CONTENTS

SYLLABUS

Paper-VIII

HISTORY OF ENGLAND FROM 1782 TO 2003 A.D.

Chapter -1

Unit -1: **England on the eve of the industrial revolution:** Village life and agriculture the roads-town life and apprenticeship – the municipal and parliamentary system –London. Country elections the gentry, their life and culture the magistrates the clergy universities and education Justice Scotland in the 18th century.

Unit -2: The end of George III's personal government, 1782 for burke, Shelburne Pitt's peace minister India Slave trade, Wilber force and the *evangelicals Australia*-Canada.

Unit -3: ***The reactions on England's politics of economics change and of the French Revolution***-Anti Jacobins and Democrats fox and the Whig via media. Suppression of the democratic movement – Course of the French revolution cause war with France. The war with French republic, 1793-1802: its four periods Naval Supremacy of Great Britain and continental failure of her allies.

Unit -4: **Ireland, 1782-1800 Grattan:** The united Irishmen the ninety eight the Unico end of pitt's long ministry, India under Cornwallis and Wellesley.

Chapter -2

Unit-5: **The Napoleonic Struggle I, 1803-1807 & (1808-15)** – *British Parties* –*The war* renewed the Trafalgar campaign-Deaths of Pitt and fox the successors Tilest Napoleon and nationality.
The Napoleonic Struggle II (1808-15): Wellington and the Peninsular war the commercial struggle & the blockade Leipzig and waterloo cast lereagh & the resettlement of Europe.

Unit -6: **The Industrial Revolution –** Rural: enclosures and speenham land – the industrial revolution urban: machines & factories material & moral influences on the new society popular education the mechanics.

Unit -7: **Macadamizing –** Highways and horses hunting, shooting, Boxing, sports, athletics. Public Schools-The army & the nation-Canada & the American War of *1812-Castlereagh American policy 1817-18.*

Unit -8: **Brougham, Qven Corbett –** The racial movement & the 2nd repression-peterlop & cato street. The queen's trial death of cast leragh. Liberal Tourism.

Chapter -3

Unit -9: **1822-27-** Canning, Peel, Husky son-Francis place, and the combination Acts the Corn laws-Caning's forage policy, Spain, America, Greece.

CHAPTER – 1

ENGLAND IN 18TH CENTURY

NOTES

STRUCTURE

1.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After studying the chapter, students will be able to :

- state the social, economic and educational status of England on the eve of the industrial revolution;
- understand the effects of industrial revolution on politics;
- explain the reign and end of George III;
- discuss the period of Shelburn's Ministry;
- describe the slave trade of England and role of William Wilberforce;
- understand the role of democrats and whigs;
- state the history of war in 18th century Europe;
- understand the history of Ireland from 1782 to 1800;
- describe the condition of India under Cornwallis and Wellesley.

NOTES

1.2 INTRODUCTION

In the last part of the 18th century, a new revolution gripped the world that we were not ready for. This revolution was not a political one, but it would lead to many implications later in its existance. Neither was this a social or cultural revolution. This revolution was an economic one.

The Industrial Revolution, as it now called by historians, changed the ways by how the world produced its goods. It also changed our societies from a mainly agricultural society to one that in which industry and manufacturing was in control.

The industrial revolution first got its start in Great Britain, during the 18th century, which at the time was the most powerful empire on the planet. So, it was inevitable that the country with the most wealth would led in this revolution. After its adoption in England, other countries such as Germany, the United States and France joined in this revolution.

During this time there were also many new technological advancements, socioeconomic and cultural problems that arised.

On the technology front, the biggest advancements were in steam power. New fuels such as coal and petroleum, were incorporated into new steam engines. This revolutionized many industries including textiles and manufacturing. Also, a new communication medium was invented called the telegraph. This made communicating across the ocean much faster.

But, along with this great leap in technology, there was an overall downfall in the socioeconomic and cultural situation of the people. Growth of cities were one of the major consequences of the Industrial Revolution. Many people were driven to the cities to look for work, in turn the ended living in the cities that could not support them. With the new industrial age, a new quantitative and materialistic view of the world took place. This caused the need for people to consume as much as they could. This still happens today. Living on small wages that required small children to work in factories for long days.

Also, during this time much international strife was occuring at this time. The American Revolution was occuring in the beginning part of the Industrial Revolution. The French Revolution was in process at the turn of the 19th century. This was a great time, but resulted in newly found democratic rights that spread through Europe and North America.

The Industrial Revolution, was not a good revolution for the planet. From the time of its start, the factories and industry has increased the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere by two-folds. Also in our drive for consumerism, our planets natural resources are being depleted at an alarming rate. Pollution by nuclear waste, pesticides and other chemicals are also the result of the Industrial Revolution.

NOTES

From the late 18th century Britain was transformed by the industrial revolution. Until then most people lived in the countryside and made their living from farming. By the mid 19th century most people in Britain lived in towns and made their living from mining or manufacturing industries.

From 1712 a man named Thomas Newcomen (1663-1729) made primitive steam engines for pumping water from mines. In 1769 James Watt (1736-1819) patented a more efficient steam engine. In 1785 his engine was adapted to driving machinery in a cotton factory. The use of steam engines to drive machines slowly transformed industry.

Meanwhile Britain built up a great overseas empire. The North American colonies were lost after the War of Independence 1776-1783. On the other hand after the Seven Years War 1756-1763 Britain captured Canada and India. Britain also took Dominica, Grenada, St Vincent and Tobago in the West Indies.

In 1707 the Act of Union was passed. Scotland was united with England and Wales (although many Scots bitterly opposed the move). England became part of Great Britain.

1.3 ENGLAND ON THE EVE OF THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

The Industrial Revolution is the period encompassing the vast social and economic changes that resulted from the development of steam-powered machinery and mass-production methods, beginning in about 1760 in Great Britain and extending through the first half of the nineteenth century. The lives of large sections of the population of Great Britain underwent massive changes during the industrial revolution. Work became more regimented and disciplined, and began to take place outside the home. Many of the jobs, especially in the textile industry, could now be done by common laborers, or even children, rather than skilled tradesmen, and was closely supervised. A movement of the population to the cities from the countryside produced dramatic changes in lifestyle. Resistance to the changes in the form of machine-breaking riots and other Luddite actions was widespread, but ultimately futile.

Background of Industrial Revolution

The world before the industrial revolution was characterized as a period of very slow, almost imperceptible, changes in technologies and commerce that affected wide sectors of the population. Such changes as occurred in per capita productivity resulted only in increase in the population, leaving living standards unchanged. This state had existed for millennia in all cultures worldwide. The living standards of the mass of the people in 1700 hardly differed from those living in Babylonia in 2000 BC. This state of affairs had been called the Malthusian

NOTES

trap, after Malthus' analysis of the relationship of the production of goods, which were supposed to grow linearly with population, to that of the increase of population, which grew geometrically. The industrial revolution is the process by which, for the first time in the history of man, a nation broke out of the Trap by producing large changes in per capita productivity, resulting in rapid technological changes and eventually in greatly improved living conditions for the mass of the people.

In 1760, taken as the start of the Industrial Revolution, power was generated by water (70,000 hp), wind (10,000 hp) and steam (5,000 hp). The population of England was about seven million.

Perhaps the first sign of the revolution was in the enclosure movement, which started in the 16th century and peaked from about 1760 to 1832. This movement often enclosed lands held in common and assigned ownership to large landowners, who were motivated to improve them by draining wetland, ditching, introducing new crops and better cultivation techniques and so on. These measures improved farm productivity, and at the same time drove some peasants into the cities who began to earn wages.

At the same time, canals began to be constructed in Britain, which resulted in greatly decreased costs in transporting coal and other commodities.

Another important precursor event for the industrial revolution was the Patent Act in 1623, which encouraged inventions to a certain extent by raising the possibility that successful inventors might actually profit by their inventions, as opposed to having their work at once pirated.

Whatever the ultimate cause, inventions, at first especially in textile manufacture, began to made by a few innovators which greatly improved labour productivity. A little later, James Watt's improvements to the Newcomen steam engine, in about 1776, produced power more efficiently anywhere it was desired, and led to many inventions in machine tools, and finally began to have a significant impact in the improved production of manufactured goods. With the application of further improvements in the steam engine a few decades later, railways and steamboats revolutionized the transportation of goods and people.

The era known as the Industrial Revolution was a period in which fundamental changes occurred in agriculture, textile and metal manufacture, transportation, economic policies and the social structure in England. This period is appropriately labeled "revolution," for it thoroughly destroyed the old manner of doing things; yet the term is simultaneously inappropriate, for it connotes abrupt change. The changes that occurred during this period (1760-1850), in fact, occurred gradually. The year 1760 is generally accepted as the "eve" of the Industrial Revolution. In reality, this eve began more than two centuries before

this date. The late 18th century and the early 19th century brought to fruition the ideas and discoveries of those who had long passed on, such as, Galileo, Bacon, Descartes and others.

NOTES

Advances in agricultural techniques and practices resulted in an increased supply of food and raw materials, changes in industrial organization and new technology resulted in increased production, efficiency and profits, and the increase in commerce, foreign and domestic, were all conditions which promoted the advent of the Industrial Revolution. Many of these conditions were so closely interrelated that increased activity in one spurred an increase in activity in another.

18TH CENTURY SOCIETY

In the mid 18th century the population of Britain was about 6.5 million. In the late 18th century it grew rapidly and by 1801 it was over 9 million.

Owning land was the main form of wealth in the 18th century. Political power and influence was in the hands of rich landowners. At the top were the nobility. Below them were a class of nearly rich landowners called the gentry. In the early 18th century there was another class of landowners called yeomen between the rich and the poor. However during the century this class became less and less numerous.

However other middle class people such as merchants and professional men became richer and more numerous, especially in the towns.

Below them were the great mass of the population, craftsmen and labourers. In the 18th century probably half the population lived as subsistence or bare survival level.

In the early 18th century England suffered from gin drinking. It was cheap and it was sold everywhere as you did not need a license to sell it. Many people ruined their health by drinking gin. Yet for many poor people drinking gin was their only comfort. The situation improved after 1751 when a tax was imposed on gin.

At the end of the 18th century a group of Evangelical Christians called the Clapham Sect were formed. They campaigned for an end to slavery and cruel sports. They were later called the Clapham Sect because so many of them lived in Clapham.

18TH CENTURY TOWNS

During the 18th century towns grew larger. Nevertheless most towns still had populations of less than 10,000. However in the late 18th century new industrial towns in the Midland and the North of England mushroomed. Meanwhile the population of London grew to nearly 1 million by the end of the century.

NOTES

Many towns were improved in the later 18th century when bodies of men called Paving or Improvement Commissioners were formed by Acts of Parliament. They had powers to pave and clean the streets and sometimes to light them with oil lamps. Some also arranged collections of rubbish. Since most of it was organic it could be sold as fertiliser.

18TH CENTURY AGRICULTURE

During the 18th century agriculture was gradually transformed by an agricultural revolution. Until 1701 seed was sown by hand. In that year Jethro Tull invented a seed drill, which sowed seed in straight lines. He also invented a horse drawn hoe which hoed the land and destroyed weed between rows of crops.

Furthermore until the 18th century most livestock was slaughtered at the beginning of winter because farmers could not grow enough food to feed their animals through the winter months.

Until the 18th century most land was divided into 3 fields. Each year 2 fields were sown with crops while the third was left fallow (unused). The Dutch began to grow swedes or turnips on land instead of leaving it fallow. (The turnips restored the soil's fertility). When they were harvested the turnips could be stored to provide food for livestock over the winter. The new methods were popularised in England by a man named Robert 'Turnip' Townsend (1674-1741).

Under the 3 field system, which still covered much of England, all the land around a village or small town, was divided into 3 huge fields. Each farmer owned some strips of land in each field. During the 18th century land was enclosed. That means it was divided up so each farmer had all his land in one place instead of scattered across 3 fields. Enclosure allowed farmers to use their land more efficiently.

Also, in the 18th century farmers like Robert Bakewell began scientific stockbreeding (selective breeding). Farm animals grew much larger and they gave more meat, wool and milk.

AGRICULTURAL CHANGES

Agriculture occupied a prominent position in the English way of life of this period. Not only was its importance rooted in the subsistence of the population, but also agriculture was an indispensable source of raw materials for the textile industry. Wool and cotton production for the manufacture of cloth increased in each successive year, as did the yield of food crops.

The improved yield of the agricultural sector can be attributed to the enclosure movement and to improved techniques and practices developed during this period. A common practice in early agriculture was to allow the land to lie fallow after it had been exhausted through cultivation. Later it was discovered that the cultivation of clover and other legumes would help to restore the fertility

of the soil. The improved yields also increased the amount of food available to sustain livestock through the winter. This increased the size of herds for meat on the table and allowed farmers to begin with larger herds in the spring than they had previously.

NOTES

Other advances in agriculture included the use of sturdier farm implements fashioned from metal. Up until this period most farming implements were made entirely out of wood. We do not find much technical innovation beyond the slight improvements made on existing implements. We do find increased energy being placed into the breeding of livestock, control of insects, improved irrigation and farming methods, developing new crops and the use of horsepower in the fields to replace oxen as a source of power.

These changes which have occurred in agriculture made it possible to feed all of the people that were attracted to the industrial centers as factory workers. By providing enough food to sustain an adequate work force, England was preparing the way for expansion of the economy and industry.

A strategy which may be employed to promote the students' understanding of the changes that have occurred in agriculture during the period of this unit, and from this period to today's modern farms, is to start with the present and work back in time to the period we are studying. Students may participate in an informative and interesting discussion centered around today's farming methods and machinery. Classroom activities could also center about constructing a chart which lists farming methods in pre-industrial revolution times, during the industrial revolution and today. Also, activities could be centered around having students write letters to manufacturers of farm machinery, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, or other farm-related concerns (*e.g.*, farm museums).

In 18th century England, the enclosure of common village fields into individual landholdings, or the division of unproductive land into private property was the first significant change to occur. This concentrated the ownership of the land into the hands of a few, and made it possible to institute improved farming techniques on a wider scale. Students may engage in a debate over the question of enclosure, concerning its effect on the rural poor. Historians are not in complete agreement on the effects of enclosure on the poor, some arguing that it contributed to swelling the numbers of poor, while others argue that their plight was only marginally related to the enclosure movement. An excellent resource for the teacher's use in this section is Chapter Seven of E. P. Thompson's book, The Making of the English Working Class.

Food in the 18th Century

There was little change in food in the 18th century. Despite the improvements in farming food for ordinary people remained plain and monotonous. For them

NOTES

meat was a luxury. A poor person's food was mainly bread and potatoes. In the 18th century drinking tea became common even among ordinary people.

18TH CENTURY HOMES

In the 18th century a small minority of the population lived in luxury. The rich built great country houses. A famous landscape gardener called Lancelot Brown (1715-1783) created beautiful gardens. (He was known as 'Capability' Brown from his habit of looking at land and saying it had 'great capabilities').

The leading architect of the 18th century was Robert Adam (1728-1792). He created a style called neo-classical and he designed many 18th century country houses.

In the 18th century the wealthy owned comfortable upholstered furniture. They owned beautiful furniture, some of it veneered or inlaid. In the 18th century much fine furniture was made by Thomas Chippendale (1718-1779), George Hepplewhite (1727–1786) and Thomas Sheraton (1751-1806). The famous clockmaker James Cox (1723-1800) made exquisite clocks for the rich.

However the poor had none of these things. Craftsmen and labourers lived in 2 or 3 rooms. The poorest people lived in just one room. Their furniture was very simple and plain.

18TH CENTURY CLOTHES

In the 18th century men wore knee-length trouser like garments called breeches and stockings. They also wore waistcoats and frock coats. They wore linen shirts. Both men and women wore wigs and for men three-cornered hats were popular. Men wore buckled shoes.

Women wore stays (a bodice with strips of whalebone) and hooped petticoats under their dresses. Women in the 18th century did not wear knickers.

Fashionable women carried folding fans. Fashion was very important for the 18th century but poor people's clothes hardly changed at all.

18TH CENTURY LEISURE

Traditional games remained popular in the 18th century. These included games such as chess, draughts and backgammon. They also played dominoes and tennis and a rough version of football.

Horse racing was carried on for centuries before the 18th century but at this time it became a professional sport. The Jockey Club was formed in 1727. The Derby began in 1780.

For the well off card games and gambling were popular. The theatre was also popular. In the early 18th century most towns did not have a purpose built theatre and plays were staged in buildings like inns. However in the late 18th

century theatres were built in most towns. Assembly rooms were also built in most towns. In them people played cards and attended balls. In London pleasure gardens were created.

NOTES

Moreover a kind of cricket was played long before the 18th century but at that time it took on its modern form. The first cricket club was formed at Hambledon in Hampshire about 1750.

Also in the 18th century rich people visited spas. They believed that bathing in and/or drinking spa water could cure illness. Towns like Buxton, Bath and Tunbridge prospered. At the end of the 18th century wealthy people began to spend time at the seaside. (Again they believed that bathing in seawater was good for their health). Seaside resorts like Brighton and Bognor boomed.

Reading was also a popular pastime in the 18th century and the first novels were published at this time. Books were still expensive but in many towns you could pay to join a circulating library. The first daily newspaper in England was printed in 1702. The Times began in 1785.

Many people enjoyed cruel 'sports' like cockfighting and bull baiting. (A bull was chained to a post and dogs were trained to attack it). Rich people liked fox hunting.

Public executions were also popular and they drew large crowds. Boxing without gloves was also popular (although some boxers began to wear leather gloves in the 18th century). Puppet shows like Punch and Judy also drew the crowds.

Furthermore in the late 18th century the circus became a popular form of entertainment.

Smoking clay pipes was popular in the 18th century. So was taking snuff.

Wealthy young men would go on a 'grand tour' of Europe lasting one or two years.

18TH CENTURY EDUCATION

In the early 18th century charity schools were founded in many towns. They were sometimes called Blue Coat Schools because of the colour of the children's uniforms.

Boys from well off families went to grammar schools. Girls from well off families also went to school but it was felt important for them to learn 'accomplishments' like embroidery and music rather than academic subjects.

However non-comformists or dissenters (Protestants who did not belong to the Church of England) were not allowed to attend most public schools. Instead they went to their own dissenting academies.

NOTES

18TH CENTURY TRANSPORT

Transport was greatly improved during the 18th century. Groups of rich men formed turnpike trusts. Acts of Parliament gave them the right to improve and maintain certain roads. Travellers had to pay tolls to use them. The first turnpikes were created as early as 1663 but they became far more common in the 18th century.

Transporting goods was also made much easier by digging canals. In the early 18th century goods were often transported by packhorse. Moving heavy goods was very expensive. However in 1759 the Duke of Bridgewater decided to build a canal to bring coal from his estate at Worsley to Manchester. He employed an engineer called James Brindley. When it was completed the Bridgewater canal halved the price of coal in Manchester. Many more canals were dug in the late 18th century and the early 19th century. They played a major role in the industrial revolution by making it cheaper to transport goods.

Travel in the 18th century was made dangerous by highwaymen. The most famous is Dick Turpin (1705-1739). Originally a butcher Turpin does not deserve his romantic reputation. In reality he was a cruel and brutal man. Like many of his fellow highwaymen he was hanged.

Smuggling was also very common in the 18th century. It could be very profitable as import duties on goods like rum and tobacco were very high.

18TH CENTURY MEDICINE

Knowledge of anatomy greatly improved in the 18th century. Until 1745 craftsmen called barber-surgeons performed operations. However, in that year the barber and the surgeon became two different jobs. Their organisation The United Company of Barber-Surgeons split in two. Surgeons began to be university educated.

The famous 18th century surgeon John Hunter (1728-1793) is sometimes called the Father of Modern Surgery. He invented new procedures such as tracheotomy.

Among other advances a Scottish surgeon named James Lind discovered that fresh fruit or lemon juice could cure or prevent scurvy. He published his findings in 1753.

A major scourge of the 18th century was smallpox. Even if it did not kill you it could leave you scarred with pox marks. Then, in 1721 Lady Mary Wortley Montague introduced inoculation from Turkey. You cut the patient then introduced matter from a smallpox pustule into the wound. The patient would (hopefully!) develop a mild case of the disease and be immune in future.

NOTES

Then, in 1796 a doctor named Edward Jenner (1749-1823) realised that milkmaids who caught cowpox were immune to smallpox. He invented vaccination. The patient was cut then matter from a cowpox pustule was introduced. The patient gained immunity to smallpox.

During the 18th century superstition declined. In 1700 many people believed that scrofula (a form of tubercular infection) could be healed by a monarch's touch. (Scrofula was called the kings evil). Queen Anne (1702-1714) was the last British monarch to touch for scrofula. Despite the decline of superstition there were still many quacks in the 18th century. Limited medical knowledge meant many people were desperate for a cure. One of the most common treatments, for the wealthy, was bathing in or drinking spa water, which they believed could cure all kinds of illness.

Art and Science in the 18th Century

During the 18th century England produced two great portrait painters, Thomas Gainsborough (1727-1788) and Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723-1792). Meanwhile the artist William Hogarth (1697-1764) painted scenes showing the harsh side of 18th century life. The Royal Academy of Arts was founded in 1768.

In theatre the greatest actor of the 18th century was David Garrick (1717-1779).

In science Joseph Priestley (1733-1804) discovered oxygen. Henry Cavendish (1731-1810) discovered hydrogen. He also calculated the mass and density of the earth. Willim Herschel (1738-1822) discovered Uranus. The Scottish engineer Thomas Telford (1757-1834) built roads, canals and the Menai suspension bridge.

Religion in the 18th Century

The early 18th century was notable for its lack of religious zeal. Most people went to church on Sunday but very often they were indifferent. Some of the clergy continued to do good work but generally there was a lack of energy in the church.

This began to change in the 1730s. First a man named George Whitefield (1714-1770) became a great preacher. It was said that he could preach to crowds of 20,000 people (without a microphone). Then in 1738 John Wesley (1703-1791) founded the Methodists. Wesley did not want to break with the Church of England. He wanted his followers to remain within it but in the end this proved impossible and the Methodists were forced to become a separate denomination.

Meanwhile at the end of the 18th century religious enthusiasm began to revive. Within the Church of England there were a number of Evangelicals campaigning for an end to slavery.

