viceroy of Ireland, 691
 Towton, Yorkist victory at, 209
 Tractarianism, 855
 Trade, 95, 111, 118; licences and imposts, 120; regulation of, by Edward III., 167; expansion of, 220-221; progress of, under the Tudors, 372; depression of, at end of nineteenth century, 948
 Trade disputes, 962
 Trade Unionism, 853-854, 890-891, 898-899, 948-961
 Trade Unions Act, 951
 Trades Unions, prohibition of, 802
 Trading Companies, 373, 535
 Trafalgar, battle of, 747
 Transport Workers' Strike, 1911, the, 962
 Transportation of convicts to Australian colonies, discontinuance of, 839
 Transvaal, the, 844, 908; annexation of, 909; independence restored to, 912; the Jameson Raid, 930; annexation of, 939
 Travancore attacked by Tippu Sultan, 719
 Treasons Act 282 282; repeal of, 299; 305
 Treasons Bill, 523
 Treasons, Statute of, 171
 Trek, the Great, 842-843
 Trelawney, Bishop, 497
 Trent, Council of, 274, 320
 Trent affair, the, 881
 Tribal System, the, 40
 Triennial Act, the, 522
 Trincomali, capture of, 671, 679
 Trinidad, 737
 Triple Alliance, the, 476, 576; with Russia and Holland, 713
 Triumvirate, the, 676, 678, 680-681
 Tromp, Van, the Dutch admiral, 472
 Troyes, treaty of, 198
 Tudor dynasty, the, 241
 Tudors, policy and character of the, 363-372; commercial progress under, 372
 Tun, or township, the, 42, 44, 64
 Turgot, French minister, and the American War of Independence, 666
 Turkey joins second coalition against Napoleon, 734; war with Greece, 788; Palmerston's policy towards, 813, 822, 858; agitation against, 902-903; war with Russia, 903; war with Greece, 940
 Turner, Bishop, 497
 Tyler, Wat, rebellion of, 165, 176
 Tyrconnel, Richard Talbot, Earl of, Deputy-Lieutenant of Ireland, 496, 509, 512
 Tyrone, Hugh O'Neill, Earl of, intrigues with Philip II. of Spain, 359; rebellion of, 360, 389
 UDALL, Nicholas, 380
 Uhtred, Earl, slain by Knut, 30
 Utlanted, grievances of the, 931-934
 Ulm, capitulation of, 748
 Ulster, plantation of Scots in, 390; 739, 896
 Ulundi, battle of, 910
 Uniformity, Act of, 300, 303; Elizabeth's, 316, 470
 Union, the, cancelled by Charles II., 469
 Union with Ireland, the, 695; agitation by O'Connell for repeal of, 831, 832-833
 Union with Scotland, the, 556-560
 Unionists, secession of, from the Liberal Party, 920
 United Empire Loyalists, 766
 United Irishmen, the Society of, 739
 United States of America, the, 721-722; war with, 766; Civil War in, 880-882; Fisheries Treaty with, 929
 "Undertakers," 690
 Ushant, battle of, 668; Howe's victory off, 727
 Utopia, Sir Thomas More's, 378, 379
 Utrecht, Peace of, 567; treaty of, 572, 592
 VAGARONDS, increase of, under Henry VII., 236
 Vagrancy, growth of, after the dissolution of the monasteries, 377
 Valenciennes, capture of, 726
 Valmy, battle of, 716, 725
 Van Tromp, the Dutch admiral, 472
 Vane, Sir Harry, 431, 451; execution of, 468
 Venezuela, Anglo-American dispute over, 940
 Vergennes, French minister, and the American War of Independence, 666
 Verneuil, battle of, 199; Scots at, 223
 Vernon, Admiral, 592
 Versailles, treaty of, 619, 673, 685
 Verulam. *See* Bacon, Francis
 Vervius, treaty of, 353
 Veto of the House of Lords, abolition of, 954, 955