NOTES

TEXTILES

Prior to 1760 the manufacture of textiles occurred in the homes, by people who gave part of their time to it. It was a tedious process from raw material to finished product. In the case of woolen cloth, the wool had to be sorted, cleaned and dyed. Then the wool was carded and combed. Next, it was spun into thread which was woven into cloth. Subsequent processes were performed upon the cloth to change the texture or the color of the woolen cloth. Many of these stages of production were performed by women and children. The supply of raw material for the woolen industry was obtained domestically. In the cases of silk and cotton, the raw materials were obtained from foreign sources, such as, China, the West Indies, North American and Africa.

The organization of the textile industry was complicated and grossly inefficient before the age of mechanization. Differences existed from one locality to another; generally, a merchant employed putters-out to distribute the raw materials to spinners and weavers who were scattered throughout the countryside.

Changes in the textile industry were already occurring in the early 1700s; however, these changes were not easily accepted as evidenced by the workers' riots which broke out in response to these new machines. John Kay's flying-shuttle, which enabled one weaver to do the work of two, and Lewis Paul's roller spinner, which was to make spinning more efficient (later to be perfected by Richard Arkwright), were the precursors of the inventive spirit and the application of new technology to the textile industry.

In the mid-1760s the textile industry began to experience rapid change. James Hargreaves' jenny, a device which enabled the operator to simultaneously spin dozens of threads, was readily adopted. By 1788 nearly 20,000 of them were being employed in England. Arkwright and others developed the water frame. This device performed similarly to Paul's roller spinner, though its use demanded greater power than could be applied by muscle.

Arkwright enlisted the financial support of Samuel Need and Jedidiah Strutt to set up a water-powered factory that utilized his invention. This factory, located in Cromford, employed more than 600 workers, many of whom were women and children. The adage "necessity is the mother of invention" is quite appropriate here; for this machine spun the cotton thread faster than human hands could supply the carded and combed raw material. This led to Arkwright's development of a machine which would perform that function.

The changes that took place in the textile industry must certainly center about the inventions and their inventors, though not necessarily be limited to them. These inventions that were perfected and employed led to tremendous change in the world of work. Gone were the days of the Domestic System, yielding

NOTES

to the new ways of the Factory System. These factories which were to spring up throughout the countryside were large, dusty, poorly illuminated and ventilated and dangerous. The employment of women and children was commonplace and desired, for they were paid lower wages than their male counterparts. Working conditions in these factories were not subject to much regulation.

A strategy similar to the one that was suggested in the previous section may easily be employed here also. Discussions may center around today's textile industry, before moving on to the methods of preindustrial and industrialized England. Today, blue jeans are often referred to as "America's national dress." Some interesting discussions may develop around the manufacture of blue jeans, from the cotton fields to the finished product.

By comparing and contrasting conditions of work today and in days gone by, the students should begin to grasp the magnitude of impact that technological change has had on societies. The modern-day factory bears very little resemblance to Arkwright's factory at Cromford. Students may be assigned to write letters to the U.S. Department of Labor and its related agencies to request materials on factories today. Letters may also be written to representatives of the textile industry, as well as to labor unions within the industry. Students may also gather information concerning governmental regulation related to work in the textile industry. An excellent resource which should be used by the teacher is E. Royston Pike's, Hard Times: Human Documents of the Industrial Revolution.

Coal Mining

One finds the working conditions and practices of coal mining in the 18th and 19th centuries to be risky, at best, and suicidal at worst. This industry, even today, provokes thoughts of hazards at every turn. During the 18th and 19th centuries one even finds specific jobs in mining which required the employee to have a "death wish" of sorts. For example, a fireman employed in a colliery had the duty of ridding a mine tunnel of dangerous, flammable gases. His job entailed crawling through the tunnel holding a long stick. Attached to the end of the stick was a lighted candle which exploded any gases that might be accumulated ahead of him. All of the jobs that existed in coal mining were not as dangerous as the fireman's,; however, everyone of them could be termed hazardous.

Different methods of mining coal were employed in various locales throughout England. All coal mining had one trait in common; the movement of coal was accomplished solely by muscle power—animal, man, woman and child, the latter being the most desirable for their size. The process of removing the coal was obviously as slow as it was dirty. Coal was moved along horizontal tunnels by the basketful and hauled up a vertical shaft to the surface. Later, the underground movement of coal was speeded up by the utilization of ponies and

NOTES

carts on rail. The production of coal increased steadily, from 2 1/2 million to more than 15 million tons by 1829.

Improvements in coal mining came in the form of improved tunnel ventilation, improved underground and surface transportation, the use of gunpowder to blast away at the coal seams, and improved tunnel illumination through the use of safety lamps.

Coal mining today continues to be a hazardous job, though modern machinery and safety equipment have made the industry more efficient and safe. Students should better understand the difficulties of mining coal in the 19th century by studying modern-day coal mining. Several modern-day issues related to the use of coal (strip-mining, air pollution, etc.) should make for some lively discussions in class. Discussions may also touch upon the question of health-related problems of this industry (black lung disease).

It was not uncommon in the 19th century for women to be employed in the mining of coal. Entire families could be found working side by side in the mines. Several sections of Pike's book, Hard Times, are an excellent teacher resource for material related to women and children working in England's coal mines. All of these short stories, as well as the illustrations, should be sufficient to help the students to understand the harsh conditions that were endured by these people.

Iron

Improvements in the iron industry came in the early 18th century. Abraham Darby successfully produced pig iron smelted with coke. This was a significant breakthrough, for prior to this discovery pig iron was smelted with the use of charcoal. Charcoal, derived from the charring of wood in a kiln, was an excellent source of energy to smelt the iron; however, its widespread use caused a serious depletion of England's forests. Darby's technique was gaining popularity within the industry, though problems still existed due to its use. Iron produced through this method was impure and brittle, making it unsuitable for the forgemaster to be able to fashion in into implements, so its use was limited to castings. Later, improvements would occur which produced high quality material and improved techniques in fashioning it.

Steam

The development and subsequent application of steam power was undoubtedly the greatest technical achievement of the Industrial Revolution. A number of industries needed the ability to apply the enormous power produced by the steam engine, in order to continue their advancement in production. James Watt is credited with the invention of the steam engine. In fact, Watt improved upon a design which was developed by Thomas Savery and Thomas Newcomen.

NOTES

Watt's engine improved the efficiency of Newcomen's engine fourfold, and he utilized the latest technology in gunmaking, where precision was absolutely necessary. The transfer of one technology to another is evident here, in that Watt used John Wilkinson's device for boring cannon to accurately bore the large cylinder for his engine.

The development of a practical, efficient steam engine and its application to industry and transportation caused a great leap for industrialization. Its application was virtually limitless, and it was responsible for lifting industries from infancy to adolescence.

THE HUMAN ASPECT

In the 18th century the population grew at a faster rate than ever before. There are four primary reasons which may be cited for this growth: a decline in the death rate, an increase in the birth rate, the virtual elimination of the dreaded plagues and an increase in the availability of food. The latter is probably the most significant of these reasons, for English people were consuming a much healthier diet.

One can find a myriad of reasons for the growth of the population, in addition to those above. Industry provided higher wages to individuals than was being offered in the villages. This allowed young people to marry earlier in life, and to produce children earlier. The old system of apprenticeship did not allow an apprentice to marry. City life provided young people with a greater choice of prospective partners, in contrast to the limited choices in some isolated village. Finally, industry provided people with improved clothing and housing, though it took a long time for housing conditions to improve.

With the adoption of the factory system, we find a shift in population. Settlements grew around the factories. In some cases, housing was provided to workers by their employers, thus giving the factory owners greater control over the lives of his workers. In some cases factories started in existing towns, which was desirable because a labor pool was readily available. The prime consideration for locating a factory was the availability of power. The early form of power was derived directly from moving water. Thus, we find factories cropping up in the hills near streams and rivers. Later, when steam power was developed, factories could be located near any source of water. Other factories, such as those involved in the manufacture of iron, had considerations of a different kind involving their location. Due to the great difficulty in moving bulk materials, such as iron ore, these mills had to be located close to the mineral source. In such situations, large communities grew directly above the seams of ore in the earth.

The development of the steam engine to drive machinery freed the mill owners from being locked into a site that was close to swiftly moving water. The

NOTES

steam powered mill still had to be located near a source of water, though the field of choice was much wider. Also, factories could be located closer to existing population centers or seaports, fulfilling the need for labor and transportation of materials.

The towns that grew in the North were crowded, dirty and unregulated. They grew so rapidly that no one took the time to consider the consequence of such conditions. In the areas of public sanitation and public health, ignorance reigned. No one understood the effects of these unsanitary conditions upon humans. Conditions in these densely populated areas worsened to the point of the reappearance of outbreaks of disease. In the mid-1800s there were several outbreaks of typhoid and cholera. Some attention to these conditions was accorded by Parliament in the form of Public Health Acts. These acts did improve conditions, though they were largely ineffective, for they did not grant local Boards of Health the powers to compel improvements.

CAPITAL

Prior to industrialization in England, land was the primary source of wealth. The landed aristocracy held enormous powers the feudal system. However, a new source of great wealth grew from the Industrial Revolution, that which was derived from the ownership of factories and machinery. Those who invested in factories and machinery cannot be identified as belonging to any single class of people (landed aristocracy, industrialists, merchants). Their backgrounds were quite diverse, yet they had one thing in common: the daring to seize the opportunity to invest in new ventures. It was these capitalists who gave the necessary impetus to the speedy growth of the Industrial Revolution.

In the early years of this period we find most investments being made in a field closely related to one's original source of capital. Manufacturers took a substantial portion of their profits to "plough back" into their business, or they invested capital in ventures that were related to their primary business. Eventually, as opportunities to realize great profits proliferated, it was not uncommon to find these entrepreneurs investing substantially in concerns about which they knew very little.

Two kinds of capital were needed by these industrialists; long-term capital to expand present operations, and short-term capital to purchase raw materials, maintain inventories and to pay wages to their employees. The long-term capital needs were met by mortgaging factory buildings and machinery. It was the need for short-term capital which presented some problems. The need for short-term capital for raw materials and maintaining stock was accommodated by extending credit to the manufacturers by the producers or dealers. Often, a supplier of raw

materials waited from 6 to 12 months for payment of his goods, after the manufacturer was paid for the finished product.

NOTES

The payment of wages was not an easily solved problem, one which taxed the creativity of employers. The problem was in finding a sufficient amount of small value legal tender to pay the wages. Some employers staggered the days on which they paid their employees, while others paid them in script. Some paid a portion of their work force early in the day, allowing them to shop for household needs. When the money had circulated through the shopkeepers back to the employer, another portion of the work force was paid. All of these methods proved to be unacceptable.

The root of the problem was the lack of an adequate banking system in these remote industrial centers. The Bank of England, established in the late 1690s, did not accommodate the needs of the manufacturers. It concentrated its interest on the financial affairs of state and those of the trading companies and merchants of London.

The early 1700s brought with it the first country banks. These private banks were founded by those who were involved in a variety of endeavors (goldsmith, merchant, manufacturer). Many industrialists favored establishing their own banks as an outlet for the capital accumulated by their business and as a means for obtaining cash for wages. When the Bank of England tightened credit because of government demands, many of these banks failed. A great number of them had a large proportion of their assets tied up in long-term mortgages, thus leaving them vulnerable when demands for cash were presented by their depositors. From 1772 to 1825, a large number of these banks failed. Their limited resources were inadequate to meet the demands of the factory economy. A banking system was eventually set up to distribute capital to areas where it was needed, drawing it from areas where there was a surplus.

Labor

If the conditions in which people lived in these factory towns were considered bad, then the conditions in which they worked can be appropriately characterized as being horrendous. Inside these factories one would find poorly ventilated, noisy, dirty, damp and poorly lighted working areas. These factories were unhealthy and dangerous places in which to work. Normally, workers put in twelve to fourteen hours daily. Factory Acts that were later enacted by Parliament regulated the number of hours that men, women and children worked.

The factory system changed the manner in which work was performed. Unlike the domestic system the work was away from home, in large, impersonal settings. Workers were viewed by their employers merely as "hands."

NOTES

Slowly, workers began to realize the strength they could possess if they were a unified force. It was a long, uphill battle for workers to be able to have the right to organize into officially recognized unions. Their lot was one of having no political influence in a land where the government followed a laissez-faire policy.

This hands off policy changed as the pressure from growing trade unions increased. A movement was beginning to free workers from the injustices of the factory system. Political leaders called for reform legislation which would address these injustices.

1.4 EFFECTS OF THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION ON POLITICS

Although Britain had become a constitutional monarchy a century earlier, the vast majority of the population remained disenfranchised from the electoral system. As industrial strength grew along with a more forcible middle class, electoral reform was a necessity to balance the new society's power structure.

- Before 1832, only 6% of the male population could vote-represented by aristocrats who owned large plots of land in the countryside and other property (Haberman).
- By 1832, the middle class factory owners wanted political power to match their new-found economic punch - this resulted in the Reform Bill of 1832 which enfranchised 20% of the male population to vote (Stearns).
- The Reform Bill also redistributed electoral districts to better reflect the large populations of city centres. Before, most of the electoral power could be found in the countryside where aristocrats owned vast properties (Stearns).
- The middle-class became more or less satisfied, but workers were still not represented by the British electoral system (Haberman).

Chartism

The dissent and insubordination of the English working men reached its peak in the mid-nineteenth century with Chartism, an ideology that called for political reform in the country. Its name was based on the People's Charter, a document written in 1838 by William Lovett and other radicals of the London Working Men's Association, and adopted at a national convention of workingmen's organizations in August of that year. The Charter called for several changes to the Parliamentary system :

- Universal Male Suffrage,
- Annual Parliaments,
- Vote by ballot,

- Abolition of the property qualification for MPs,
- Payment of MPs,
- Equal electoral constituencies (Chartism - too much talk, too little action)

NOTES

Chartism rapidly gained support among the poorer classes and in Northen England, where economic depression was common and the people were upset about the new Poor Law Amendment. The public attention was largely thanks to Feargus O'Connor, a fervent radical with excellent oratory skills. However, the movement soon lost its momentum when its leaders became divided over how its demands were to be enforced. A petition to Parliament was rejected in July of 1839, and most of the movement's leaders were arrested by the end of the year after the November clash between Chartists and the military at Newport, Wales.

O'Connor attempted to revive Chartism in 1840 by founding the National Charter Association, but the people had generally lost interest, appeased by better economic conditions, a revival of trade unionism, and the growth of the Anti-Corn Law League (Chartism). After a mass demonstration and procession planned for London during an economic crisis in 1848 failed to take place, the Chartist movement faded away altogether. Decades later, in 1884, the majority of males were finally granted the right to vote unit (Haberman).

Fundamental Shifts in Social Structure

During the Industrial Revolution, the social structure of society changed dramatically. Before the Revolution most people lived in small villages, working either in agriculture or as skilled craftsmen. They lived and often worked as a family, doing everything by hand. In fact, three quarters of Britain's population lived in the countryside, and farming was the predominant occupation (Porter). With the advent of industrialization, however, everything changed. The new enclosure laws—which required that all grazing grounds be fenced in at the owner's expense—had left many poor farmers bankrupt and unemployed, and machines capable of huge outputs made small hand weavers redundant. As a result, there were many people who were forced to work at the new factories. This required them to move to towns and cities so that they could be close to their new jobs. It also meant that they made less money for working longer hours. Add to this the higher living expenses due to urbanization, and one can easily see that many families' resources would be extremely stretched.

As a result, women and children were sent out to work, making up 75% of early workers (Stearns). Families were forced to do this, since they desperately needed money, while factory owners were happy to employ women and children for a number of reasons. First of all, they could be paid very little, and children could be controlled more easily than adults, generally through violent beatings

NOTES

(Sadler). Children also had smaller hands, which were often needed to reach in among the parts of a machine. Furthermore, employers found that children were more malleable, and adapted to the new methods much better than adults did. Children were also sent to work in mines, being small enough to get more coal and ore from the deep and very often unsafe pits (Stearns). They could also be forced to work as long as eighteen hours each day (Sadler). For these reasons, children as young as eight years old were sent to factories—usually those which manufactured textiles—where they became part of a growing and profitable business.

This unprecedented growth and profit was another social change that occurred during the Industrial Revolution. The laissez-faire approach taken by the government—and advocated by philosopher-economist Adam Smith—allowed capitalism to flourish. There were little or no government regulations imposed upon factory policies, and this allowed the wealthy, middle-class owners to pursue whichever path was most profitable, regardless of the safety and well being of their workers. This relentless pursuit of money caused another important social change the ultimate breakdown of the family unit.

Since workers, especially women and children, were labouring for up to eighteen hours each day, there was very little family contact, and the only time that one was at home was spent sleeping. People also had to share housing with other families, which further contributed to the breakdown of the family unit. As a result, children received very little education, had stunted growth, and were sickly. They also grew up quite maladjusted, having never been taught how to behave properly (Sadler). The living conditions were indeed horrible; working families often lived in slums with little sanitation, and infant mortality skyrocketed. During the early Industrial Revolution, 50% of infants died before the age of two (Stearns).

However, the social changes that took place were not all negative. Most classes eventually benefited in some way from the huge profits that were being made, and by 1820 most workers were making somewhat better wages. The "widespread poverty and constant threat of mass starvation...lessened, and overall health and material conditions of the populace clearly improved" (Porter). The government, however, did have to eventually intervene in order to put an end to child labour and other unacceptable practices.

1.5 THE REIGN AND END OF GEORGE III

George III was born on 4 June 1738 in London, the eldest son of Frederick, Prince of Wales, and Princess Augusta of Saxe-Gotha.

He became heir to the throne on the death of his father in 1751, succeeding his grandfather, George II, in 1760. He was the third Hanoverian monarch and the first one to be born in England and to use English as his first language.

NOTES

George III is widely remembered for two things: losing the American colonies and going mad. This is far from the whole truth.

George's direct responsibility for the loss of the colonies is not great. He opposed their bid for independence to the end, but he did not develop the policies (such as the Stamp Act of 1765 and the Townshend duties of 1767 on tea, paper and other products) which led to war in 1775-76 and which had the support of Parliament.

These policies were largely due to the financial burdens of garrisoning and administering the vast expansion of territory brought under the British Crown in America, the costs of a series of wars with France and Spain in North America, and the loans given to the East India Company (then responsible for administering India).

By the 1770s, and at a time when there was no income tax, the national debt required an annual revenue of £4 million to service it.

The declaration of American independence on 4 July 1776, the end of the war with the surrender by British forces in 1782, and the defeat which the loss of the American colonies represented, could have threatened the Hanoverian throne.

However, George's strong defence of what he saw as the national interest and the prospect of long war with revolutionary France made him, if anything, more popular than before.

The American war, its political aftermath and family anxieties placed great strain on George in the 1780s. After serious bouts of illness in 1788-89 and again in 1801, George became permanently deranged in 1810.

He was mentally unfit to rule in the last decade of his reign; his eldest son - the later George IV - acted as Prince Regent from 1811. Some medical historians have said that George III's mental instability was caused by a hereditary physical disorder called porphyria.

George's accession in 1760 marked a significant change in royal finances. Since 1697, the monarch had received an annual grant of £700,000 from Parliament as a contribution to the Civil List, i.e. civil government costs (such as judges' and ambassadors' salaries) and the expenses of the Royal Household.

In 1760, it was decided that the whole cost of the Civil List should be provided by Parliament in return for the surrender of the hereditary revenues by the King for the duration of his reign. (This arrangement still applies today, although civil government costs are now paid by Parliament, rather than financed directly by the monarch from the Civil List.)

The first 25 years of George's reign were politically controversial for reasons other than the conflict with America. The King was accused by some critics,

NOTES

particularly Whigs (a leading political grouping), of attempting to reassert royal authority in an unconstitutional manner.

In fact, George took a conventional view of the constitution and the powers left to the Crown after the conflicts between Crown and Parliament in the 17th century.

Although he was careful not to exceed his powers, George's limited ability and lack of subtlety in dealing with the shifting alliances within the Tory and Whig political groupings in Parliament meant that he found it difficult to bring together ministries which could enjoy the support of the House of Commons.

His problem was solved first by the long-lasting ministry of Lord North (1770-82) and then, from 1783, by Pitt the Younger, whose ministry lasted until 1801.

George III was the most attractive of the Hanoverian monarchs. He was a good family man (there were 15 children) and devoted to his wife, Charlotte of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, for whom he bought the Queen's House (later enlarged to become Buckingham Palace).

However, his sons disappointed him and, after his brothers made unsuitable secret marriages, the Royal Marriages Act of 1772 was passed at George's insistence. (Under this Act, the Sovereign must give consent to the marriage of any lineal descendant of George II, with certain exceptions.)

Being extremely conscientious, George read all government papers and sometimes annoyed his ministers by taking such a prominent interest in government and policy.

His political influence could be decisive. In 1801, he forced Pitt the Younger to resign when the two men disagreed about whether Roman Catholics should have full civil rights. George III, because of his coronation oath to maintain the rights and privileges of the Church of England, was against the proposed measure.

One of the most cultured of monarchs, George started a new royal collection of books (65,000 of his books were later given to the British Museum, as the nucleus of a national library) and opened his library to scholars.

In 1768, George founded and paid the initial costs of the Royal Academy of Arts (now famous for its exhibitions).

He was the first king to study science as part of his education (he had his own astronomical observatory), and examples of his collection of scientific instruments can now be seen in the Science Museum.

George III also took a keen interest in agriculture, particularly on the crown estates at Richmond and Windsor, being known as 'Farmer George'.

In his last years, physical as well as mental powers deserted him and he became blind.

He died at Windsor Castle on 29 January 1820, after a reign of almost 60 years - the second longest in British history. The last very impact of european industrialization was on the mechanical industry.