Vice comes, 41, 59
 Victor, Marshal, defeated at Talavera, 757
 Victor Emmanuel, King, 878, 880
 Victoria, colonisation of, 839
 Victoria, Queen, accession of, 814; marriage of, 821; refuses to dismiss her Ladies of the Bedchamber, 822, 852, 878; proclaimed Empress of India, 905; Jubilee of, 929; death of, 945; character and policy of, 946
 Vienna, occupation of, by Napoleon, 748; treaty of, 756; Congress of, 767
 Vigo, defeat of Spanish fleet at, 577
 Vikings, the, 17
 Vill, the, or Villa, 64
 Villafranca, treaty of, 878
 Village, the English, 46
 Villars, Marshal, 552; defeated at Malplaquet, 563
 Villeins, 56, 64, 65, 110; improved conditions of, 173, 219
 Villeneuve, Admiral, 746
 Villeroi, Marshal, defeated at Ramillies, 560
 Vimiero, battle of, 754
 Vinegar Hill, battle of, 740
 Virginia, colonisation of, 375, 532
 Vittoria, battle of, 762
 Volunteers (Ireland), 692, 693, 694
 Vortigern, 6
 WADE, General, 600
 Wager of battle, 44
 Wagram, battle of, 756
 Waitangi, treaty of, 840-841
 Wakefield, Lancastrian victory at, 209
 Walcheren Expedition, the, 758
 Wales, 117; conquest of, by Edward I., 122; Statute of, 126
 Wallace, William, 127, 131, 135-137
 Waller, Sir William, Parliamentary General, 430
 Wallingford, treaty of, 77
 Walpole, Sir Robert, 576, 578; institutes Sinking Fund, 579; becomes Prime Minister, 580; policy of, 581-594
 Walsingham, Sir Francis, 339; statesmanship of, 353
 Walter of Coutances, Justiciar, 93

- Walter, Hubert, Justiciar, 93;
Chancellor, 94, 95
Walthef, Earl of Huntingdon, 51;
execution of, 54
Walton, Captain, 577
Walton, Isaac, 545
Wandewash, battle of, 628
Warbeck, Perkin, impersonator of
the murdered Prince Richard,
245, 246, 247
Wards, Bill of, rejected by the
Commons, 366
Warrene, Earl, 134
Warham, Archbishop, 270
Warsaw, Grand Duchy of, 752
Warwick, Richard Neville, Earl of,
"the Kingmaker," 208; alliance
with Louis XI. of France, 211;
proclaims Henry VI., 212; de-
feated and slain at battle of
Barnet, 212
Washington, George, 661-664; re-
verses of, 665; success at Sara-
toga, 665; reinforced by French
troops, 670
Washington burnt by General
Ross, 766
Waterloo, battle of, 771-774
Waterways, growth of traffic on
the, 699-700
Watt, James, inventor of the steam
engine, 700
Wealth of Nations, Adam Smith's,
701
Weaving industry, the, 695, 697-
698
Wedgwood, Josiah, the potter,
700
Wedmore, Peace of, 19
Wellesley, Marquess of, Governor-
General of India, 736, 864;
Foreign Secretary, 758; resigns,
761; Indian administration of,
763; Viceroy of Ireland, 782, 792
Wellington, battle of, 638
Wellington, Duke of, campaign in
Portugal, 754; enters France,
762; victories of Assaye and Ar-
gaon, 764; 776; Prime Minister,
787; resigns, 791; and the Re-
form Bill, 794; 819, 820, 822,
826; death of, 831
Welsh Disestablishment, 961
Wensleydale, Lord, 863
Wentworth, Thomas. *See* Strafford
Weregild, 43
Wesley, John, 703
Wesleyan revival, 855
Wessex, royal line of, 59
West Indies, Admiral D'Estaing's
operations in the, 668-669, 669-
673
Western Australia, colonisation of,
800, 839
Western rising, the, 301
Westminster Confession, the, 431;
Convention of, 616; Peace of,
478; Statute of, 120, 122
Weston, tool of Charles I., 411, 413
Westphalia, treaty of, 461
Wexford stormed by Cromwell,
446
Wharton, Lord, 562
Whigs, the, 483; growth of, 489;
and William III., 523, 528, 529;
under Anne, 566; supremacy of,
under George I., 572, 583; policy
of, under George I., 578; 647, 684,
707; eclipse of the, 759; 790,
813
Whitby, Synod of, 13
White, Bishop, 497
Whiteboys, the, 690
Wicklow, English defeat in, 338
Wiclif, John, 163, 164, 171, 175,
181, 235, 269
Wilberforce, William, 816
Wilkes, John, prosecution of, 642-
643; returned to Parliament for
Middlesex, 652; prosecution of,
653-654
William I. (the Conqueror), 32, 37,
48, 50; crowned, 51; insurrec-
tions against, 51, 52, 53; oath of
allegiance to, 54; policy of, 53-
54; his love of hunting, 56; re-
lations with Normandy and
France, 56; death of, 56; char-
acter of, 56-67; his resistance to
the Papacy, 57
William II. (Rufus), character of,
67; relations with the Church,
68; insurrections against, 68;
death of, 70
William III., policy of, 505; Irish
campaign, 509; Netherlands
campaigns, 518, 522; foreign
policy of, 524; death of, 530;
and Scotland, 556
William IV., character of, 790;
and the Reform Bill, 793; death
of, 814
William, son of Henry I., 71
William the Clito, son of Robert
of Normandy, 71, 72
William the Lion, King of Scots,
114
William the Silent, Prince of
Orange, 321, 327, 342
William of Orange, 477; marries
Princess Mary, 479, 494; invited
to England, 498
William of Orange, 775
Wilmington, Lord, Prime Minister,
603
Wilson, Margaret, martyrdom of,
513
Wilton, battle of, 18
Winceby, battle of, 431
Winchester, 111
Window tax, the, 708
Winnington Bridge, battle of, 464
Winwaed, battle of, 12
Witan, the, 15, 18, 35, 39, 55, 59
Wite, 43
Wolfe, General, 624; captures
Quebec, 626-628; death of, 628
Wolsey, Cardinal, 262; diplomacy
of, 265; aspirations to the papal
throne, 266; arouses popular
displeasure, 268; and the divorce
of Katharine of Aragon, 276;
fall of, 277
Wolsey, Lord, commands Ashanti
expedition, 900, 910; victory of
Tel-el-Kebir, 915; commands
expedition for relief of Gordon,
917
Woodgate, General, death of, 937
Wool, 128, 130; subsidies, 170,
220; growing, 375; duties on,
785
Worcester, battle of, 449
Wordsworth, William, 810
Wulferth, son of Penda, 13
Wyatt, Sir Thomas, insurrection
of, 309; execution of, 310; poetry
of, 379
Wynndael, battle of, 562
YAKUB KHAN, Regent of Kabul,
906; marches on Kandahar, 907
"Year of Battles," the, 48
Yeomanry, the, 174, 175
Yeomen, the, 695; extinction of,
696
Yonge, Charlotte D., 888
York, 111
York, defeat of Edwin and Morker
at, 37
York, Frederick, Duke of, disas-
trous command of, against the
French, 727; captures Dutch
fleet in the Texel, 734, 781
York, Richard, Duke of, antagon-
ism to the King's party, 205-7;
appointed Protector, 207; de-
feated and slain at Wakefield,
209
York, Richard, Duke of, son of
Edward IV., murdered in the
Tower, 216
Yorkists, plots of, against Henry
VII., 243, 244, 245, 246
Yorktown captured by Washing-
ton, 671-672
ZEMINDARS, the, 720
Zorndorf, battle of, 623
Zulu War, the, 908
Zululand, 841, 904
Zutphen, battle of, 342









LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 020 665 263 9