NOTES

1.6 SHELBURNE'S MINISTRY: JULY 1782-FEBRUARY 1783

When Rockingham died on 1 July 1782, the king asked Shelburne to form the next ministry. Although Shelburne was an earl, it was an Irish peerage so he was unable to sit in the House of Lords. He sat for the family pocket borough of High Wycombe. He had been employed in 1760 to gather a party round the Earl of Bute and consequently gained a reputation for deceit and duplicity that was unwarranted. Shelburne was still unpopular because of these early links with Bute, even though he had served as Secretary of State in Chatham's ministry. Shelburne was hard-working, talented, witty, cultured and rich. He was well informed on diplomatic and financial matters; he was a patron of Price and Priestley (both Unitarians) and of Jeremy Bentham. Shelburne appears to have been a poor leader with few close friends. The king referred to him as the "Jesuit of Berkeley Square" (Shelburne's home was at Lansdowne House in Berkeley Square) and cartoons nicknamed him "Malagrida" (a Portuguese Jesuit who had been convicted of heresy).

Shelburne had great respect for the institution of monarchy, which made the Whigs suspicious of him. On Shelburne's appointment as First Lord of the Treasury, Fox, Burke and other Rockingham Whigs resigned. This weakened Shelburne's position but he did appoint Pitt the Younger (aged 22) as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Shelburne hoped to win the support of the Independent Gentlemen in parliament and from the public through his programme of utilitarian administrative reforms.

Shelburne concluded the final peace negotiations at the Treaty of Versailles (1783) which ended all European and American hostilities. The last part of the war (after the fighting in America had ended) had brought British successes:

- Gibraltar withstood the French and Spanish siege (1179–1183),
- Admiral Rodney beat de Grasse at the Battle of the Saints (1782) and re-established British control over the West Indies and the Atlantic sea routes,
- Britain's empire was secured by the peace treaty.

Government economies were fairer and more honest. Shelburne applied "political philosophy" to politics (Benthamite Utilitarianism and Adam Smith's free trade ideas). Shelburne is thought of as the first Utilitarian politician and his reforms followed the precepts of Bentham's philosophy, aimed at achieving administrative efficiency and preserving national resources. He chose men of talent, not influence. Shelburne planned to introduce a series of measures:

- a reform of the Civil List,
- a reduction of fees paid by the government for "services rendered",
- a redistribution of offices,
- the overhauling of methods of accounting,
- a simplification of taxation,
- an attack on patronage,
- a mild reform of the constitution involving the abolition of some rotten/ pocket boroughs and the redistribution of seats. This was deemed to be a capitulation to public pressure.

Shelburne did give valuable training to Pitt, whose later achievements owed much to Shelburne - who received no credit whatsoever from Pitt. Shelburne's ministry was defeated by a combination of Foxites, Northites, placemen, courtiers, borough mongers, government contractors and serving officers who feared attacks on the patronage system.

Fox believed that Shelburne was extremely unpopular, and refused to serve under Shelburne because Shelburne was seen as a "Tory" because of his respect for the monarch and because Shelburne looked like staying in office indefinitely and Fox was desperate for power. Fox was annoyed that the Home Secretary, not the Foreign Secretary, had been chosen as PM. Fox does not seem to have realised that George III hated him.

Fox manipulated a coalition strong enough to cause Shelburne to resign because of a series of parliamentary defeats. Shelburne resigned in February 1783 and retired from public life, aged 45. George III had no alternative but to accept a "Whig" coalition ministry.

1.7 SLAVE TRADE IN BRITAIN

In the early 1660s, when the events described in Behn's Oroonoko are supposed to have taken place, England was not yet a major power in the slave trade. Portugal had been actively engaged in the traffic in African slaves for more than two centuries; Spain had built a lucrative sugar empire by importing slave labor to the New World; and as early as the 1560s, the English captain John Hawkins had plundered slaves from Africa and Latin America. But only in 1660, when Charles II helped found a new company, the Royal Adventurers into Africa, did England fully enter the trade. The first ships took slaves from the African Gold Coast (Guinea) to Surinam and Barbados, a flourishing sugar island in the Caribbean; by the early eighteenth century, the leading colony for sugar and slaves was Jamaica. The trade continued to grow. In 1713 Great Britain was awarded the contract (asiento) to import slaves to the Spanish Indies, and the South Sea Company, which bought the contract, excited frenzied speculation.

NOTES

This was a risky business, but the profits could be immense. Bristol, then Liverpool, developed into prosperous slave ports, trading manufactured goods to Africa for human cargo, which crossed the Atlantic on ships that returned to England with sugar and money. By the 1780s, when Britain shipped a third of a million slaves to the New World, the national economy depended on the trade.

The human cost was terrible. Though slavery in Africa had long been common, the deadly voyage — the Middle Passage — across the Atlantic made it something unfamiliar, brutal, unendurable. Torn from their homes, slaves were often packed into spaces too small to allow them to turn, with barely enough food and drink and air to keep them alive. It is estimated that 10 per cent, on average, died on each crossing; on a bad voyage the figure might rise above 30 per cent. Revolts and mutinies were common, though seldom successful (since the slaves had nowhere to go), and were ruthlessly punished. Nor did those slaves who survived the crossing feel fortunate for long. On the labor-intensive Caribbean sugar plantations, so many died that new shiploads were constantly needed (the situation was different in North America, where slaves lived on to reproduce and grow in numbers). Black people also lost their ties to the cultures in which they had been born. Mixed together from different regions of Africa, without a common language or background, they came to be identified merely by the color of their skin. It was convenient for owners of slaves to regard them as less than human.

The loss of humanity rebounded on Britain as well. The English had long regarded themselves as a people uniquely devoted to liberty, whose spirit was embodied in the rights of Magna Carta (1215). James Thomson spoke for patriotic pride in the chorus of "Rule, Britannia": "Rule, Britannia, rule the waves; / Britons never will be slaves." But British rule meant slavery for others. The deep contradictions of this position were reflected in the political philosophy of John Locke and the interpretations of law by William Blackstone. Some Britons avoided shame by arguing that slavery had uplifted negroes, since it had introduced them to Christianity and civilization; one African American poet, Phillis Wheatley, expressed her gratitude for this conversion. But many Britons were troubled. Humanitarian feelings grew in strength throughout the later eighteenth century. A famous, sentimental exchange of letters between the black writer Ignatius Sancho and Laurence Sterne, the author of Tristram Shandy, displays their mutual sympathy for the victims of the slave trade. Such cruelty was a libel on human nature.

By the 1780s a wave of abolitionist fervor swept through Great Britain, led by the Quakers and, in Parliament, by William Wilberforce (1759–1833). The Society for the Abolition of the Slave Trade, founded in 1787, inspired many abolitionist poets to join the campaign. A few years later the French Revolution, and the wars that followed, caused a conservative backlash in Britain. Boswell,

NOTES

who had earlier argued the case for slavery against Samuel Johnson (NAEL 8, 1.2849), wrote a poem advocating "No Abolition of Slavery" in 1791. But Wilberforce won in the end, and a bill abolishing the British slave trade became law in 1807. That did not, of course, put an end to illegal trade, let alone slavery itself. The conflict between boasts of liberty and the enslavement of human beings passed from Britain to America, where its consequences would be written in blood. Yet the eighteenth century, which witnessed the high tide of the slave trade, also gave rise to the ideals of freedom, equality, and human rights that led to its doom.

Benefits of Slave Trade

By trading slave, Britain made huge profits. British people used to buy slaves from tribes in Africa for a very low price and sell them to rich people in their own country or outside for triple or four fold of the actual price. In the absence of slaves, most of the defense activities involved huge number of man-power. Britain saved on this man-power as well as the money spent to keep it by hiring slaves as labour force.

Trading of slaves also made daily life easy and comfortable in Britain. Slaves were hired to do almost every household task. It gave the natives time to revel in recreational activities. It also gave them time to spend into more creative things, for exmaple,reading, writing or socializing. It benefitted Britain to rise her standard of living. People were also able to contribute to art because of spare time.

Slave trading also helped Britain to emerge as the super power as far as colonisation was concern. Every nation regarded Britain as the symbol of power and subversion. Hence, Britain was able to spread her influence and culture across the globe. Every nation wanted to associate with Britain for various reasons. Hence, they adopted Britain's culture as well as language. It gave Britain an opportunity to precide over the international or internal issues of any nation.

Therfore, Britain was able to rule over the world for years. Even today, we trace the impression/force of England almost everywhere in the world.

1.8 WILLIAM WILBERFORCE

William Wilberforce was a British politician, a philanthropist and a leader of the movement to abolish the slave trade. A native of Kingston upon Hull, Yorkshire, he began his political career in 1780, eventually becoming the independent Member of Parliament for Yorkshire (1784–1812). In 1785, he underwent a conversion experience and became an evangelical Christian, resulting in major changes to his lifestyle and a lifelong concern for reform. In 1787, he came into contact with Thomas Clarkson and a group of anti-slave-trade activists, including Granville Sharp, Hannah More and Charles Middleton. They persuaded Wilberforce to take on the cause of abolition, and he soon became one of the

leading English abolitionists. He headed the parliamentary campaign against the British slave trade for twenty-six years until the passage of the Slave Trade Act 1807.

NOTES

Wilberforce was convinced of the importance of religion, morality and education. He championed causes and campaigns such as the Society for Suppression of Vice, British missionary work in India, the creation of a free colony in Sierra Leone, the foundation of the Church Mission Society and the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. His underlying conservatism led him to support politically and socially repressive legislation, and resulted in criticism that he was ignoring injustices at home while campaigning for the enslaved abroad.

In later years, Wilberforce supported the campaign for the complete abolition of slavery, and continued his involvement after 1826, when he resigned from Parliament because of his failing health. That campaign led to the Slavery Abolition Act 1833, which abolished slavery in most of the British Empire; Wilberforce died just three days after hearing that the passage of the Act through Parliament was assured. He was buried in Westminster Abbey, close to his friend William Pitt.

Early Life

William Wilberforce was born in a house on the High Street of Hull, in the East Riding of Yorkshire on 24 August 1759, the only son of Robert Wilberforce (1728–1768), a wealthy merchant and his wife Elizabeth Bird (1730–1798). He was baptised at Seaton Ross in the East Riding on 29 September 1759. His grandfather William (1690–1776) had made the family fortune in the maritime trade with Baltic countries, and had twice been elected mayor of Hull.

Wilberforce was a small, sickly and delicate child, with poor eyesight. In 1767 he began attending Hull Grammar School, at the time headed by a young, dynamic headmaster, Joseph Milner, who was to become a life-long friend. Wilberforce profited from the supportive atmosphere at the school until the death of his father in 1768. With his mother struggling to cope, the nine-year-old Wilberforce was sent to a prosperous uncle and aunt with houses in both St James' Place, London and Wimbledon, at that time a village 7 mi (11 km) southwest of London. He attended an "indifferent" boarding school in Putney for two years, spending his holidays in Wimbledon, where he grew extremely fond of his relatives. He became interested in evangelical Christianity because of their influence, especially that of his Aunt Hannah, sister of the wealthy Christian merchant John Thornton, a philanthropist and a supporter of the leading Methodist preacher George Whitefield.

NOTES

Wilberforce's staunchly Church of England mother and grandfather, alarmed at these nonconformist influences and at his leanings towards evangelicalism, brought the 12-year-old boy back to Hull in 1771. Wilberforce was heartbroken to be separated from his aunt and uncle. His family opposed a return to Hull Grammar School because the headmaster had become a Methodist; Wilberforce therefore continued his education at nearby Pocklington School from 1771–76. Influenced by Methodist scruples, he initially resisted Hull's lively social life, but as his religious fervour diminished, he embraced theatre-going, attended balls and played cards.

In October 1776 at the age of 17, Wilberforce went up to St John's College, Cambridge. The deaths of his grandfather and uncle in 1776 and 1777 respectively had left him independently wealthy, and as a result he had little inclination or need to apply himself to serious study. Instead, he immersed himself in the social round of student life, and pursued a hedonistic lifestyle enjoying cards, gambling and late-night drinking sessions—although he found the excesses of some of his fellow students distasteful. Witty, generous, and an excellent conversationalist, Wilberforce was a popular figure. He made many friends, including the more studious future Prime Minister, William Pitt. Despite his lifestyle and lack of interest in studying, he managed to pass his examinations, and was awarded a B.A. in 1781 and an M.A. in 1788.

Early Parliamentary Career

Wilberforce began to consider a political career while still at university, and during the winter of 1779–80 he and Pitt frequently watched House of Commons debates from the gallery. Pitt, already set on a political career, encouraged Wilberforce to join him in obtaining a parliamentary seat. In September 1780, at the age of twenty-one and while still a student, Wilberforce was elected Member of Parliament (MP) for Kingston upon Hull, spending over £8,000 to ensure he received the necessary votes, as was the custom of the time. Free from financial pressures, Wilberforce sat as an independent, resolving to be "no party man". Criticised at times for inconsistency, he supported both Tory and Whig governments according to his conscience, working closely with the party in power, and voting on specific measures according to their merits. Wilberforce attended Parliament regularly, but he also maintained a lively social life, becoming an habitué of gentlemen's gambling clubs such as Goostree's and Boodle's in Pall Mall, London. The writer and socialite, Madame de Staël, described him as the "wittiest man in England" and, according to Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire, the Prince of Wales said that he would go anywhere to hear Wilberforce sing. Wilberforce used his speaking voice to great effect in political speeches; the diarist and author, James Boswell, witnessed Wilberforce's eloquence in the House of Commons and

noted: "I saw what seemed a mere shrimp mount upon the table; but as I listened, he grew, and grew, until the shrimp became a whale." During the frequent government changes of 1781–84 Wilberforce supported his friend Pitt in parliamentary debates, and in autumn 1783 Pitt, Wilberforce and Edward Eliot (later to become Pitt's brother-in-law), travelled to France for a six-week holiday together. After a difficult start in Rheims, where their presence aroused police suspicion that they were English spies, they visited Paris, meeting Benjamin Franklin, General Lafayette, Marie Antoinette and Louis XVI, and joined the French court at Fontainebleau.

NOTES

Pitt became Prime Minister in December 1783, with Wilberforce a key supporter of his minority government. Despite their close friendship, there is no record that Pitt offered Wilberforce a ministerial position in this or future governments. This may have been due to Wilberforce's wish to remain an independent MP. Alternatively, Wilberforce's frequent tardiness and disorganisation, as well as the chronic eye problems that at times made reading impossible, may have convinced Pitt that his trusted friend was not ministerial material. When Parliament was dissolved in the spring of 1784, Wilberforce decided to stand as a candidate for the county of Yorkshire in the 1784 General Election. On 6 April, he was returned as MP for Yorkshire at the age of twenty-four.

Conversion

In October 1784, Wilberforce embarked upon a tour of Europe which would change his life and ultimately his future career. He travelled with his mother and sister in the company of Isaac Milner, the brilliant younger brother of his former headmaster, who had been Fellow of Queens' College, Cambridge in the year when Wilberforce first went up. They visited the French Riviera and enjoyed the usual pastimes of dinners, cards, and gambling. In February 1785, Wilberforce returned to the United Kingdom temporarily, to support Pitt's proposals for parliamentary reforms. He rejoined the party in Genoa, Italy, from where they continued their tour to Switzerland. Milner accompanied Wilberforce to England, and on the journey they read The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul by Philip Doddridge, a leading early 18th century English nonconformist.

Wilberforce's spiritual journey is thought to have begun at this time. He started to rise early to read the Bible and pray and kept a private journal. He underwent an evangelical conversion, regretting his past life and resolving to commit his future life and work to the service of God. His conversion changed some of his habits but not his nature: he remained outwardly cheerful, interested, and respectful, tactfully urging others towards his new faith. Inwardly, he underwent an agonising struggle and became relentlessly self-critical, harshly

NOTES

judging his spirituality, use of time, vanity, self-control, and relationships with others.

At the time religious enthusiasm was generally regarded as a social transgression and was stigmatised in polite society. Evangelicals in the upper classes, such as Sir Richard Hill, the Methodist MP for Shropshire, and Selina Hastings, Countess of Huntingdon were exposed to contempt and ridicule, and Wilberforce's conversion led him to question whether he should remain in public life. Wilberforce sought guidance from John Newton, a leading Evangelical Anglican clergyman of the day and Rector of St Mary Woolnoth in the City of London. Both Newton and Pitt counselled Wilberforce to remain in politics, and he resolved to do so "with increased diligence and conscientiousness". Thereafter, his political views were informed by his faith and by his desire to promote Christianity and Christian ethics in private and public life. His views were often deeply conservative, opposed to radical changes in a God-given political and social order, and focused on issues such as the observance of the Sabbath and the eradication of immorality through education and reform. As a result, he was often distrusted by progressive voices due to his conservatism, and regarded with suspicion by many Tories who saw Evangelicals as radicals, bent on the overthrow of church and state.

In 1786 Wilberforce leased a house in Old Palace Yard, Westminster, in order to be near Parliament. He began using his parliamentary position to advocate reform by introducing a Registration Bill, proposing limited changes to parliamentary election procedures. He brought forward a bill to extend the measure permitting the dissection after execution of criminals such as rapists, arsonists and thieves. The bill also advocated the reduction of sentences for women convicted of treason, a crime that at the time included a husband's murder. The House of Commons passed both bills, but they were defeated in the House of Lords.

Abolition of the Slave Trade

The British initially became involved in the slave trade during the 16th century. By 1783, the triangular route that took British-made goods to Africa to buy slaves, transported the enslaved to the West Indies, and then brought slave-grown products such as sugar, tobacco, and cotton to Britain, represented about 80 per cent of Great Britain's foreign income. British ships dominated the trade, supplying French, Spanish, Dutch, Portuguese and British colonies, and in peak years carried forty thousand enslaved men, women and children across the Atlantic in the horrific conditions of the middle passage. Of the estimated 11 million Africans transported into slavery, about 1.4 million died during the voyage.

The British campaign to abolish the slave trade is generally considered to have begun in the 1780s with the establishment of the Quakers' antislavery

NOTES

committees, and their presentation to Parliament of the first slave trade petition in 1783. The same year, Wilberforce, while dining with his old Cambridge friend Gerard Edwards, met Rev. James Ramsay, a ship's surgeon who had become a clergyman on the island of St Christopher (later St Kitts) in the Leeward Islands, and a medical supervisor of the plantations there. What Ramsay had witnessed of the conditions endured by the slaves, both at sea and on the plantations, horrified him. Returning to England after fifteen years, he accepted the living of Teston, Kent in 1781, and there met Sir Charles Middleton, Lady Middleton, Thomas Clarkson, Hannah More and others, a group that later became known as the Testonites. Interested in promoting Christianity and moral improvement in Britain and overseas, they were appalled by Ramsay's reports of the depraved lifestyles of slave owners, the cruel treatment meted out to the enslaved, and the lack of Christian instruction provided to the slaves. With their encouragement and help, Ramsay spent three years writing an essay on the treatment and conversion of African slaves in the British sugar colonies, which was highly critical of slavery in the West Indies. The book, published in 1784, was to have an important impact in raising public awareness and interest, and it excited the ire of West Indian planters who in the coming years attacked both Ramsay and his ideas in a series of pro-slavery tracts.

Wilberforce apparently did not follow up on his meeting with Ramsay. However, three years later, and inspired by his new faith, Wilberforce was growing interested in humanitarian reform. In November 1786 he received a letter from Sir Charles Middleton that re-opened his interest in the slave trade. At the urging of Lady Middleton, Sir Charles suggested that Wilberforce bring forward the abolition of the slave trade in Parliament. Wilberforce responded that "he felt the great importance of the subject, and thought himself unequal to the task allotted to him, but yet would not positively decline it". He began to read widely on the subject, and met with the Testonites at Middleton's home at Barham Court in Teston in the early winter of 1786–87.

In early 1787, Thomas Clarkson, a fellow graduate of St John's, Cambridge, who had become convinced of the need to end the slave trade after writing a prize-winning essay on the subject while at Cambridge, called upon Wilberforce at Old Palace Yard with a published copy of the work. This was the first time the two men had met; their collaboration would last nearly fifty years. Clarkson began to visit Wilberforce on a weekly basis, bringing first-hand evidence he had obtained about the slave trade. The Quakers, already working for abolition, also recognised the need for influence within Parliament, and urged Clarkson to secure a commitment from Wilberforce to bring forward the case for abolition in the House of Commons.

NOTES

It was arranged that Bennet Langton, a Lincolnshire landowner and mutual acquaintance of Wilberforce and Clarkson, would organize a dinner party in order to ask Wilberforce formally to lead the parliamentary campaign. The dinner took place on 13 March 1787; other guests included Charles Middleton, Sir Joshua Reynolds, William Windham, MP, James Boswell and Isaac Hawkins Browne, MP. By the end of the evening, Wilberforce had agreed in general terms that he would bring forward the abolition of the slave trade in Parliament, "provided that no person more proper could be found".

The same spring, on 12 May 1787, the still hesitant Wilberforce held a conversation with William Pitt and the future Prime Minister William Grenville as they sat under a large oak tree on Pitt's estate in Kent. Under what came to be known as the "Wilberforce Oak" at Holwood, Pitt challenged his friend: "Wilberforce, why don't you give notice of a motion on the subject of the Slave Trade? You have already taken great pains to collect evidence, and are therefore fully entitled to the credit which doing so will ensure you. Do not lose time, or the ground will be occupied by another." Wilberforce's response is not recorded, but he later declared in old age that he could "distinctly remember the very knoll on which I was sitting near Pitt and Grenville" where he made his decision.

Wilberforce's involvement in the abolition movement was motivated by a desire to put his Christian principles into action and to serve God in public life. He and other Evangelicals were horrified by what they perceived was a depraved and unchristian trade, and the greed and avarice of the owners and traders. Wilberforce sensed a call from God, writing in a journal entry in 1787 that "God Almighty has set before me two great objects, the suppression of the Slave Trade and the Reformation of Manners [moral values]". The conspicuous involvement of Evangelicals in the highly popular anti-slavery movement served to improve the status of a group otherwise associated with the less popular campaigns against vice and immorality.

Early Parliamentary Action

On 22 May 1787, the first meeting of the Society for Effecting the Abolition of the Slave Trade took place, bringing like-minded British Quakers and Anglicans together in the same organisation for the first time. The committee chose to campaign against the slave trade rather than slavery itself, with many members believing that slavery would eventually disappear as a natural consequence of the abolition of the trade. Wilberforce, though involved informally, did not join the committee officially until 1791.

The society was highly successful in raising public awareness and support, and local chapters sprang up throughout Great Britain. Clarkson travelled the country researching and collecting first-hand testimony and statistics, while the

committee promoted the campaign, pioneering techniques such as lobbying, writing pamphlets, holding public meetings, gaining press attention, organising boycotts and even using a campaign logo: an image of a kneeling slave above the motto "Am I not a Man and a Brother?" designed by the renowned pottery-maker Josiah Wedgwood. The committee also sought to influence slave-trading nations such as France, Spain, Portugal, Denmark, Holland and the United States, corresponding with anti-slavery activists in other countries and organising the translation of English-language books and pamphlets. These included books by former slaves Ottobah Cugoano and Olaudah Equiano, who had published influential works on slavery and the slave trade in 1787 and 1789 respectively. They and other free blacks, collectively known as "Sons of Africa", spoke at debating societies and wrote spirited letters to newspapers, periodicals and prominent figures, as well as public letters of support to campaign allies. Hundreds of parliamentary petitions opposing the slave trade were received in 1788 and following years, with hundreds of thousands of signatories in total. The campaign proved to be the world's first grassroots human rights campaign, in which men and women from different social classes and backgrounds volunteered to end the injustices suffered by others.

NOTES

Wilberforce had planned to introduce a motion giving notice that he would bring forward a bill for the Abolition of the Slave Trade during the 1789 parliamentary session. However, in January 1788 he was taken ill with a probable stress-related condition, now thought to be ulcerative colitis. It was several months before he was able to resume work, and he spent time convalescing at Bath and Cambridge. His regular bouts of gastrointestinal illnesses precipitated the use of moderate quantities of opium, which proved effective in alleviating his condition, and which he continued to use for the rest of his life.

During Wilberforce's absence, Pitt, who had long been supportive of abolition, introduced the preparatory motion himself, and ordered a Privy Council investigation into the slave trade, followed by a House of Commons review.

With the publication of the Privy Council report in April 1789 and following months of planning, Wilberforce commenced his parliamentary campaign. On 12 May 1789, he made his first major speech on the subject of abolition in the House of Commons, in which he reasoned that the trade was morally reprehensible and an issue of natural justice. Drawing on Thomas Clarkson's mass of evidence, he described in detail the appalling conditions in which slaves travelled from Africa in the middle passage, and argued that abolishing the trade would also bring an improvement to the conditions of existing slaves in the West Indies. He moved 12 resolutions condemning the slave trade, but made no reference to the abolition of slavery itself, instead dwelling on the potential for reproduction in the existing slave population should the trade be abolished. With the tide running

NOTES

against them, the opponents of abolition delayed the vote by proposing that the House of Commons hear its own evidence, and Wilberforce, in a move that has subsequently been criticised for prolonging the slave trade, reluctantly agreed. The hearings were not completed by the end of the parliamentary session, and were deferred until the following year. In the meantime, Wilberforce and Clarkson tried unsuccessfully to take advantage of the egalitarian atmosphere of the French Revolution to press for France's abolition of the trade, which was, in any event, to be abolished in 1794 as a result of the bloody slave revolt in St Domingue (later to be known as Haiti), although later briefly restored by Napoleon in 1802.

In January 1790 Wilberforce succeeded in speeding up the hearings by gaining approval for a smaller parliamentary select committee to consider the vast quantity of evidence which had been accumulated. Wilberforce's house in Old Palace Yard became a centre for the abolitionists' campaign, and a focus for many strategy meetings. Petitioners for other causes also besieged him there, and his ante-room thronged from an early hour, like "Noah's Ark, full of beasts clean and unclean", according to Hannah More.

Interrupted by a general election in June 1790, the committee finally finished hearing witnesses, and in April 1791 with a closely-reasoned four-hour speech, Wilberforce introduced the first parliamentary bill to abolish the slave trade. However, after two evenings of debate, the bill was easily defeated by 163 votes to 88, the political climate having swung in a conservative direction in the wake of the French Revolution, and in reaction to an increase in radicalism and to slave revolts in the French West Indies. Such was the public hysteria of the time that even Wilberforce himself was suspected by some of being a Jacobin agitator.

This was the beginning of a protracted parliamentary campaign, during which Wilberforce's commitment never wavered, despite frustration and hostility. He was supported in his work by fellow members of the so-called Clapham Sect, among whom was his best friend and cousin Henry Thornton. Holding evangelical Christian convictions, and consequently dubbed "the Saints", the group lived in large adjoining houses in Clapham, then a village south of London. Wilberforce accepted an invitation to share a house with Henry Thornton in 1792, moving into his own home after Thornton's marriage in 1796. The "Saints" were an informal community, characterised by considerable intimacy as well as a commitment to practical Christianity and an opposition to slavery. They developed a relaxed family atmosphere, wandering freely in and out of each other's homes and gardens, and discussing the many religious, social and political topics that engaged them.

Pro-slavery advocates claimed that enslaved Africans were lesser human beings who benefited from their bondage. Wilberforce, the Clapham Sect and others were anxious to demonstrate that Africans, and particularly freed slaves, had human and economic abilities beyond the slave trade; that they were capable

NOTES

of sustaining a well-ordered society, trade and cultivation. Inspired in part by the utopian vision of Granville Sharp, they became involved in the establishment in 1792 of a free colony in Sierra Leone with black settlers from the United Kingdom, Nova Scotia and Jamaica, as well as native Africans and some whites. They formed the Sierra Leone Company, with Wilberforce subscribing liberally to the project in money and time. The dream was of an ideal society in which races would mix on equal terms; the reality was fraught with tension, crop failures, disease, death, war and defections to the slave trade. Initially a commercial venture, the British government assumed responsibility for the colony in 1808. The colony, although troubled at times, was to become a symbol of anti-slavery in which residents, communities and African tribal chiefs, worked together to prevent enslavement at the source, supported by a British naval blockade to stem the region's slave trade.

On 2 April 1792, Wilberforce again brought a bill calling for abolition. The memorable debate that followed drew contributions from the greatest orators in the house, William Pitt and Charles James Fox, as well as from Wilberforce himself. Henry Dundas, as home secretary, proposed a compromise solution of so-called "gradual abolition" over a number of years. This was passed by 230 to 85 votes, but the compromise was little more than a clever ploy, with the intention of ensuring that total abolition would be delayed indefinitely.

War with France

On 26 February 1793, another vote to abolish the slave trade was narrowly defeated by eight votes. The outbreak of war with France the same month effectively prevented any further serious consideration of the issue, as politicians concentrated on the national crisis and the threat of invasion. The same year, and again in 1794, Wilberforce unsuccessfully brought before Parliament a bill to outlaw British ships from supplying slaves to foreign colonies. He voiced his concern about the war and urged Pitt and his government to make greater efforts to end hostilities. Growing more alarmed, on 31 December 1794, Wilberforce moved that the government seek a peaceful resolution with France, a stance that created a temporary breach in his long friendship with Pitt.

Abolition continued to be associated in the public consciousness with the French Revolution and with British radical groups, resulting in a decline in public support. In 1795, the Society for Effecting the Abolition of the Slave Trade ceased to meet, and Clarkson retired in ill-health to the Lake District. However, despite the decreased interest in abolition, Wilberforce continued to introduce abolition bills throughout the 1790s.

Wilberforce had shown little interest in women, but in his late thirties twenty-year-old Barbara Ann Spooner (1777–1847) was recommended by his

NOTES

friend Thomas Babington as a potential bride. Wilberforce met her two days later on 15 April 1797, and was immediately smitten; following an eight-day whirlwind romance, he proposed. Despite the urgings of friends to slow down, the couple married in Bath, Somerset, on 30 May 1797. They were devoted to each other and Barbara was very attentive and supportive to Wilberforce in his increasing ill health, though she showed little interest in his political activities.

The early years of the 19th century once again saw an increased public interest in abolition. In 1804, Clarkson resumed his work and the Society for Effecting the Abolition of the Slave Trade began meeting again, strengthened with prominent new members such as Zachary Macaulay, Henry Brougham and James Stephen. In June 1804, Wilberforce's bill to abolish the slave trade successfully passed all its stages through the House of Commons. However, it was too late in the parliamentary session for it to complete its passage through the House of Lords. On its reintroduction during the 1805 session it was defeated, with even the usually sympathetic Pitt failing to support it. On this occasion and throughout the campaign, abolition was held back by Wilberforce's trusting, even credulous nature, and his deferential attitude towards those in power. He found it difficult to believe that men of rank would not do what he perceived to be the right thing, and was reluctant to confront them when they did not.

Final Phase of the Campaign

Following Pitt's death in January 1806 Wilberforce began to collaborate more with the Whigs, especially the abolitionists. He gave general support to the Grenville-Fox administration, which brought more abolitionists into the cabinet; Wilberforce and Charles Fox led the campaign in the House of Commons, while Lord Grenville advocated the cause in the House of Lords.

A radical change of tactics, which involved the introduction of a bill to ban British subjects from aiding or participating in the slave trade to the French colonies, was suggested by maritime lawyer James Stephen. It was a shrewd move since the majority of British ships were now flying American flags and supplying slaves to foreign colonies with whom Britain was at war. A bill was introduced and approved by the cabinet, and Wilberforce and other abolitionists maintained a self-imposed silence, so as not to draw any attention to the effect of the bill. The approach proved successful, and the new Foreign Slave Trade Bill was quickly passed, and received the Royal Assent on 23 May 1806. Wilberforce and Clarkson had collected a large volume of evidence against the slave trade over the previous two decades, and Wilberforce spent the latter part of 1806 writing A Letter on the Abolition of the Slave Trade, which was a comprehensive restatement of the abolitionists' case. The death of Fox in September 1806 was a blow, and was followed quickly by a general election in the autumn of 1806. Slavery became an election issue, bringing more abolitionist MPs into the House of Commons,

including former military men who had personally experienced the horrors of slavery and slave revolts. Wilberforce was re-elected as an MP for Yorkshire, after which he returned to finishing and publishing his Letter, in reality a 400-page book which formed the basis for the final phase of the campaign.

Lord Grenville, the Prime Minister, was determined to introduce an Abolition Bill in the House of Lords rather than in the House of Commons, taking it through its greatest challenge first. When a final vote was taken, the bill was passed in the House of Lords by a large margin. Sensing a breakthrough that had been long anticipated, Charles Grey moved for a second reading in the Commons on 23 February 1807. As tributes were made to Wilberforce, whose face streamed with tears, the bill was carried by 283 votes to 16. Excited supporters suggested taking advantage of the large majority to seek the abolition of slavery itself but Wilberforce made it clear that total emancipation was not the immediate goal: "They had for the present no object immediately before them, but that of putting stop directly to the carrying of men in British ships to be sold as slaves." The Slave Trade Act received the Royal Assent on 25 March 1807.

1.9 ANTI-JACOBIN

The Anti-Jacobin was a newspaper founded by George Canning in 1797. William Gifford was its editor. Its first issue was published on 20 November and during the parliamentary session of 1797-98 it was issued every Monday.

Canning founded it, in his words, "to be full of sound reasoning, good principles, and good jokes and to set the mind of the people right upon every subject." One of Canning's biographers described its purpose as to "deride and refute the ideas of the Jacobins, present the government's point of view on the issues of the day and expose the misinformation and misinterpretation which filled the opposition newspapers." In its first issue Canning said he and his friends:

> "avow ourselves to be partial to the COUNTRY in which we live, notwithstanding the daily panegyrics which we read and hear on the superior virtues and endowments of its rival and hostile neighbours. We are prejudiced in favour of her Establishments, civil and religious; though without claiming for either that ideal perfection, which modern philosophy professes to discover in the more luminous systems which are arising on all sides of us."

Canning's "most serious, vehement and effective onslaught in verse" on the values of the French Revolution was set out in a long poem, 'New Morality', published in the last issue of the Anti-Jacobin (No. 36, 9 July 1798). Canning considered these values as "French philanthropy" which professed a love of all mankind whilst eradicating every patriotic impulse. He described those in Britain

NOTES

who held these values as a "pedant prig" who "disowns a Briton's part, And plucks the name of England from his heart":

> "No – through th'extended globe his feelings run As broad and general as th'unbounded sun! No narrow bigot he; – his reason'd view Thy interests, England, ranks with thine, Peru! France at our doors, he sees no danger nigh, But heaves for Turkey's woes the impartial sigh; A steady patriot of the world alone, The friend of every country – but his own.

In order to publicise the Anti-Jacobin Canning paid the cartoonist James Gillray to publish plates themed on the Anti-Jacobin's principles and it has been claimed that twenty Gillray plates were the fruit of this arrangement.

William Pitt the Younger, the Prime Minister, also contributed to the newspaper.

The Anti-Jacobin estimated its total readership to be 50,000: the regular weekly sale of 2,500 was multiplied by seven (arriving at 17,500) because that was the average size of a family; to this was added 32,500 on the claim that many readers lent their copies to their poorer neighbours.

History of Composition

The Anti-Jacobin consisted of 36 issues printed from November 20, 1797 until July 9, 1798. These 36 issues amounted to only 288 pages; however, the Anti-Jacobin is considered to be one of the most influential and effective periodicals published for both literature and politics. There are two significant stylistic features of the Anti-Jacobin that contributes to these positive remarks: the mass amount of factual material and the straightforward, brief nature that the material was presented in.

The Anti-Jacobin is believed to have originated from George Canning's involvement in peace negotiations with France in 1797 when he was the undersecretary of state for foreign affairs. The coup d'état caused these negotiations to end abruptly on September 4, 1797. This led Canning to revert his attention towards his home, England, where he decided to write a letter to George Ellis on October 19, 1797. This letter contained Canning's proposal to write a periodical that was to include humour, good principles, and frank reasoning that would influence the public to side with the anti-Jacobins. With the help of fellow Tory Parliament members John Hookham Frere (Canning's school friend) and George Ellis, Canning was able to commission the publication of the Anti-Jacobin to Wright. The anti-Jacobins established their headquarters in a vacated, secret house nearby Wright where they would congregate every Sunday before each new issue was released.

William Gifford, the editor of the periodical, had established his style by writing poems like the Baviad (1794) and Maeviad (1795), which satirized Robert Merry, a Jacobin writer, and the Della Cruscans Pitt, Jenkinson, Hammond, Baron Macdonald, and Marquis Wellesley were also contributors to the periodical.

NOTES

The Anti-Jacobin satirized many famous poets, scientists, philosophers, politicians, explorers, pedagogues, and demagogues. "It was to its satire that it owed both its influence and its fame, and of this satire much was in verse, some of the most telling poems being from Canning's pen," (Marshall 179). These groups and individuals included: The French and their British allies, radicals, William Wordsworth, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Robert Southey, Percy Bysshe Shelley, Erasmus Darwin, Thomas Paine, William Godwin, and Mary Wollstonecraft. Styles of poetry that were commonly mocked in the Anti-Jacobin were Orientalism, Gothic, Darwinian didactic couplets, German Drama, and sentimentalism.

1.10 DEMOCRATS AND WHIGS

The Liberal Democrats are the successors to two important reformist traditions in British politics - those of liberalism and of social democracy, which became separated from each other in the early part of the twentieth century, but are now reunited, in the shape of the Liberal Democrats. This entry provides a concise history of the Liberal Democrats and its two predecessor parties, the Liberal Party and the SDP.

Origins: Whigs, Radicals and Peelites

Whilst the history of the Liberal Democrats as a formal political party stretches back 150 years to the formation of the Liberal Party in 1859, Liberal political thought goes back at least a further 200 years to the ferment of the English Civil War and the reaction that set in with the restoration of the monarchy in 1660. The philosopher John Locke started the long line of British liberal thinkers, particularly with his Treatises on Government in 1690, but there was no organisation that could reasonably be regarded as a political party in the modern sense, liberal or otherwise, at this time.

The eighteenth century saw the gradual establishment of relatively formal parliamentary groupings, the Whigs and the Tories. Broadly speaking, the Tories were defenders of the Crown and the established Anglican Church, while the Whigs drew their inspiration from the Glorious Revolution of 1688, in which the circumscription of the monarchy's role was finally established through the overthrow of James II and his replacement by William III. The ideological similarities between the two factions outweighed the differences, though it did not prevent bitter personal rivalries between the aristocratic families which provided their leadership.

NOTES

The revolt of the American colonies in the 1770s, however, and, more particularly, the French Revolution, opened up, and increased popular participation in, a renewed debate over the ideological basis of government. The Whigs, under Charles James Fox, resisted the authoritarian measures taken by Pitt's government to suppress debate and dissension during the wars with France in the 1790s. A prolonged period in opposition also encouraged the Whigs to embrace a more popular agenda, in the form of religious toleration, to incorporate Catholics and Nonconformists into civil society, and electoral reform. The Whigs saw parliamentary reform, to widen the electorate and redistribute parliamentary seats, as the necessary means to reflect the changes in the distribution and wealth of the population which had followed the Industrial Revolution. Tory divisions over both Catholic emancipation and electoral reform gave them their chance, and a Whig government under Lord Grey passed the Great Reform Act of 1832, in retrospect a very modest measure but at the time almost a revolutionary one.

The Great Reform Act began the process of extending the franchise and, thereby, the need for politicians to engage with both ordinary electors and radical elements outside Parliament. Out of this process grew the establishment of the political parties that we recognise today. The Conservative Party came into existence in 1835, but it took longer for a cohesive liberal party to emerge. Uneasy alliances between the aristocratic Whigs and the new breed of middle-class liberals elected after 1832, often to represent the newly enfranchised towns and cities of the industrial regions, could not be relied upon. There was also the problem of how to accommodate radical opinion, which was barely represented in the House of Commons, but which looked to Parliament for a strong reforming lead.

For many years personality was the most significant factor in liberal politics, with Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston competing for the parliamentary support required to become Prime Minister. The glue to bind the two leaders and their various factions together was provided by the Peelites, a small but influential band of former Conservatives (including William Gladstone), who had broken with their previous party in 1846 over the repeal of the Corn Laws (import duties on grain), because of their ideological support for free trade.

The Liberal Ascendancy

The Liberal Party was finally formed on 6 June 1859, when Whigs, Peelites and Radicals met at Willis's Rooms in St James Street, London, to overthrow a minority Conservative government. The Liberals governed Britain for most of the following thirty years, benefiting from further extensions of the franchise in 1867 and 1885. The Liberal slogan during these years was 'peace, retrenchment and reform', the underlying theme of which was the need for free trade in order to generate prosperity for all.

NOTES

Liberal leader and four-times Prime Minister William Ewart Gladstone dominated British politics during this period. During the 1850s he established his reputation for prudent financial innovation by replacing taxes on goods and customs duties with a progressive income tax, which also made a modest step towards the redistribution of income. Another significant achievement was the establishment of parliamentary accountability for government spending. Although firmly devoted to the Church of England, Gladstone won strong support from Nonconformists for his attitude to religious questions, which at that time affected basic liberties as well as such matters as education. Winning the 1868 general election, Gladstone disestablished the Church of Ireland and in 1870 his government passed the first Education Act. In 1872, the Liberals established the secret ballot, but Liberal differences over Irish university education allowed the Conservatives to win the 1874 election.

Gladstone returned to power in 1880, partly because of the renown he had won for defending the rights of oppressed minorities abroad, particularly in the Balkans. The Liberal government grew increasingly concerned with bringing peace to Ireland, where sectarian differences and economic problems were intermingled. Increasing electoral support for Parnell's Irish Home Rule party, assisted by the secret ballot and electoral reform, made life difficult for both major British political parties. Following the 1885 election, Parnell's party held the balance of power in the House of Commons. Gladstone converted to the Home Rule cause and made an unsuccessful attempt to navigate a devolution bill on to the statute book. In doing so, he split the Liberal Party.

The bulk of the Whigs, who had been gradually drifting away from the Liberal cause for sometime, joined forces with a smaller group of radical MPs under Joseph Chamberlain to form the Liberal Unionist Party, which was eventually to fuse with the Conservatives. The Liberals lost the 1886 election and remained out of power for most of the next twenty years, apart from a minority administration in 1892-95.

Ireland was not the only source of dissension within the party. There was no obvious successor to Gladstone when he eventually retired, in 1894, and his replacement, Lord Rosebery, proved to be a weak leader with no clear sense of direction. The party was split over social policy, between those more traditional Liberals who thought the government should keep out of economic affairs, and those who argued that state intervention was necessary to relieve poverty, unemployment and ill-health and thereby guarantee true liberty. The 1891 Newcastle Programme was the first step in the Liberals' embrace of the more interventionist set of policies which was to be the main characteristic of the 1906 government - the New Liberalism of progressive social reform.

NOTES

1.11 UNREST IN THE EARLY 19TH CENTURY

The early 19th century was an era of political and social unrest in Britain. In the early 19th century a group of Evangelical Christians called the Clapham Sect were active in politics. They campaigned for an end to slavery and cruel sports. They gained their name because so many of them lived in Clapham.

Then on 11 May 1812 a man named John Bellingham shot Tory prime minister Spencer Perceval. He was the only British prime minister ever to be assassinated.

Bellingham was a lone madman but in 1820 there was a plot to kill the whole cabinet. Arthur Thistlewood led the Cato Street Conspiracy but the conspirators were arrested on 23 February 1820. Thistlewood and 4 of his companions were hanged.

Meanwhile in 1811-1816 textile workers in the Midlands and the north of England broke machines, fearing they would cause unemployment. The wreckers were called Luddites and if caught they were likely to be hanged.

In March 1817 textile workers from Manchester tried to march to London to petition the Prince Regent. They were called blanketeers because many of them carried blankets. However, even though the march was peaceful the blanketeers were stopped by soldiers at Stockport.

Then on 16 August 1819 a crowd of about 60,000 people gathered at St Peter's Field in Manchester to hear a man named Henry Hunt. Even though the crowd were unarmed and the peaceful the authorities sent in soldiers. As a result 11 people were killed and hundreds were wounded. Afterwards people called the event 'The Peterloo Massacre' in a grim mockery of Waterloo.

In 1830 farm labourers in Kent and Sussex broke agricultural machinery fearing it would cause unemployment. The riots were called the Swing Riots because a man named Captain Swing supposedly, led them. As a result of the riots 4 men were hanged and 52 were transported to Australia.

In 1834 6 farm labourers in Tolpuddle, Dorset tried to form a trade union. However, they were prosecuted for making illegal oaths. (Not for forming a union, which was legal). They were sentenced to transportation to Australia. The case caused an outcry and they returned to Britain in 1838.

Political Reform

In 1822 a Tory government was formed which introduced some reforms. At that time you could be hanged for over 200 offences. (Although the sentence was often commuted to transportation). In 1825–1828 the death penalty was abolished for more than 180 crimes.

Peel also formed the first modern police force in London in 1829. The police were called 'bobbies' or 'peelers' after him.

From 1828 to 1830 the Duke of Wellington (1769-1852) was prime minister. He introduced the Catholic Emancipation Act (1829). Since, the Reformation Catholics had been unable to become MPs or to hold public office. The Act restored those rights to them.

NOTES

However, Wellington was strongly opposed to any change to the electoral system.

At that time there were two types of constituency, country areas and towns or boroughs. In the countryside only the landowners could vote. In boroughs the franchise varied but was usually limited. However the constituencies had not been changed for centuries and they no longer reflected the distribution of the population. Industrial towns like Birmingham and Manchester did not have MPs of their own. On the other hand some settlements had died out but they were still represented in parliament! In 'rotten' or 'pocket' boroughs there might be only one or two voters!

In the early 19th century there were increasing demands for reforms. Most people wanted constituencies distributed more fairly and they also wanted the franchise extended but Wellington's party, the Tories, resisted.

However, in 1830 the Whigs formed a government and they tried to introduced reform. The House of Commons eventually voted for a reform bill but, the House of Lords rejected it. The King, William IV, warned that he would create more peers, who favoured the bill unless the Lords agreed to accept it. Eventually the House of Lords backed down and passed the Great Reform Bill. It received the royal assent on 7 June 1832.

The franchise was only extended slightly but much more importantly the new industrial towns were now represented in parliament. Before 1832 Britain was ruled by an oligarchy of landowners. After 1832 the urban middle class had an increasing say.

However, the working class were excluded from the reforms. From 1838 a working class protest movement called the Chartists was formed. (They were named after their People's Charter). The Chartists had several demands. They wanted all men to have the vote. Furthermore at that time you had to own a certain amount of property to become an MP. Chartists wanted the property qualification abolished. They also wanted MPs to be paid. Chartists also wanted all constituencies to be equal in size and they wanted voting to be by secret ballot.

The first Chartist rally was held in Manchester in 1838. In 1839 the Chartists delivered a petition to parliament, which was rejected out of hand. Another petition delivered in 1842 was also rejected. Finally in 1848 another great petition was sent

NOTES

to parliament but, it turned into a farce. Some of the signatures were obvious fakes.

Chartism then fizzled out. For one thing it lacked middle class support and had no support among MPs. For another in the late 1840s conditions for the working class in Britain were improving and discontent was declining.

However, further reform did eventually follow. In 1867 most workers in the towns were given the vote and in 1872 the Ballot Act introduced voting by secret ballot. In 1884 farm labourers were given the vote.

Meanwhile in 1835 the Municipal Corporations Act reformed town governments. A uniform system of town government was formed.

1.12 WAR IN 18TH CENTURY EUROPE

Of no small concern among the major European powers in the early 1700s was their power relative to each other, and in 1702 Great Britain was alarmed at the prospect of the grandson of the King of France, Louis XIV, inheriting the Spanish throne. Great Britain, the United Netherlands, Austria and Brandenburg-Prussia united against France in what was called the War of Spanish Succession, a war from 1702 to 1713 that ended in exhaustion and a temporary settlement, signed at Utrecht in the United Netherlands.

The family of Louis XIV — the Bourbons — gained from the settlement by recognition of his grandson, Philip V, as king of Spain. But, to the pleasure of the British and their allies, the king of Spain lost territory: the Kingdom of Naples, the Duchy of Milan, and Sardinia. These lands, like the Spanish throne itself, had belonged to the Habsburg family — which had intermarried with the Bourbons — and now the Treaty of Utrecht left these lands with the Habsburgs, who were ruling from Vienna, in Austria. To the Habsburgs also went what had been called the Spanish Netherlands (around Ghent, Antwerp and Brussels). The treaty also took Sicily from Spain and gave to Vittorio (Victor) Amadeus of the House of Savoy — which won international recognition as royalty. (The Hohenzollern family, which ruled Brandenburg-Prussia, was also given international recognition as royalty.) The treaty took the island of Gibraltar from Spain and gave it to the British. And the treaty also gave the British territory in the Americas that had belonged to the French: Hudson Bay territory, Newfoundland and that part of Acadia that the British called Nova Scotia.

Meanwhile, in 1711, a Habsburg prince in Spain, Charles, had inherited Habsburg lands and also had become ruler of the Holy Roman Empire — by now little more than a titular position. Prince Charles was now Charles VI. With the Spanish throne passing to a Bourbon, he moved to Vienna, but he looked forward to the Habsburgs returning to power in Spain and all Habsburg lands remaining united under one king.

NOTES

From Austria, Charles ruled more territory than any other monarch in Europe. He ruled what had been the Spanish Netherlands, Bohemia (including Prague), Silesia, the Duchy of Milan, the Kingdom of Naples, Sardinia and, thanks to an expansion against the Ottoman Turks late in the previous century, he was also king of Hungary, Slovenia, Croatia and Transylvania.

After the settlement at Utrecht, the French viewed Austria as their nation's primary rival on the European continent. And, as a counter to France, Charles maintained his family's tie to the British, which included loans and financial debt, while the British and French enjoyed a respite from their traditional hostilities. Both nations had been exhausted by war and were in need of recuperation, and in 1715 both nations had new kings: Louis XV under a regent, and George I in Britain.

But, the British remained at odds with that other Bourbon power: Spain. The Spanish were stopping and boarding British ships suspected of trading with their territory in the Americas, the Spanish interrogating British crews and looking for goods such as indigo and cocoa and for Spanish money.

In the years just after the Treaty of Utrecht, conflict was taking place also between the Ottoman Empire and Venice. Austria joined the war against the Ottomans, and, to help the Christians against the Ottomans, Pope Clement XI equipped a Spanish fleet. Spain, instead, used the fleet to win back Sardinia and Sicily. The Austrians defeated the Ottomans near Belgrade. In mid-1718, Austria settled with the Ottomans and gained northern Bosnia, Banat, Belgrade, much of Serbia and a part of Walachia (Wallachia). Also in 1718, the British, Dutch and Austria teamed up against Spain's move. So too did the French — Bourbon against Bourbon, the French trying to expand against Spanish territory along the northern coast of the Gulf of Mexico. In 1719, Austria sent troops against the Spanish in Sicily. And Britain declared war on Spain and sank the Spanish navy.

Spain felt overwhelmed militarily and sued for peace. With the Treaty of London the major powers solidified the peace they made at Utrecht. Philip V of Spain finally recognized the loss of the Spanish Netherlands to the Habsburgs of Austria. Charles VI recognized the succession of Philip to what he had thought should be his rule in Spain. Charles was recognized as ruler over Sicily, and Vittorio (Victor) Amadeus of the House of Savoy, who had ruled Sicily, was instead given rule over Sardinia.

Also in the years between 1718 and 1721, those powers that had been involved in the Great Northern War settled their differences: Denmark, Saxony, Brandenburg-Prussia and Russia made a peace of sorts with Sweden. Europe was at peace, for awhile.

NOTES

FREDERICK WILLIAM OF BRANDENBURG-PRUSSIA

A promoter of Pietism was the ruler of Brandenburg-Prussia since 1713: Frederick William. He reinforced Lutheranism's subservience to the state and created a closer tie between his rule and the university at Halle, where Pietism dominated and where he sent his administrators for training. Frederick William saw the world as filled with sin and believed it was his duty to clean it up. Harlotry, he claimed, was the most terrible sin. He kept the devil away from his personal life by providing his wife with fourteen children and with devotion to his work, arriving at his study each morning at seven. He was also devoted to cleanliness, careful not to soil his uniform and quick to wash his hands. He disliked everything French and was devoted to frugality and the stern discipline associated with his military.

Frederick William believed in the sword more than the pen. He saw military strength as dominating international realities, and after he made peace with Sweden in 1720 (at the end of the Great Northern War) he maintained and trained an army of conscripted peasants, led exclusively by noble officers. He believed that noblemen were more inclined to act on family honor while commoners were inclined to give greater consideration to personal safety.

Like some other armies, Frederick William's military had a free-enterprise element. Military commanders were also entrepreneurs. Captured wealth went to them to divide as they pleased, and they could amass a fortune in weapons and demand compensation for these weapons when they retired.

Frederick William tried to advance his realm economically. He had spent several years with his relatives among the Dutch, learning economic advancements, but in agriculture — the most important economic activity — his kingdom remained handicapped by a soil that was more sandy than some other places in Europe. His government assumed control over the realm's economy — Frederick William hoping for more income to pay for his military. He protected domestic production with high tariffs. New industries were founded, and textile manufacturing received special government attention as a state industry. Frederick William imported sheep from Spain, and he founded a warehouse in Berlin, through which all wool had to pass. As in Germany as a whole, his kingdom remained with a smaller middleclass and less manufacturing compared to Britain or the United Netherlands. But he did achieve some efficiency in government administration, giving Brandenburg-Prussia a reputation as a highly bureaucratized state. His inspectors supervised all aspects of production to assure quality. His government offered workers in state-owned enterprises above average wages. He abolished labor guilds, and he made illegal exports of wool products a capital offense.

In the area of crime and punishment, Frederick William remained a stern conformist. He left in place various traditional punishments: branding, pinching with hot tongs, beheading, drawing and quartering, breaking on the wheel, and hanging. Infanticide was punished by sewing the offending woman into a leather bag and throwing her into a river to drown. But, he demanded the removal from public squares all stakes upon which accused witches had been burned.

NOTES

Charles VI and the War of Polish Succession

In years of peace, Austria failed to diminish its debt or advance economically, and it failed to reform its military. Charles VI was no Peter the Great. He abolished some minor trade barriers but not the bigger barriers between his various lands. He built a road between Vienna and his port at Trieste, which helped develop Austria's maritime trade, to the annoyance of Venice. But Austria's international trade would advance little because of French and British competition.

Charles did strengthen Austria in one area. He signed a defensive treaty with Russia's new ruler, Peter the Great's widow, Catherine (who ruled to 1727). The treaty was defensive -- against an attack by the Ottomans. But it was Poland that was to be the focus of concern that would lead to the next war. Monarchical succession was still a source of instability. Augustus II — ruler of Saxony and King of Poland — died in 1733. Russia (now ruled by Anne, a daughter of Peter the Great's feeble-minded half brother) joined with Austria in favoring the son of Augustus for Poland's throne. Louis XV of France favored his father-in-law, Stanislaus I, who had been king of Poland earlier in the century. And Louis' agents bribed Polish nobles in an attempt to win their support for Stanislaus.

Russians still saw Stanislaus as an old enemy, and as soon as Stanislaus arrived in Warsaw, a Russian army arrived to expel him. Polish nobles complied with Russian and Austrian wishes and elected the son of Augustus II, Augustus III, as their king. The French were enjoying a new prosperity and felt recuperated from war. They were looking to recover their old position as Europe's leading power, and in 1733 they retaliated against Austria's position on Poland by declaring war. That year they sent an army across their border into the Holy Roman Empire — to Lorraine — fighting the Austrians and others from the Holy Roman Empire, and taking the town of Kehl.

The British, still in détente with France, preferred not to intervene, ignoring their old allies on the continent. The Swedes, on the other hand, were frightened by Russia's aggression in Poland and the possibility that Russia might interfere in a monarchical succession in their country. Sweden also chose to stay out of the war. But, to defend itself better, Sweden buried its differences with Denmark, and those two kingdoms signed an alliance.

NOTES

Seeing another opportunity to win back territory in Italy, Philip V of Spain signed a "family compact" with his Bourbon relative, Louis XV, and Spain declared war against Austria. France bribed the new king of Sardinia, the son of Vittorio Amadeus II, Charles Emanuel III, and he also joined the war against Austria. In 1734, French and Spanish troops drove Austrians from the city of Naples. Charles Emanuel won a battle against the Austrians at Guastalla, near Parma in northern Italy, the Austrians losing 10,000 killed, and France recognized Charles Emanuel as ruler of the Duchy of Milan.

In 1735, Russian troops joined the Austrians fighting against the French in western Germany. The French had been urging the Ottomans to side with them against the Austrians and Russians. The Ottoman Empire was distracted by a war against its neighbor to its east: the Shiite Muslims in Iran. The Russians hoped to take advantage of this and were planning to expand to the Black Sea. And they talked the Austrians into joining them against the Ottomans, the two powers agreeing to divide the spoils equally.

In 1736, the Russians ravaged and slaughtered their way to Azov, but they were unable to live off the land devastated by the defenders. The Russians succumbed to famine and illness, and were forced to evacuate. The Austrians were also suffering — from a shortage of money and from the quality of their military commanders. In 1736, while continuing to fight against the Ottomans, Austria felt obliged to make peace with France. In an agreement with France, Austria recognized Naples and Sicily as belonging to Spain and agreed to Louis XV acquiring Lorraine. And France agreed to the Duchy of Milan being returned to Austria, Victor Emmanuel III of the House of Savoy having to be content to give up Milan and settle for nearby Novara and Tortona.

By the summer of 1737 the Ottomans were better prepared for war against the Russians and Austrians. The Russians that year captured the area around Otyakov, west of the Crimea, but then at Bender the Ottomans drove the Russians back. The Austrians were advancing in Walachia and beyond Bosnia into Serbia, and they took Nish in August. But by late October, the Ottomans were also driving back the Austrians, retaking Nish and routing the Austrians near Bucharest.

In 1738, the Russians failed to interest Christians in the Balkans in joining them against the Ottomans. Their war against the Ottomans stalled, while the Ottomans were advancing farther against the Austrians. In 1739, both Austria and Russia decided to negotiate an end to their war against the Ottomans. In this settlement, Austria returned to the Ottomans the city of Belgrade and territory south of the Sava River — territory it had won from the Ottomans in 1718. Russia was allowed to keep Azov on condition that it destroy the forts there and that it sail no ships on the Sea of Azov or the Black Sea. And the Tatars in the Crimea —

the Kabardias - were to remain an independent buffer between the Ottomans and Russia.

NOTES

Frederick the Great and the War of Austrian Succession

Frederick William of Brandenburg-Prussia trained his son, Frederick, to be a hardy soldier. But Frederick disliked rifle shooting and horseback riding. Unlike his father, he was interested in French literature. He enjoyed poetry and music and, like some others of the Enlightenment, he scoffed at religion. His father thought him soft, frivolous and unmindful of his duties. And when Frederick refused to put his signature on a Right to Succession, for a few moments his father strangled him.

In 1730, at the age of eighteen, Frederick tried running away to England. He and a friend who had helped him were caught, and Frederick's father had him tried by a court martial and sentenced to death, and he had Frederick's friend beheaded in his presence. The father threatened his son with execution if he were disobedient again. Frederick languished in prison for awhile. But by 1735, at the age of twenty-three, he had recovered from his disgrace and was serving in his father's army, fighting against the French near the Rhine during the war of Polish Succession.

Frederick William died on May 31, 1740 at the age of fifty-two, and Frederick became Frederick II. (His grandfather had been Frederick I.) Still with a bent towards the Enlightenment, Frederick allowed Christian von Wolff to return from exile. Wolff had annoyed his fellow professors of the university at Halle by his attachment to intellectual currents from France. Wolff had been interested in improving society. He had opposed torture and prosecuting people for witchcraft. He had been a hero to students at Halle, and authorities at the university supported by Frederick William had driven him into exile. But now, Wolff returned to the university in triumph and with acclaim.

Frederick began doing what he could to make his city, Berlin, a center of research, learning, art and culture. He was corresponding with Voltaire, pursuing his interest in literature, and he kept his mind on matters political. He described his rule as a sort of contract with his subjects, with himself as first servant of the state, duty bound to promote well-being and security. And seeing the world filled with others eager to expand their power, he saw, as had his father, that a strong military was vital for security.

The Outbreak of War

On October 20, 1740, Austria's Habsburg monarch and Holy Roman Emperor, Charles VI, died — after a short illness said to have been caused by eating mushrooms. Without a son to succeed him, Habsburg rule passed to his

NOTES

eldest daughter, the dutiful and religiously devout Maria Theresa, then 23, who acquired the titles of Archduchess of Austria, Queen of Bohemia and Queen of Hungary.

Europe's rulers had no fear of Frederick at this time. He was known for having been a crown prince who despised war, who loved reading and wrote bad verse and who preferred to play the flute rather than review his troops. Maria Theresa's husband, Francis Stephen, also had no fear of Frederick. He had recently attended Frederick's wedding and considered him a friend.

Frederick was aware of Austria's economic and military weakness, made more apparent during the War of Polish Succession. He decided that the time was right to expand his rule southward into Silesia, an area that would double the number of Frederick's subjects — to six million. Silesia was relatively advanced in industry, rich in agriculture and mineral wealth, and Protestant — unlike the Habsburgs who presently ruled there. It was an area that included principalities claimed by Frederick's family, the Hohenzollerns: Liegnitz, Brieg, Wohlau and Jägerndorf. Frederick believed that Silesia should be his reward for the support he planned to give Maria Theresa and for his vote, as an elector, in selecting her husband as the new Holy Roman Emperor. Frederick was seeking his reward first because he had inherited his father's distrust of Habsburg promises in exchanging favors and because he believed that the Habsburgs did not take Hohenzollern power seriously enough.

By the end of November, much of Europe was aware of Frederick's troop concentrations. French authorities sent Voltaire on a courtesy visit to report of Frederick's intentions. But Frederick refused to answer Voltaire's questions.

On December 16, Frederick asked his generals to think of "the good name of Prussia" which their forefathers had earned on the battlefield. Then he and his army marched into Silesia, and not having announced his intentions paid off. In the coming weeks he and his army took over Silesia without serious opposition.

In Vienna, Maria Theresa was aghast. Rather than accept Frederick's proposal of friendship and help, she sent troops to reconquer Silesia. A showdown battle occurred on April 10, 1741, at Mollwitz. Austria's cavalry fell apart when attempting to ride down Frederick's infantry. Frederick's troops had a five to three advantage in rapidity of fire, and they drove off the Austrian infantry. And news of Frederick's success at Mollwitz traveled across Europe, awakening all of Europe that Brandenburg-Prussia was a power to be reckoned with.

The War Broadens

French strategists were delighted to see a division between Brandenburg-Prussia and Austria. Austria's defeat at Mollwitz inspired France to seek a treaty with Fredrick. Frederick was happy to have France as an ally against Habsburg

hostility, and in signing a defensive treaty with the French he promised to cast his vote for their friend, Charles Albert of Bavaria, rather than for Francis Stephen, for emperor.

NOTES

In June, Maria Theresa was shoring up what support she could. She dressed in Hungarian attire, sailed eighty kilometers down the Danube River to Bratislava, on a ship bedecked in Hungary's national colors. When greeted by Hungarian nobles and churchmen she was a picture of dignity and simplicity. She reassured the Hungarians of their autonomy and won their support for her as their queen.

At the end of July, 1741, France's ally, Bavaria, attacked Austria at the town of Passau, and the war entered a new phase. Maria Theresa wanted support from her ally, Russia, but Russia was occupied by a threat from Sweden. Sweden was allied with France and declared war on Russia on August 4. The political party in power in Sweden, the Hats, believed that the time was right to win back from Russia the territories Sweden had lost in the Great Northern War of 1700–21.

In August, Maria Theresa returned to Bratislava and won Hungarian regiments for her armies. In September, the Russians defeated the Swedes in Finland, at Wilmanstrand, but rather than help the Austrians, the Russians would remain occupied with the Swedes in Finland. Also in September, a French and Barvarian army was pushing into Maria Theresa's Bohemia. Meanwhile Augustus III, Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, had turned his back on his former allies, Russia and Austria, and had joined the alliance of France, Bavaria and Brandenburg-Prussia. He wished to be on the winning side and was hoping for a reward of more territory. His troops from Saxony joined forces with an army of French and Bavarians, and in late November they captured Prague.

Hearing news of her loss of Prague, Maria Theresa burst into tears. She was only a little more than twenty-four years-old, pregnant with her fifth child and surrounded by elderly male advisors of questionable competence. She was outdoing them in planning and resolve, complaining that her pregnancy prevented her from mounting a horse to lead her troops.

The Year 1742

Austrian troops were withdrawn from Italy to meet challenges closer to home, and the Italian wife of Spain's King Philip, Elizabeth Farnese, who was running foreign policy, sought advantage from this and was again hoping to win back territory in Italy. In November (1741), a fleet of Spanish ships landed 14,000 men at Orbetello. And at the end of January, they landed 12,800 more at Spezia — unopposed.

Also in January, the Holy Roman Empire's electors selected Charles Albert emperor — Charles Albert becoming Charles VII. He also declared himself King of Bohemia. Maria Theresa sent troops to retake Bohemia, and, to help Charles,

NOTES

Frederick led an army, augmented by French and Saxon troops, into Maria Theresa's Moravia. He went deep into enemy territory and cursed himself for his inadequate planning and lack of provisions. His French troops left him to help in the fighting near the Rhine, and Frederick retreated to Bohemia.

Frederick's financial reserves were running out, and Britain thought it was a good time for Maria Theresa to make peace with Frederick — in order for her to better combat France and Spain. In May, Maria Theresa's army clashed with Frederick's army in Bohemia, at Chotusitz. Frederick won, and this helped persuade Maria Theresa to agree with the British. A treaty between her and Frederick was drawn, Maria Teresa agreeing to Frederick's hold on Silesia except for parts of southern Silesia called Jagerndorf and Troppau, which Frederick agreed would go to the Habsburgs.

Maria Theresa pursued her war against Spain, France and Bavaria, while Russia, in August, was taking Helsingfors (Helsinki) in Finland. Sweden capitulated, and Russia proposed an independent Finland as a buffer between it and Sweden.

Meanwhile, according to Voltaire, all Europe "had its eyes on Prague," which was now being held by 25,000 French troops, surrounded by an Austrian army of around 70,000. Civilians in the city were suffering, and the French were eating their horses. The French sent troops to the rescue, and the Austrians shifted their forces around to meet that force. Winter set in, and in mid-December around 14,000 of the French in Prague sneaked passed the Austrian lines, leaving behind their sick and wounded.

The Austrians moved into Prague and allowed France's sick and wounded to return home. The Austrians took reprisals against people in Prague suspected of having collaborated with the French. Jews were among the suspects, and Maria Theresa banished Jews from the city and from all her territories. Some others suspected of collaboration with the enemy received fines or loss of property. Some were sentenced to life imprisonment, to maiming, or to death. But Maria Theresa, being a woman of generosity and having a soft heart, commuted the death sentences.

Britain Leads an Anti-Bourbon Alliance

Great Britain had been at war with Spain since 1739 — the War of Jenkins' Ear — over the mistreatment of English seaman. The War of Jenkins' Ear was merging with the War of Austrian Succession. Britain had been technically at peace with France since 1713, but friction between the two powers still existed in the Americas and India. Britain was still aligned with Austria, and now that Maria Theresa and Frederick were at peace, Britain signed a defensive treaty with Brandenburg-Prussia, happy to keep the French and Frederick apart and to have

Frederick's good will regarding security for Hanover — which belonged to King George II. Britain also signed a defensive treaty with Russia, and in the spring of 1743 it brought the Dutch into the alliance, Britain wanting as large an alliance as possible against Spain and France.

NOTES

In April, an allied force of 20,000 British, 20,000 from the Austrian Netherlands, 16,000 from Hanover, and around 6,000 Germans from Hesse, were camped at Mainz. Before moving against French troops still in Germany, they were waiting for the arrival of their military leader from England, George II. A force from Austria was moving into Bavaria, the French withdrawing and burning villages to the ground to deprive the Austrians provisions. Munich surrendered to the Austrians in early June. King George arrived at Mainz in mid-June, and the allied force marched south, meeting and defeating the French late that month at Dettingen, the French suffering around 4,000 casualties and the allied force half that many. News of their defeat at Dettingen brought despondence to the French, while in England and Austria people rejoiced. Then King George's force, short of supplies, retreated northward to Hanau.

Great Britain hoped to split Charles VII of Bavaria from France and urged Maria Theresa to settle with Charles, and the British urged her to settle with Charles Emmanuel of the House of Savoy and Sardinia. Spain was having little success at warfare in Italy, including having lost a battle at Campo Santo. Maria Theresa ceded to Charles Emmanuel territory at her expense — Vigevano (24 kilometers southwest of Milan), Piacenza (60 kilometers southeast of Milan) and a few other places, while Charles Emmanuel agreed to recognize Maria Theresa's rule in the Duchy of Milan. The British, Charles Emmanuel and Maria Theresa agreed that if the Bourbons were defeated, the Habsburgs would regain the kingdom of Naples and the House of Savoy would regain Sicily. The agreement was signed in September, in the town of Worms, on the Rhine River, and became known as the Treaty of Worms.

France responded by signing a treaty with Spain — the Treaty of Fontainebleau. France declared war on Charles Emmanuel of the House of Savoy, and France chose all out war against Great Britain. France prepared to invade Britain and looked forward to a rising of Catholics there and toward returning a Catholic Stuart to the British throne. On March 7, 1744, a gale tore apart the French fleet in the English Channel, and the French dropped their plans to invade. But they formally declared war on both Great Britain and Hanover. And in May they formally declared war on Austria.

Frederick Chooses More War

None of this was too tedious for Frederick. He was alarmed over the Treaty of Worms not having recognized his hold on Silesia. He believed that Maria Theresa

NOTES

did not really accept his hold on Silesia and that George of England-Hanover disliked him. He feared Maria Theresa's husband, Francis Stephen, becoming emperor in place of Charles VII. He disliked the shift of August III of Saxony and Poland back to the side of Austria. His solution: side with the French against Austria. In June 1744 Frederick and the French struck another agreement, the French hoping that pressure from Frederick would force Austria to withdraw troops from Italy. The French agreed to attack Austria along the Danube River and to keep Hanover in check, and Frederick agreed to attack in the direction of Vienna.

Frederick carefully planned his move toward Vienna, among other things increasing his military to 140,000 men. In August he led 80,000 of these men across the frontier into Bohemia, his first major target being Prague. The reaction in Austria was outrage, with Frederick's ambassador there having to be protected from angry crowds. The British were mortified and pledged more money to Austria. And Saxony promised Austria 20,000 of its soldiers.

Frederick and his army captured Prague in mid-September, Frederick seeing his cousin's head blown away by an Austrian artillery shell. Then Frederick pushed farther south, and the going became tougher. Rather than France helping Frederick as he had expected, France was giving priority to fights along the Rhine. A combined Austrian and Saxon force of 75,000 outnumbered Frederick's army. And, in December, Frederick retreated back to home territory, his invasion a failure. More or less 25 per cent of his troops had been lost, many having died of dysentery. His reputation was diminished, and he was angry at the French, believing that they had let him down.

Austria and Brandenburg-Prussia Settle Again

In Munich, in January 1745, Charles VII died, and the coming elections to replace Charles as emperor looked good for Francis Stephen, with many of the electors, including George of Hanover and Maria Theresa, supporting his candidacy.

In May, the French defeated an allied force, including Dutchmen, in the Austrian Netherlands at Fontenoy. And other successes soon followed, at Tournai and Ghent. In June, Frederick defeated an Austrian attack in Silesia, at Hohenfriedberg (a little to the west of Mollwitz). In June, George was facing a rebellion in Britain: the Jacobite rebellion, which was hoping for help from the French. Britain withdrew forces from the Austrian Netherlands and mobilized 30,000 troops against the rebellion.

In late August, Britain and Frederick signed an agreement, George II winning assurance from Frederick that he would respect the territorial integrity of Hanover

and support the candidacy of Francis Stephen as emperor, and Frederick winning Britain's support for his one big interest: an end to war that left him with Silesia.

In September, Francis Stephen was elected emperor. Maria Theresa was still reluctant to give up Silesia, but Frederick defeated her army at Soor. And in December, Frederick defeated the Saxons near Dresden. Then Maria Theresa gave in again to British pressure. On Christmas Day, Austria signed the Treaty of Dresden, Austria recognizing Silesia as belonging to the Hohenzollerns, and Frederick recognizing Francis Stephen as Holy Roman Emperor and the right of all Habsburg lands to remain under the rule of one Habsburg monarch. Frederick also agreed to return to Augustus III all territory that had been his, in exchange for a large payment of money (one million crowns).

NOTES

For Frederick the war of Austrian Succession was over, but Austria was still at war with France and Spain, the Austrians losing Milan to the Spanish in December.

The Final Years, from 1746 to 1748

In March, 1746, Austria's ally, the Sardinians, surprised the French force that had been stationed at Asti (100 kilometers southwest of Milan) the French surrendering without resistance. Ten days later, the Spaniards evacuated Milan. Then King Philip of Spain died and was succeeded by a son by his first marriage, Ferdinand VI, who was less interested than his mother-in-law, Elizabeth Farnese, in Italy and more interested in peace.

In July 1747, the Sardinians and French fought in mountainous territory around 200 kilometers southwest of Milan — the Battle of Assietta — where the French were slaughtered trying to ascend a ridge, losing a quarter of their troops in one day — a total of 5,300 casualties and perhaps 3,700 dead. The war in this area dwindled to a series of small, cross-border raids, while in the Netherlands the French advanced into Dutch territory, overrunning Bergen-op-Zoom in September.

By the second half of 1747 the British blockade of French ports was hurting the French. The British public had been elated by victories at sea against the French and the Spanish but it had become disillusioned by the expense of the war and the elusiveness of a decisive victory. War weariness and depleted finances was making all of the belligerents more interested in peace. In January, 1748, Austria and France met to end to their war. In April, the British and French representatives met to settle their differences. In October, Britain, France, Spain and the Dutch signed the Treaty of Aix-la-Chappel, Austria and Sardinia adding their signatures in November. The treaty confirmed Brandenburg-Prussia's hold on Silesia. France agreed to the Habsburgs regaining their Netherlands. And the British agreed to return areas in the Americas and India to the French.

NOTES

THE SEVEN YEARS' WAR

With Europe's major powers having settled their differences, Voltaire, Montesquieu and some other intellectuals became optimistic about the nations of Europe getting along with each other. In 1751, Voltaire described Europe (excluding that controlled by the Ottoman Turks) as "a sort of great republic." The kingdoms of Europe, he wrote, had "the same principles of public and political law unknown in other parts of the world" and were bent on "maintaining among themselves as far as possible an equal balance of power."

If there was a balance of power in Europe it was not an effective instrument in maintaining peace. War was still not dreaded enough to adequately motivate compromise and harmony. Military action was still viewed more than economic development as a means to well-being. In European civilization there was still no international law to which all the powers felt obliged to adhere. And not all powers would endure in taking seriously the recent agreements that ended the last great war.

Among the British, more war with the French seemed likely over their differences in the Americas. The English politician, William Pitt the Elder — not yet prime minister — was thinking that conflict with France in the Americas would eventually be settled through war in Europe, and he advocated the maintenance of military pacts with dependable allies.

Renewed conflict between Britain and France erupted in the Ohio Valley in 1754 — to be known as the French and Indian War. In early 1755, troops left Britain and crossed the Atlantic. In late April, troops from France embarked for the Americas, and in early June the British attacked the French ships carrying these troops. It had been seven years since the British public was tired of war, but now they were again eager for war against the French.

Maria Theresa still saw Silesia as rightly belonging to her, and she believed it should be Catholic in faith. She saw the return of war between Britain and France as an opportunity. She suggested to Britain that she would support Britain's war against France only if Britain supported her against Frederick. Instead, King George II of Britain, who was concerned about his territory in Hanover, signed a defensive treaty with Frederick — the Treaty of Westminster — to discourage the French from attacking Hanover. Frederick of Brandenburg-Prussia hoped that with this alliance, Britain's other ally, Russia, would diminish in animosity towards him. The treaty would instead make Hanover less secure, and increase Russian hostility toward Frederick.

Austria was shaken by Britain's agreement with Frederick. Maria Theresa's foreign minister urged her to forget the 250-year-old feud between the Bourbons of France and her Habsburg family and ally herself with France. Wielding some

power in France was Madame Pompadour, who was hostile toward Frederick, sparked by his insult to her. She had sent Frederick greetings through Voltaire. Frederick and Voltaire had a falling out and an angry Voltaire had returned to France, describing Frederick as a homosexual and telling Madame Pompadour that when he had passed along her greeting to Frederick, Frederick had responded by saying "I don't know this woman."

NOTES

France, at any rate, was ready to take advantage of the falling out between Britain and Austria. French strategists interpreted recent British aggressions against them on the high seas and in the Americas as stemming from the certainty of assistance from its treaty with Brandenburg-Prussia. And they were ready to accommodate Austria with an alliance.

Russia also felt threatened by the treaty between Britain and Brandenburg-Prussia. The ruler of Russia since 1741 was Peter the Great's daughter, Elizabeth, who had also been the target of Frederick's insults — Frederick having described her, according to rumors, as a superstitious and indolent voluptuary. Elizabeth was unhappy about Frederick having territory alongside Poland and unhappy about his possessing Silesia. In April 1756, her ministry suggested to Austria that Frederick's Prussia be partitioned, with Silesia and Glatz (Kladsko) going to Austria, East Prussia going to Poland, and Courland (just north of East Prussia) going to Russia.

On May 1, 1756, France and Austria signed an alliance that was ostensibly defensive — the First Treaty of Versailles. It was recognized that Austria was to remain neutral regarding France's war against Britain, and Austria had France's acceptance of Austria's attack on Brandenburg-Prussia. Russia joined this alliance — upsetting its traditional hostility towards France. And the new alliance between Madame Pompadour of France, Maria Theresa of Austria and Elizabeth of Russia became known as the League of the Three Petticoats.

The Fighting Begins

This time Frederick was not the aggressor. He did not want war, but he believed that to defend himself he should move first. He sent 11,000 men to Pomerania to guard against Sweden joining the war to take back that area, and he sent 26,000 men to his frontier with Russia. Then, on August 29, 1756, with an army of 70,000, Frederick and his army crossed into Saxony — which had been conspiring with the League of Three Petticoats. Frederick had learned from the last war that it was dangerous to leave a hostile Saxony on his border while fighting others, and he did not want to commit that mistake twice. On September 10, Frederick and his army took the Saxon capital, Dresden, and defeated Saxons were ordered into Frederick's army — the forced recruitment typical of those times.

NOTES

THE WAR TO ITS CONCLUSION IN 1763

The object of warfare among the Europeans at this time was not to force a showdown against the enemy. Showdowns were considered too risky and too costly. The preferred strategy was to outmaneuver the enemy army, to prevent the enemy army from acquiring adequate supplies, including food, and to force it to retreat. Nevertheless, on October 1, Austria's army and Frederick's met on October 1, at Lobositz, just south of Saxony. On that day the two sides exchanged artillery fire and cavalry charges followed by a clash of their infantries. Each side lost about 3,000 men, killed and wounded, with indecisive results: Maria Theresa's army managed an orderly withdrawal from the battlefield, and Frederick's army returned to Saxony to wait out the winter.

In March 1757, Sweden joined the war against Brandenburg-Prussia — despite Frederick's sister being Queen of Sweden. In early May, Frederick's forces began maneuvering against Austria's forces in Bohemia, and on May 5 the two armies met just outside the city of Prague. The fighting lasted two hours, with Frederick losing 11,740 killed and wounded and 1560 as prisoners — about 21 percent of his army's strength. The Austrians lost about as many and retreated behind Prague's walls.

On May 17, 1757, a Russian army of 85,000 advanced against Königsberg in East Prussia. And that spring the French crossed the Rhine River and overran Hanover. In November, Frederick defeated a French army at Rossbach, just south of Leipzig in Saxony, and a month later he defeated the Austrians at Leuthen, in Silesia.

In 1758, William Pitt the Elder, now leader of a coalition government, began to give more active aid to Brandenburg-Prussia, while Frederick was surrounded by advancing enemies: Sweden from the north, Russia advancing across East Prussia, and the Austrians coming at him from the south. France was distracted by a ground war in America, where it was hoping to stave off defeat while winning in Europe — while Britain was hoping to win in America and just hold on in Europe. And Austria was distracted by new threats from the Ottoman Empire.

In 1759, Frederick still had 150,000 in the field, but they were slower in loading and firing their rifles compared to his troops at the start of the war. His ability to maneuver was also reduced and his cavalry weaker. And in August, at the Battle of Kunersdorf, he lost half of his force of 43,000 men against a combined force of Russians and Austrians, who together lost 15,700. Fortunately for Frederick, however, the Russians and Austrians failed to pursue Frederick's defeated force.

In 1760, all the belligerents were again hurting enough from war that again all of them wanted peace — except for Great Britain. That year the British were

NOTES

tightening their noose around the French in Canada. In October, while Frederick and his army were under pressure in Saxony, a combined force of Russians and Austrians occupied and looted Berlin. Then, hearing that Fredrick and his army were on their way, they fled. Also in October, George II died. The new king, George III, cared little about Hanover, and British subsidies to Frederick were discontinued.

Late in 1760, Frederick was drawn into battle against the Austrians in Saxony, at Torgau, where he won the battle but lost 30 percent of his force of 44,000. In 1761 the British defeated the French in India, while France's army in Germany was marching around, occasionally confronting the enemy and gaining nothing. That year, Frederick was moving rapidly between the Russians and Austrians, striking here and there, trying to keep the Russian and Austrian armies from joining, and by the end of 1761 Frederick was exhausted.

Russian armies around the Pomeranian seaport of Colberg had failed to take the city but had reduced it to starvation, and they took up winter quarters in Pomerania. Frederick withdrew into an entrenched camp in Silesia, where his enemies refused to risk an attack. Then Frederick was blessed by good luck. On January 5, Russia's empress, Elizabeth, died. She was succeeded by Peter III, a 33-year-old grandson of Peter the Great on his mother's side, who saw himself as German, disliked Russia and was a great admirer of Frederick. On February 23 he declared an end to the war against Frederick. In Brandenburg-Prussia it was seen as a miracle (to be remembered during World War II — the miracle that Goebbels and Hitler had in mind when Franklin Roosevelt died in 1945.) Peter put Russia's armies on the side of Brandenburg-Prussia. Making former allies into enemies and former enemies into allies in the middle of a war was awkward. But for Sweden it was an opportunity to abandon a war from which they had lost hope of gains, and on May 22 the Swedes made peace with Frederick.

On June 28 a military coup overthrew Peter III and placed his wife, Catherine II, on the throne, and she declared Russia's neutrality. Maria Theresa, suffering from the loss of Russia as an ally and receiving little help from France, was also ready for negotiations. Also her military was exhausted and she was without money. She saw no hope in defeating Frederick and sent him representatives to discuss an end to the war.

By now the war had also impoverished Great Britain's treasury, and Britain's political leaders saw the time as right to negotiate. On February 10, 1763, Britain, Spain and France signed the Treaty of Paris, and on February 15, Austria and Brandenburg-Prussia signed the Peace of Hubertusburg.

Frederick had successfully defended his hold on Silesia, but Austria had gained nothing. France lost all of its possessions in the Americas to the British — except for some small islands in the Caribbean and on the St. Lawrence River. To

NOTES

the British it also lost its African colony by the Senegal River, and it agreed to pull out of India. The royal French government was also deeply in debt, which would contribute to a coming revolution. And the debt of the government of King George III of Britain would also to lead to conflict — over taxation in his American colonies.

1.13 IRELAND FROM 1782 TO 1800

For nearly a century after the last conquest of Ireland, under William the Third, that unhappy country was quiescent with the apathy of exhaustion, misery, and despair. In Elizabeth's reign the native Celts had been hunted like wild beasts: their faith had been proscribed; their lands had been largely confiscated. Great further land robberies were perpetrated in the days of James the First, his son Charles, Cromwell, and William the Third. In one quarter alone, Ulster, the Protestant "plantation" of Scottish and English settlers, formed by James the First, was there any real prosperity.

After the surrender of Limerick in 1691, the treaty which promised religious freedom to the Catholics was grossly violated, and they were made subject to the action of severe "penal laws", passed in the Irish parliament, an assembly composed of Protestant lords, and of members returned for boroughs controlled by the crown or by patrons or by close corporations, and for counties dominated in election affairs by great proprietors of land. Catholics were not permitted to keep school; to go beyond seas, or to send others thither, for education in the Romish religion. Intermarriage with Protestants was disallowed, in case of the possession of an estate in Ireland. Children of mixed marriages were always to be brought up in the Protestant faith.

A "Papist" could not be guardian to any child, nor hold land, nor possess arms. He could not hold a commission in the army or navy, or be a private soldier. No Catholic could hold any office of honour or emolument in the state, or be a member of any corporation, or vote for members of the Commons, or, if he were a peer, sit or vote in the Lords. Almost all these personal disabilities were equally enforced by law against any Protestant who married a Catholic wife. It was a felony, with transportation, to teach the Catholic religion, and treason, as a capital offence, to convert a Protestant to the Catholic faith. The legislation devised for the Irish Catholics in that evil time was described by Burke as "a machine as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man".

The legislation against Irish industries had its origin in the narrow and selfish spirit of commercial monopoly in England which had devised the Navigation Acts against the carrying trade of the Dutch, and was displayed by her in commercial dealings with her "plantations" and colonies in the seventeenth and

NOTES

eighteenth centuries. Irish manufactures and trade were openly suppressed and extirpated. In the reign of Charles the Second, Irish land was chiefly used for pasture, and Irish wealth was derived from the export of cattle, meat, butter and cheese to western English ports. The English landowners complained, and laws of 1665 and 1680 prohibited the importation of all this Irish produce into England. Her trade with the colonies was ruined by legislation which forbade exports thither save in English ships, or imports thence except with first unlading in English harbours.

When the Irish landowners were prevented from exporting their cattle to England, they raised large flocks of sheep and began a manufacture in wool. English jealousy was again aroused, and in 1699 Irish woollens were excluded from the English and all foreign markets. Thousands of workmen left Ulster for America and the Continent, and the country was once more reduced to penury, when the people were thrown for sustenance entirely upon the land. The linens of Ireland, and some manufactures in cotton, were also shut out from the English markets by heavy duties. The trade in beer and malt was heavily taxed, and, under George the Second, severe restrictions were laid on Irish manufactures in glass, paper, velvet, hats, and other articles. The breaking up of land from pasture into arable was restricted by legislation, and disastrous famines arose from time to time in the failure to grow sufficient corn.

The political position of the country was that, under the laws procured by Lord-deputy Poynings in 1495, the Irish parliament was subject to the privy-council in England, and, by later legislation, to the British parliament at Westminster. By the middle of the eighteenth century much relaxation had arisen in applying the laws against religion, but the faith of the great majority of the Irish people was illegal, and there was no repeal of the persecuting statutes. In the early part of George the Third's reign, the Irish parliament began to show some signs of an independent spirit.

In 1768 the Commons rejected a money bill "because it did not take its rise in that House", and parliaments in Ireland became octennial, instead of the Commons being chosen for the duration of each reign. Henry Grattan succeeded Flood as the advocate of legislative independence, and England's difficulty of war with her American colonies and with European powers gave Ireland her opportunity. In 1778, the British parliament, on Irish demands, gave some relief to Irish trade, and changes were made in the penal code against the Catholics. They could now hold their property on the same terms as Protestants, and in 1782 they were enabled to acquire freeholds for lives or by inheritance, to open schools, and to educate their youth in literature and religion.

In 1779 the British government, in dread of invasion, had desired to raise a Protestant militia in Ireland, but there were no funds for their payment, and

NOTES

volunteer corps arose, for part of whom the ruling powers provided arms. Eighty thousand men, all Protestants, were soon enrolled, the Catholics being permitted only to subscribe towards the expenses. It was this volunteer movement which led to the brief legislative independence of Ireland that existed from 1782 till 1800.

Early in the former year the famous Convention of Dungannon was held. This was a meeting of the Protestant leaders of the Ulster volunteers, and after long debate they passed a resolution that " The claim of any body of men, other than the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland, to make laws to bind that kingdom is unconstitutional, illegal, and a grievance". A second resolution was that "We hold the right of private judgment in matters of religion to be equally sacred in others as in ourselves. We rejoice in the relaxation of the penal laws against our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, and we conceive this measure to be fraught with the happiest consequences to the union and prosperity of the inhabitants of Ireland". The men who passed these resolutions had arms in their hands, and were not to be trifled with. In April, 1782, the Irish parliament carried a Declaration of Rights, demanding legislative independence, and Great Britain was forced to come to terms. The legislative and judicial authority of the British parliament was renounced: the right of the privy-council to alter bills transmitted from Ireland was abandoned, and Ireland, for eighteen years, had an independent legislature, and occupied a constitutional position like that of Scotland before the Union of 1707.

This Irish Parliament was, however, from the first a foredoomed failure. Not merely was it purely Protestant, while four-fifths of the Irish people were Catholics, but it did not properly represent even the Protestant minority. Of the 300 members of this Irish House of Commons only 72 were really returned by the Protestant voters, while 123 sat for nomination boroughs, and represented only their patrons. Fifty-three peers directly appointed these "legislators", and could also ensure, by their influence, the election of ten others. Fifty commoners also nominated ninety-one members, and controlled the election of four others. As a representative assembly it was, therefore, a farce more ridiculous even than the British House of Commons prior to 1832. It was, in other ways, a grossly corrupt body, and the government in England influenced its debates and votes by wholesale and unblushing bribery.

The changes needed, in order to turn it into a really representative and useful body, were a thorough franchise reform and Catholic emancipation. For these changes, in those days, it was hopeless to strive, and the last state of the Irish parliament was worse than the first. Pitt, an enlightened statesman placed in a very difficult position between the promptings of his own judgment and the prejudices of his chief supporters, including those of a monarch now half insane,

strove to give more freedom to Irish trade. His efforts failed in both Parliaments, and matters drifted on towards the legislative union of the two countries. In 1793, the Irish Catholics obtained the right of voting for Protestant members, but they could not sit in parliament, and George the Third, from scruples which he supposed to affect his coronation oath, declined to grant full political emancipation.

NOTES

The national life of Ireland, deprived of an outlet in Parliament, sought relief in various forms of secret and open organization. The "Whiteboys" and other violent men who met in dark places and wrought corresponding deeds, had long been at work against the payment of rent and tithe. As the end of the century drew near, the revolutionary spirit of France produced its effect in Ireland, and in July, 1790, the "Society of United Irishmen", organized by Wolfe Tone and Hamilton Rowan, was formed at Belfast. This body included men of both religions, and proclaimed "an identity of interests and a communion of rights" for all Irishmen.

The successes of the French republicans so far alarmed the British government that, in 1793, the Irish Catholics, besides receiving the electoral franchise, were allowed to become barristers, attorneys, freemen of corporations, grand jurors, and magistrates, and to attain the rank of colonel in the army. The country was in a welter of confusion and trouble. The intelligent and leading Catholics were conciliated by the policy of concession, but bigots on both sides had formed hostile associations, and in 1795 open war was being waged in pitched battle between the Catholic "Defenders" and the Protestant "Peep-of-day Boys" of Ulster. Then came the formation of "Orange" lodges by the Protestants, in strong opposition to Catholic claims.

Early in 1795 Lord Fitzwilliam, a distinguished Whig statesman, an avowed and warm supporter of Catholic emancipation, had arrived in Dublin as viceroy. Many Catholic petitions were presented, asking admission to Parliament, and large numbers of Protestants were in favour of the measure. Then the viceroy, after a reply expressing his sympathy with the Catholics, was suddenly recalled, and this step has been held to have greatly conduced to the subsequent rebellion. The "United Irishmen", largely composed of Presbyterians, now became a secret society, and adopted republican views, aiming at revolution, and separation from Great Britain, instead of merely the reforms which they had vainly striven to obtain.

An alliance with France was sought, and the Directory sent an armament, under their famous young general, Lazare Hoche, in 1796. The hostile fleet was dispersed by a storm, and the enterprise was abandoned. Excessive punishment followed this failure in Irish rebellion. The Catholics in Ulster had already been driven by thousands from their homes, and Lord Gosford, the governor of Armagh, declared that " neither age nor sex, nor even acknowledged innocence of any

NOTES

misconduct, is sufficient to excite mercy, much less to afford protection. The only crime with which the objects of this ruthless persecution are charged is simply a profession of the Roman Catholic religion". Before the attempted French invasion, the Irish parliament had passed two Coercion Acts, giving large powers of arrest to magistrates on mere suspicion. The Habeas Corpus Act was suspended; martial law was proclaimed; and the country was placed in a state of siege.

After the failure of Hoche's expedition the Irish Catholics were delivered over to the tender mercies of the "Orange" yeomanry and of militia regiments from England. The grossest outrages were rife, including methods of torture called "half-hanging", "pitch-capping", and "picketing". "Half-hanging" consisted in stringing up the victim, cutting him down, and allowing him to struggle back to life again. "Pitch-capping" meant the pouring of hot pitch on the head, allowing it to cool, and then roughly tearing off the "cap" thus formed, bringing with it the hair and portions of the scalp. The fearful device of "picketing" placed the bare soles of the tortured man on pegs driven into the ground, with their pointed ends uppermost. His whole weight was thus supported on a most sensitive part, and exquisite pain was caused.

The gallant Scottish soldier, Sir Ralph Abercrombie, was appointed to the command of the army in Ireland in December, 1796, and in one of his letters he declares that "here (in Ireland) every crime, every cruelty that could be committed by Cossacks or Calmucks has been committed by the troops". He issued a general order, severely rebuking the "licentiousness which must render the troops formidable to every one but the enemy", and he stoutly refused to withdraw this order at the request of the viceroy, Lord Camden. Within four months he resigned his command to General Lake, being unable to check excesses, and resolved not to play the part of an executioner.

The Irish Catholics were goaded by these horrors into premature and unsuccessful revolt. In March, 1798, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, one of their leaders, died of wounds received in his desperate resistance to arrest in Dublin. In May, detached risings took place, chiefly in the counties of Wexford and Wicklow, and the rebels at first gained some successes over the troops. Enniscorthy and Wexford were taken, and cruel massacres of Protestants occurred. After repulse from New Ross and Arklow, the insurgents were finally and decisively defeated by General Lake at Vinegar Hill, near Enniscorthy, on June 21st. This event was followed by an exciting episode, not very creditable to the rulers of Ireland and their instruments.

In August three frigates, under English colours, dropped anchor in Killala Bay, county Mayo. About eleven hundred Frenchmen, with two guns, under General Humbert, landed. Killala and Ballina were taken, and the invaders were joined by some fourteen hundred Irishmen. With this small force Humbert

NOTES

advanced on Castlebar, which was held by about four thousand yeomanry and militia, in the bad state of discipline denounced, as we have seen, by Abercrombie. Humbert showed much skill, took the British in flank and drove them away in disgraceful rout, which amply fulfilled Abercrombie's prophecy as to the probable value of lawless troops in action. General Lake was in command, and he left behind him all the artillery, ammunition, and small arms. The fleeing troops scarcely halted until they reached Athlone, eighty miles from the field. They there encountered the viceroy, Lord Cornwallis, and so ended what the Irish called "the Races of Castlebar".

A brave resistance was made at Castlebar, when the French occupied the town, only by a small body of Highlanders, who scorned to flee rather than fight. The Irish Republic was proclaimed by the French victors and their friends; but there could, of course, be no hope of ultimate success against the large British forces in Ireland. On leaving Castlebar for Sligo, Humbert found his march followed or watched by bodies of men, with Lake, General Moore (afterwards Sir John, the hero of Corunna), and Cornwallis in command. He defeated, in a fierce battle, the Limerick militia who faced him forty miles north-east of Castlebar, but was at last surrounded by an overwhelming force, and, after a resistance made for honour's sake, the French general was driven to lay down his arms less than nine hundred Frenchmen thus becoming prisoners to above thirty thousand foes on or near the scene.

The suppression of the rebellion of 1798 was followed by severities so brutal that the viceroy, Lord Cornwallis, wrote: "There is no law either in town or country but martial law. Numberless murders are committed by our people without any process or examination whatever"; and again, in April, 1799, when all danger of further outbreaks had long ceased, Cornwallis denounced the system of free quarters for the troops, "which comprehended universal rape and robbery throughout the whole country". Later still, he declared that the "violence of our loyal friends" (the Orangemen) was such as would, if not checked with the strictest hand, become "a more violent and intolerable tyranny than that of Robespierre".

In this terrible condition of affairs it appeared to Pitt that a legislative union of the two countries was the one policy which afforded a prospect of restored and lasting peace. This policy he adopted, with the full intention of granting therewith full political rights to the Catholics of both Ireland and Great Britain by admitting them to seats in the legislature, and removing all disabilities which now placed them in a position inferior to that of their Protestant fellow-subjects. His beneficent intentions in this respect were frustrated by the obstinate refusal of the king, and the measure was thus deprived of that quality which would have commended it with great force to the feelings of the Irish Catholics who formed the bulk of the nation. The immorality of the inevitable means employed in Ireland in order to

NOTES

effect the Union has been denounced by some of its strongest supporters as an existing fact, men who stoutly oppose its repeal. The Irish Orangeman and Unionist, Mr. Lecky, declares "the Union, as it was carried", to be "a crime of the deepest turpitude a crime which, by imposing, with every circumstance of infamy, a new form of government on a reluctant and protesting nation, has vitiated the whole course of Irish opinion".

What is certain is, that Castlereagh, the Chief Secretary chosen by Pitt to carry out the work, spent over a million sterling in buying out the owners of "rotten" or "nominee" boroughs which were disfranchised under the Act. In spite of the destruction of a large part of the correspondence, the clearest evidence exists of military intimidation, of the bribery of the Irish press and the Irish bar, and of the forcible suppression of public meetings called to protest against the measure. The bill was at last carried through the Irish parliament, and on the first day of the nineteenth century the Act came into force. One hundred Irish members now sat in the House of Commons, and the Irish peerage was represented by four bishops, and by twenty-eight lay peers, chosen for life. Irish trade was admitted to a free career, with undoubted benefit to the country, and her share of contribution to the imperial revenue was placed at two-fifteenths, far below the proportion due to population, and reckoned in accordance with her degree of national resources. Thus, came into political existence "The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland", and the addition of the diagonal cross of St. Patrick, red on a white ground, completed the union flag in its existing form.

1.14 INDIA UNDER CORNWALLIS AND WELLESLEY

British General Charles Cornwallis, the 2nd Earl Cornwallis, was appointed in February 1786 to serve as both Commander-in-Chief of British India and Governor of the Presidency of Fort William, also known as the Bengal Presidency. Based in Calcutta, he oversaw the consolidation of British control over much of peninsular India, setting the stage for the British Raj. He was also instrumental in enacting administrative and legal reforms that fundamentally altered civil administration and land management practices in India. According to historian Jerry Dupont, Cornwallis was responsible for "laying the foundation for British rule throughout India and setting standards for the services, courts, and revenue collection that remained remarkably unaltered almost to the end of the British era."

He was raised to the title of Marquess Cornwallis in 1792 as recognition for his performance in the Third Anglo-Mysore War, in which he extracted significant concessions from the Mysorean ruler, Tipu Sultan. He returned to England in 1793, and was subsequently engaged in a variety of administrative and diplomatic postings until 1798, when he was posted to the Kingdom of Ireland as Lord

Lieutenant and Commander-in-Chief, similar to his leadership posts in India. After returning from Ireland in 1801, he was again posted to India. He arrived in July 1805, and died the same October in Ghazipur. Cornwallis was buried at Ghazipur, and is memorialized throughout India.

NOTES

Background

Lord Charles Cornwallis was a British army officer, civil administrator, and diplomat. His early career was primarily military in nature, including a series of well-known campaigns during the War of American Independence from 1776 to 1781 that culminated in his surrender at Yorktown. Following his return to England in 1782 he was prevented by his parole from further participation in the war, and financial demands eventually caused him to seek a position of greater pay than the half-pay that military officers received when not in service.

India in the 1780s

The area encompassed by modern India was significantly fractured following the decline of the Mughal Empire in the first half of the 18th century. European colonial outposts, from countries including Denmark, Portugal, France, and the Dutch Republic, dotted both the Coromandel (east) and Malabar (west) coasts of the subcontinent, although many of these had been established with the formal permission of a local ruler (which was sometimes secured by force of arms). The Kingdom of Travancore dominated the southern tip, the Kingdom of Mysore held sway over the center of the peninsula, and the Maratha Empire, a confederation of loosely allied principalities, dominated the northern reaches from Calcutta to Bombay. Although there were significant British presences at Bombay and Madras, each governed by a separate presidency, the Bengal region, including Calcutta, had come under the direct rule of the British East India Company in 1757, with authority to levy taxes, and its presidency dominated the others. Its civil head, the Governor-General of Fort William, ranked ahead of those of Madras and Bombay.

British colonial administration was dominated in the 1760s and 1770s by Warren Hastings, the first man to hold the title of Governor-General. The military arm of the East India Company was directed during the Seven Years' War and the Second Anglo-Mysore War by General Eyre Coote, who died in 1783 during the later stages of the war with Mysore. Company policy, as implemented by Hastings, had involved the company in intrigues and shifting alliances involving France, Mysore, the Marathas, and factions within those and other local territories.

Appointment

Cornwallis was first considered for a posting to India during the ministry of the Earl of Shelburne in the spring of 1782. Shelburne asked Cornwallis if he

NOTES

wanted to go to India as governor general, an idea Cornwallis viewed with favor, as it provided employment without risking his parole status. However, Shelburne was a weak leader, and was turned out of power in early 1783, replaced by a coalition government dominated by men Cornwallis (and King George) disliked, Charles James Fox and Lord North. Cornwallis, who normally avoided politics (in spite of holding a seat in the House of Lords), became more vocal in opposition to the Fox-North ministry, hoping his support would be repaid by the next government.

> "Much against my will, and with grief of heart, I have been obliged to say yes, and to exchange a life of ease and content, to encounter all the plagues and miseries of command an public station."

With the ascendancy of William Pitt the Younger to power in December 1783, doors to new positions were opened to the earl. Pitt first offered him the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland, which he politely refused. He also made it clear that, were he posted to India, he would want the supreme military command in addition to civil control. When informed that Pitt was agreeable to this demand, he went through a period of soul-searching, torn between the conflicting demands of family and country. This, however, was not the only troubling issue. When Parliament took up consideration of assignments in India in August 1784, it was only prepared to offer one of the two posts, which he again refused to consider. Passed over for other military postings, Pitt placated him with the post of Constable of the Tower.

After refusing another inadequate entreaty from Pitt to take a post in India in February 1785, Cornwallis's demand for both posts were finally met a year later, on 23 February 1786. Departing London in May, he arrived at Madras on 22 August 1786, after "a most prosperous and expeditious passage", and at Calcutta on 12 September. Although he was accorded a welcome suitable to his rank, the acting governor-general, John Macpherson, was unhappy at being replaced. He attempted to reserve for his own use the Government House, which was normally reserved for the governor-general. Cornwallis, after having his oaths of office administered, immediately announced his intention to occupy the residence.

Administrative Reforms

Cornwallis was charged by the directors of the British East India Company to overhaul and reform its administration in India. The company had historically paid its functionaries (revenue collectors, traders, and administrators) in India relatively little, but allowed them to engage in trade for themselves, including the use of company shipping for the purpose. As long as the company was profitable, this open door to corruption and graft at the company's expense was overlooked. However, the rise of manufacturing in Britain led to a collapse of prices for textiles

and other goods from India, and the company's involvement in wars on the subcontinent had also been expensive. By the time Cornwallis arrived the company was losing money. Its employees, however, continued to profit personally, without caring whether or not the company made money. Cornwallis sought to change this practice, first by refusing to engage in such dealing himself, and second, by securing pay increases for the company's functionaries while denying them their personal trading privileges.

Another area of reform that Cornwallis implemented was the reduction of nepotism and political favoritism as means for advancement and positions within the company. Seeking instead to advance the company's interests, he sought out and promoted individuals on the basis of merit, even refusing requests by the Prince of Wales to assist individuals in the latter's good graces.

Judicial Reforms

Prior to the earl's arrival, judicial and police powers in territories controlled by the company were a confusion of differing standards that were also either inconsistently or arbitrarily applied. Part of Cornwallis's work was the introduction of criminal and judicial regulations that to a significant degree still underpin the Indian judicial system.

Indian cities, much like British cities of the time, were poorly policed, and crime was widespread. Different penal and civil codes were applied to Hindus and Muslims, and the codification of these codes in different languages meant that it was virtually impossible for justice to be properly and consistently applied. Much of the criminal justice system in Bengal remained in the hands of the nawab, the nominal local ruler of the company's territory. Furthermore, individuals with powerful political connections in their community often were able to act with impunity, since no one suffering at their hands was likely to press charges for fear of retribution. Hastings had several times made changes to policing and the administration of justice, but none of these had a significant impact on the problem.

Cornwallis received critical assistance from others in his effort to introduce legal reforms. William Jones, an expert on languages, translated existing Hindu and Muslim penal codes into English so that they could be evaluated and applied by English-speaking judges. Cornwallis began in 1787 by giving limited criminal judicial powers to the company's revenue collectors, who already also served as civil magistrates. He also required them to report regularly on detention times and sentences given. In 1790 the company took over the administration of justice from the nawab, and Cornwallis introduced a system of circuit courts with a superior court that met in Calcutta and had the power of review over circuit court decisions. Judges were drawn from the company's European employees.

NOTES

These reforms also included changes to the penal codes to begin harmonizing the different codes then in use. By the time of his departure in 1793 his work on the penal code, known in India as the Cornwallis Code, was substantially complete.

One consequence of the Cornwallis Code was that it, in effect, institutionalized racism in the legal system. Cornwallis, in a manner not uncommon at the time, believed that well-bred gentlemen of European extraction were superior to others, including those that were the product of mixed relationships in India. Of the latter, he wrote "as on account of their colour and extraction they are considered in this country as inferior to Europeans, I am of opinion that those of them who possess the best abilities could not command that authority and respect which is necessary in the due discharge of the duty of an officer." In 1791 he issued an order that "No person, the son of a Native Indian, shall hence forward be appointed by this Court to Employment in the Civil, Military, or Marine Service of the Company." Cornwallis's biographers, the Wickwires, also observe that this institutionalization of the British as an elite class simply added another layer on top of the complex status hierarchy of caste and religion that existed in India at the time. Cornwallis could not have formalized these policies without the (tacit or explicit) agreement of the company's directors and employees.

Cornwallis's attituted toward the lower classes did, however, include a benevolent and somewhat paternalistic desire to improve their condition. He introduced legislation to protect native weavers who were sometimes forced into working at starvation wages by unscrupulous company employees, outlawed child slavery, and established in 1791 a Sanskrit college for Hindus that is now the Government Sanskrit College in Benares. He also established a mint in Calcutta that, in addition to benefiting the poor by providing a reliable standard currency, was a forerunner India's modern currency.

The Permanent Settlement

The Company's acquisition of the territories of Bengal in the 1760s led to its decisions to collect taxes in the area as a means of reducing investment capital directed toward India. A variety of taxation schemes were implemented in the following years, none of which produced satisfactory results, and many of which left too much power over the natives in the hands of the tax collectors, or zamindars. The company's directors gave Cornwallis the task of coming up with a taxation scheme that would meet the company's objectives without being an undue burden on the working men of its territories.

John Shore (who went on to succeed Cornwallis as Governor-General) and Charles Grant, two men he came to trust implicitly, were the most important contributors to what is now called the Permanent Settlement. The essence of the arrangement they came up within the summer of 1789 was that the zamindars

NOTES

would effectively become hereditary landholders, paying the company tax based on the value of the land. Shore and Cornwallis disagreed on the term of the scheme, with Shore arguing for a ten-year time limit on the arrangement, while Cornwallis argued for a truly permanent scheme. Cornwallis prevailed, noting that many of the company's English revenue collectors, as well as others knowledgeable of company finance and taxation, supported permanency. In 1790 the proposal was sent to London, where the company directors approved the plan in 1792. Cornwallis began implementing the regulations in 1793.

Critics of the Permanent Settlement objected to its permanency, claimed that the company was forgoing revenue, and that Cornwallis and others advocating it misunderstood the historic nature of the zamindars. The Wickwires note that Cornwallis relied extensively on advice not only from John Shore, who had extensive experience in India prior to Cornwallis's arrival, but also from the revenue collectors in the various districts, who were almost uniformly in favor of a permanent settlement with the zamindars. He was also clear on the need to protect the ryots (land tenants) from the excesses of the zamindars, writing, "It is immaterial to government what individual possessed the land, provided he cultivates it, protects the ryots, and pays the public revenue."

War with Mysore

Immediately after the signing of the Treaty of Mangalore in 1784, ending the Second Anglo-Mysore War, Tipu Sultan, the ruler of the Kingdom of Mysore, restated his hatred for the British, declaring that he would seek to renew conflict with them. Cornwallis, upon his arrival in India, took steps to modify or abrogate agreements with the Maratha Empire and with the Nizam of Hyderabad (both of whom had territories on Mysore's northern border) that he saw as problematic with respect to the provisions of the 1784 treaty. He did assure them that if France became involved in conflict against their territories that the company would assist them. Pursuant to this policy, he refused to send company troops to assist the Marathas and the Nizam in their war with Mysore to recover previously lost territories.

Early Campaigns

Tensions between Tipu and the Nizam and the British were raised when, in 1788, the East India Company gained control over the Circar of Guntur, the southernmost of the Northern Circars, pursuant to an earlier agreement with the Nizam. In exchange, the company agreed to station some of its troops with the Hyderabadi army. By 1789, tensions between Tipu and his neighbors and vassals to Mysore's west, including the Kingdom of Travancore, also rose noticeably. Travancore, listed in the 1784 treaty as a British ally, acquired from the Dutch East India Company two forts located within the territory of Cochin, a Mysorean

NOTES

vassal state. The Dutch had never paid tribute to anyone for these forts since gaining control of them, but the fact that they were within Cochin's bounds was sufficient for Tipu to dispute Travancore's claim. He began massing troops at Coimbatore and making threatening gestures toward Dharma Raja of Travancore. British authorities in Madras warned Tipu that acts of aggression against Travancore would be met with a British response, and Cornwallis began urging John Hollond, the governor of Madras, to begin military preparations. On December 29, 1789, Tipu attacked Travancore's defenses. Hollond, however, was not a military man, and rather than acting with vigor, he temporized and attempted negotiation with Tipu. He was replaced in early 1790 by General William Medows, to whom Cornwallis gave the authority for a military campaign against Mysore. Cornwallis began negotiating with the Marathas and the Nizam for their support, since the British forces in India were significantly lacking in cavalry, one of Tipu's strengths. The Marathas and the Nizam both had significant cavalry forces, and they were interested in recovering territories lost to Mysore in earlier conflicts. However, they were too weak to attack Mysore individually, and did not trust each other, so they preferred to wait until it was clear the British were committed to act against Mysore.

Medows' campaign in 1790 was a limited success. He occupied the Coimbatore district against minimal opposition, but a forceful counterattack by Tipu reduced the British holdings to Coimbatore itself and a few other outposts. Tipu had also descended to the coastal plain, where he plowed through the Carnatic and even met with the French at Pondicherry in a fruitless attempt to draw them into the conflict. By September 1790 the British allies were taking the field, but still did not want to face Tipu's strong force without significant British support. Consequently, Cornwallis decided to personally take control of the main British force from Medows. In early February 1791 he began a campaign that was squarely targeted at Mysore's capital, Seringapatam.

First Campaign against Seringapatam

One of the largest issues confronting Cornwallis in managing the army was its diversity. In addition to British Army and East India Company European forces, there were German troops from Hanover, and a large number of native sepoys from a diversity of cultural backgrounds, speaking different languages and having varied religious and dietary requirements. In order to meet the needs of this patchwork of forces, the army was followed by a number of camp followers that was unusually large by comparison to typical European or North American armies, further increasing the need for reliable supply. The army he took over from General Medows had 15,000 troops and 60,000 camp followers. He permitted the artist Robert Home to accompany the army on its campaign; the resulting artwork is one of the legacies of the campaign.

NOTES

Cornwallis was sensitive to the fact that Tipu was likely to deny the invading army access to local forage and provisions, and made arrangements for a large supply of provisions, and arranged for the use of elephants to assist in the movement of the army's siege equipment. He also encouraged the Marathas and the Nizam to step up their advances to join his army as quickly as possible, so that he could take advantage of their cavalry.

Cornwallis departed Velhout, near Madras, on 5 February, reaching Vellore on 11 February. After several days of rest, the army set out with the apparent intention of crossing the Eastern Ghats directly west of Vellore. However, this was a feint, and Cornwallis turned the army north, and instead crossed the mountains at Muglee. Tipu, who had taken steps to defend the more southerly passes, had not defended this one, and the army met no resistance. In fact, it met no significant resistance until it neared Bangalore, one of the strongest fortresses in eastern Mysore. On 5 March, Colonel John Floyd, leader of the British cavalry, was lured into a trap set by Tipu that cost the army 70 men and 250 valuable horses. Cornwallis brushed off the loss, and proceeded to besiege Bangalore. On 7 March the city's walls were breached, and the city was stormed through the opening, sending its defenders scurrying. Cornwallis gained control of the whole city except its fortress, which was stormed on the night of 21 March after its walls were breached. Tipu, from his camps outside the city, offered only weak resistance, ineffectually attempting to impede the siege works and assist the besieged fortress during the final assault.

After securing Bangalore, Cornwallis began to move against Tipu, who retreated toward Seringapatam. The lack of cavalry, however, hampered the British effort, so Cornwallis ordered the army north to make junction with the nizam's troops. When they finally met about 60 miles (97 km) from Bangalore, Cornwallis described Teige Wunt's cavalry as "extremely defective in almost every point of military discipline", and their presence in the army ultimately presented more difficulties than assistance. Instead of acting as flanking companies and foraging on their own, they preferred to remain with the main army and consume its provisions. This forced Cornwallis to alter the army's route again to join with a supply train carrying additional provisions. The army returned to Bangalore on 28 April, and then set out for Seringapatam.

The march was significantly slowed by early monsoon rains that turned the march into a muddy mess. In spite of appeals by Cornwallis to Teige Wunt, the nizam's men continued to consume provisions, and the army's provisions began to run short. Tipu retreated before the army, employing scorched earth tactics to deny his enemy provisions. Baggage was left behind as draft animals died, and the army, including its officers, were on half rations. The rains flooded the Kaveri River, which was difficult to cross even under favorable conditions,

NOTES

and which separated the army from a British force under Robert Abercromby that was waiting on the far side of Seringapatam for Cornwallis's arrival.

On 13 May, near the village of Arakere, about 10 miles (16 km) below Seringapatam, Tipu decided to offer battle from a position on nearby heights. In the ensuing battle, complicated by the rains, Cornwallis prevailed, routing Tipu's forces, which retreated into Seringapatam. Following the battle, Cornwallis made the difficult decision to retreat, as the army's supply situation had become so desperate that a siege would have been impossible, even if he could have joined with Abercromby's troops. A hoped-for junction with Marathan troops also seemed unlikely, as Tipu had successfully prevented communication and intelligence of their position from reaching Cornwallis, and the most recent reports placed them some distance off. After ordering Abercromby to retreat on 21 May, Cornwallis ordered his siege train destroyed, and began to retreat toward Bangalore on 26 May. That very day, he was met by an advance company of the Marathan army. The Marathan army was well-provisioned, so they were able to relieve some of the British army's stresses, although the prices they charged for their provisions were exorbitant. The combined army reached Bangalore on 11 July. Tipu took advantage of the retreat to make a concerted attack on Coimbatore, which fell after a lengthy siege in November.

Second Campaign against Seringapatam

The armies of Purseram Bhow and Teige Wunt then left the grand army to pursue territorial gains in Mysore's northern territories. Cornwallis spent the remainder of 1791 securing his supply lines to Madras, and clearing the way to Seringapatam. To this end he laid siege to Nundydroog in November and Savendroog in December, both of which fell after unexpectedly modest efforts. He also ordered a massive supply operation to ensure that adequate supplies and pay for his army and those of the allies would be available. Spies were sent to infiltrate Tipu's camps, and he began to receive more reliable reports of the latter's troop strengths and disposition.

The relation between Cornwallis and the allies were difficult. The Mahrattan military leaders, Purseram Bhow and Hurry Punt, had to be bribed to stay with the army, and Cornwallis reported the Hyderabadi forces to be more of a hindrance than a help; one British observer wrote that they were a "disorderly rabble" and "not very creditable to the state of military discipline at Hyderabad."

On 25 January, Cornwallis moved from Savendroog toward Seringapatam, while Abercromby again advanced from the Malabar coast. Although Tipu's men harassed the column, they did not impede its progress, and it reached the Mysorean capital on 5 February. Cornwallis established a chain of outposts to protect the

NOTES

supply line from Bangalore, and planned an attack for that night, even though Abercromby had not yet arrived. Cornwallis responded with a night-time attack to dislodge Tipu from his lines. After a somewhat confused battle, Tipu's forces were flanked, he retreated into the city, and Cornwallis began siege operations. On 12 February Abercromby arrived with the Bombay army, and the noose began to tighten around Tipu. By 23 February, Tipu began making overtures for peace talks, and hostilities were suspended the next day when he agreed to preliminary terms.

Among the preliminary terms that Cornwallis insisted on was the Tipu surrender two of his sons as hostages as a guarantee for his execution of the agreed terms. On 26 February his two young sons were formally delivered to Cornwallis amid great ceremony and gun salutes by both sides. Cornwallis, who was not interested in significantly extending the company's territory, or in turning most of Mysore over to the Mahrattas and Hyderabad, negotiated a division of one half of Mysorean territory, to be divided by the allies, in which the company's acquisition would improve its defenses. He later wrote, "If we had taken Seringapatam and killed Tippoo, [...] we must either have given that capital to the Marattas (a dangerous boon) or have set up some miserable pageant of our own, to be supported by the Company's troops and treasures, and to be plundered by its servants." The territories taken deprived Mysore of much of its coastline; Mysore was also obligated to pay some of the allied war costs. On 18 March 1792 Tipu agreed to the terms and signed the Treaty of Seringapatam, ending hostilities.

Departure

The difficulties of the military campaigns took a great physical toll on Cornwallis, and he sought to return to England. John Shore, his replacement, did not arrive until March 1793, and Cornwallis remained until August to assist in the transition. He also oversaw the capture of the French outpost at Pondicherry following the arrival of news that war had again broken out in Europe. On 14 August 1793, without ceremony, he quietly sailed from Calcutta for Madras, and on 10 October he finally sailed for England on board the Swallow.

After India

On his return to England, Cornwallis was immediately asked to return to India. One reform that Cornwallis had been unable to achieve was the harmonization of pay and rank between the military forces of the company and those of the Crown. Company officers of a given rank were generally paid better than those of a comparable rank in the Crown forces, and proposals to merge their pay scales were met with resistance that bordered on mutiny. The company directors asked Cornwallis to deal with this; he refused.

NOTES

After serving for several years as the Master of the Ordnance, he was asked by Prime Minister William Pitt the Younger to serve as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland as well as its Commander-in-Chief after the Irish Rebellion of 1798 broke out. While the rebellion was mostly put down before his arrival, he oversaw the mopping of the remaining pockets of rebellion, and successfully defeated a French invasion intended to foment further rebellious activity. He then worked to secure the passage by the Irish Parliament of the 1800 Act of Union, which joined the Kingdom of Ireland and the Kingdom of Great Britain into the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. He resigned his posts when the king refused to support Catholic emancipation, which he viewed as a key element for securing an enduring peace in Ireland.

He was then engaged by the king in diplomatic efforts in Europe. Cornwallis led the British diplomatic team whose negotiations with Napoleon resulted in the 1802 Treaty of Amiens, with Cornwallis signing the treaty on behalf of King George.

Return to India

In the years since he left India, the company's reach and control over the country had increased significantly, mainly under the governorship of Lord Mornington. Wellesley had decisively defeated Tipu in 1799, and gained control, direct and indirect, over most of southern India. In 1803 the company came into conflict with the Marathas, and Mornington began extending the company's reach further into the northern territories. His liberal spending and aggressive methods for dealing with the Marathas were not appreciated by the company's directors, and following military setbacks in 1804 and allegations of improprieties, the directors decided to replace him.

On 7 January 1805 Cornwallis was again appointed to the positions of Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of India; he reached Madras on 19 July, and on 30 July he resumed his duties. William Hickey wrote that Cornwallis had become "a wreck of what he had been when formerly in Bengal", and another aide noted that "his constitution was less equal to contend against the effects of this climate". In spite of declining health and mental faculties, Cornwallis began a trip by boat to visit army outposts northwest of Calcutta.

On the journey he wrote to General Gerard Lake, then commanding the forces in the war with the Marathas, insisting that peace be made. However, he never received Lake's answer. When Cornwallis reached Ghazipur on 27 September, he was too ill to proceed further, and he died there a week later, on 5 October 1805.

NOTES

Mornington seems to have caught Pitt's large political spirit in the period 1793 to 1797. That both had consciously formed the design of acquiring a great empire in India to compensate for the loss of the American colonies is not proved; but the rivalry with France, which in Europe placed Britain at the head of coalition after coalition against the French republic and empire, made Mornington's rule in India an epoch of enormous and rapid extension of British power. Robert Clive won and Warren Hastings consolidated the British ascendancy in India, but Mornington extended it into an empire. On the voyage outwards, he formed the design of annihilating French influence in the Deccan.

Soon after his landing, in April 1798, he learned that an alliance was being negotiated between Tipu Sultan and the French republic. Mornington resolved to anticipate the action of the enemy, and ordered preparations for war. The first step was to effect the disbandment of the French troops entertained by the Nizam of Hyderabad.

The invasion of Mysore followed in February 1799, and the campaign was brought to a swift conclusion by the capture of Seringapatam on 4 May 1799 and the killing of Tippoo Sultan. In 1803, the restoration of the Peshwa proved the prelude to the Mahratta war against Sindh and the raja of Berar, in which his brother Arthur took a leading rôle. The result of these wars and of the treaties which followed them was that French influence in India was extinguished, that forty million people and ten millions of revenue were added to the British dominions, and that the powers of the Maratha and all other princes were so reduced that Britain became the true dominant authority over all India. He found the East India Company a trading body, but left it an imperial power. He was an excellent administrator, and picked two of his talented brothers for his staff: Arthur was his military adviser, and Henry was his personal secretary. He founded Fort William College, a training centre intended for those who would be involved in governing India. In connection with this college, he established the governor-general's office, to which civilians who had shown talent at the college were transferred, in order that they might learn something of the highest statesmanship in the immediate service of their chief. A free-trader like Pitt, he endeavoured to remove some of the restrictions on the trade between Britain and India.

Both the commercial policy of Wellesley and his educational projects brought him into hostility with the court of directors, and he more than once tendered his resignation, which, however, public necessities led him to postpone till the autumn of 1805. He reached England just in time to see Pitt before his death. He had been created a Peer of Great Britain in 1797, and in 1799 became Marquess Wellesley in the Peerage of Ireland. He formed an enormous collection of over 2,500 painted miniatures in the Company style of Indian natural history.

NOTES

1.15 SUMMARY

- From the late 18th century Britain was transformed by the industrial revolution. Until then most people lived in the countryside and made their living from farming. By the mid 19th century most people in Britain lived in towns and made their living from mining or manufacturing industries.
- In the mid 18th century the population of Britain was about 6 1/2 million. In the late 18th century it grew rapidly and by 1801 it was over 9 million.
- During the 18th century agriculture was gradually transformed by an agricultural revolution. Until 1701 seed was sown by hand. In that year Jethro Tull invented a seed drill, which sowed seed in straight lines. He also invented a horse drawn hoe which hoed the land and destroyed weed between rows of crops.
- During the 18th century agriculture was gradually transformed by an agricultural revolution. Until 1701 seed was sown by hand. In that year Jethro Tull invented a seed drill, which sowed seed in straight lines. He also invented a horse drawn hoe which hoed the land and destroyed weed between rows of crops.
- George III was born on 4 June 1738 in London, the eldest son of Frederick, Prince of Wales, and Princess Augusta of Saxe-Gotha.
- Shelburne concluded the final peace negotiations at the Treaty of Versailles (1783) which ended all European and American hostilities.
- The early 19th century was an era of political and social unrest in Britain. In the early 19th century a group of Evangelical Christians called the Clapham Sect were active in politics. They campaigned for an end to slavery and cruel sports. They gained their name because so many of them lived in Clapham.
- Then on 11 May 1812 a man named John Bellingham shot Tory prime minister Spencer Perceval. He was the only British prime minister ever to be assassinated.
- Great Britain had been at war with Spain since 1739 — the War of Jenkins' Ear — over the mistreatment of English seaman. The War of Jenkins' Ear was merging with the War of Austrian Succession. Britain had been technically at peace with France since 1713, but friction between the two powers still existed in the Americas and India. Britain was still aligned with Austria, and now that Maria Theresa and Frederick were at peace, Britain signed a defensive treaty with Brandenburg-Prussia, happy to keep the French and Frederick apart and to have Frederick's good will regarding security for Hanover — which belonged to King George II.

- Wellesely was an excellent administrator, and picked two of his talented brothers for his staff: Arthur was his military adviser, and Henry was his personal secretary. He founded Fort William College, a training centre intended for those who would be involved in governing India. In connection with this college, he established the governor-general's office, to which civilians who had shown talent at the college were transferred, in order that they might learn something of the highest statesmanship in the immediate service of their chief.

1.16 REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What was the historical background of industrial revolution in England?
2. Discuss the education and transport system of 18th century England.
3. State the role of William Wilberforce in slave trade abolition.
4. Describe the origin of whigs.
5. What were the achievements of Cornwallis?
6. Discuss the condition of India under Wellesely.

1.17 FURTHER READINGS

- Andrew Marr, ***A History of Modern***, Publisher: Macmillan (17 May 2007).
- Padmaja Ashok, ***The Social History of England***, Publisher : Orient Blackswan, 2011.
- Thomas Babington Macaulay and Hugh Trevor-Roper, ***The History of England***, Publisher: Penguin Classics (April 26, 1979).

NOTES

CHAPTER– 2

ENGLAND IN THE BEGINNING OF 19TH CENTURY

STRUCTURE

2.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After studying the chapter, students will be able to :

- state the important phases of Napoleonic Wars (1803-1815);
- understand the effects of industrial revolution of England;
- explain the condition of transport, highways and education in 19th century England;
- discuss the significant dimensions of canada and American War of 1812;
- state the history of revolution of 19th century in England (Peterloo and Cato Street).

NOTES

2.2 INTRODUCTION

During the 19th century Britain was transformed by the industrial revolution. In 1801, at the time of the first census, only about 20% of the population lived in towns. By 1851 the figure had risen to over 50%. By 1881 about two thirds of the population lived in towns.

Furthermore in 1801 the majority of the population still worked in agriculture or related industries. Most goods were made by hand and very many craftsmen worked on their own with perhaps a labourer and an apprentice. By the late 19th century factories were common and most goods were made by machine.

2.3 NAPOLEONIC WARS (1803-1815)

The Napoleonic Wars were a series of conflicts declared against Napoleon's French Empire by opposing coalitions that ran from 1803 to 1815. As a continuation of the wars sparked by the French Revolution of 1789, they revolutionized European armies and played out on an unprecedented scale, mainly due to the application of modern mass conscription. French power rose quickly as Napoleon's armies conquered much of Europe but collapsed rapidly after France's disastrous invasion of Russia in 1812. Napoleon's empire ultimately suffered complete military defeat resulting in the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy in France. The wars resulted in the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire and sowed the seeds of nascent nationalism in Germany and Italy that would lead to the two nations' consolidation later in the century. Meanwhile, the global Spanish Empire began to unravel as French occupation of Spain weakened Spain's hold over its colonies, providing an opening for nationalist revolutions in Spanish America. As a direct result of the Napoleonic wars, the British Empire became the foremost world power for the next century, thus beginning Pax Britannica.

No consensus exists as to when the French Revolutionary Wars ended and the Napoleonic Wars began. An early candidate is 9 November 1799, when Bonaparte seized power in France with the coup of 18 Brumaire. 18 May 1803 is the most commonly used date, as this was when a renewed declaration of war between Britain and France (resulting from the collapse of the Treaty of Amiens), ended the only period of general peace in Europe between 1792 and 1814. The latest proposed date is 2 December 1804, when Napoleon crowned himself Emperor. The Napoleonic Wars ended following Napoleon's final defeat at Waterloo on 18 June 1815 and the Second Treaty of Paris.

Background 1789–1802

The French Revolution of 1789 had a significant impact throughout Europe, which only increased with the arrest of King Louis XVI of France in 1792 and his

NOTES

execution in January 1793 for "crimes of tyranny" against the French people. The first attempt to crush the French Republic came in 1793 when Austria, the Kingdom of Sardinia, the Kingdom of Naples, Prussia, Spain and the Kingdom of Great Britain formed the First Coalition. French measures, including general conscription (levée en masse), military reform, and total war, contributed to the defeat of the First Coalition, despite the civil war occurring in France. The war ended when General Napoleon Bonaparte forced the Austrians to accept his terms in the Treaty of Campo Formio. Only Great Britain remained diplomatically opposed to the French Republic.

The Second Coalition was formed in 1798 by Austria, Great Britain, the Kingdom of Naples, the Ottoman Empire, Papal States, Portugal, Russia, Sweden and other states. During the War of the Second Coalition, the French Republic suffered from corruption and internal division under the Directory. France also lacked funds, and no longer had the services of Lazare Carnot, the war minister who had guided it to successive victories following extensive reforms during the early 1790s. Bonaparte, the main architect of victory in the last years of the First Coalition, had gone to campaign in Egypt. Missing two of its most important military figures from the previous conflict, the Republic suffered successive defeats against revitalized enemies whom British financial support brought back into the war.

Bonaparte returned from Egypt to France on 23 August 1799, and seized control of the French government on 9 November 1799 in the coup of 18 Brumaire, replacing the Directory with the Consulate. He reorganized the French military and created a reserve army positioned to support campaigns either on the Rhine or in Italy. On all fronts, French advances caught the Austrians off guard and knocked Russia out of the war. In Italy, Bonaparte won a notable victory against the Austrians at Marengo in 1800, but the decisive win came on the Rhine at Hohenlinden later that year. The defeated Austrians left the conflict after the Treaty of Lunéville (9 February 1801), forcing Britain to sign the "peace of Amiens" with France. Thus the Second Coalition ended in another French triumph. However, the United Kingdom remained an important influence on the continental powers in encouraging their resistance to France. London had brought the Second Coalition together through subsidies, and Bonaparte realized that without either defeating the British or signing a treaty with them he could not achieve complete peace.

Start Date and Nomenclature

No consensus exists as to when the French Revolutionary Wars ended and the Napoleonic Wars began. Possible dates include 9 November 1799, when Bonaparte seized power in France; 18 May 1803, when Britain and France ended

NOTES

the only period of peace in Europe between 1792 and 1814, and 2 December 1804, when Bonaparte crowned himself Emperor.

Sources in the UK occasionally refer to the nearly continuous period of warfare from 1792 to 1815 as the Great French War, or as the final phase of the Anglo-French Second Hundred Years' War, spanning the period 1689 to 1815.

War Between Britain and France, 1803–1814

Unlike its many coalition partners, Britain remained at war throughout the period of the Napoleonic Wars. Protected by naval supremacy (in the words of Admiral Jervis to the House of Lords "I do not say, my Lords, that the French will not come. I say only they will not come by sea"), the United Kingdom maintained low-intensity land warfare on a global scale for over a decade. The British Army provided long-term support to the Spanish rebellion in the Peninsular War of 1808–1814, assisted by Spanish guerilla ('little war') tactics. Anglo-Portuguese forces under Arthur Wellesley campaigned successfully against the French armies, eventually driving them from Spain and invading southern France. By 1815, the British Army would play the central role in the final defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo.

The Treaty of Amiens (25 March 1802) resulted in peace between the UK and France, but satisfied neither side. Both parties dishonoured parts of it: the French intervened in Swiss civil strife (Stecklikrieg) and occupied several coastal cities in Italy, while the UK occupied Malta. Bonaparte tried to exploit the brief peace at sea to restore French colonial rule in Haiti. The expedition, though initially successful, would soon turn to a disaster, with the French commander and Bonaparte's brother-in-law, Charles Leclerc, dying of yellow fever and almost his entire force destroyed by the disease combined with the fierce attacks by the rebels.

Hostilities between Britain and France renewed on 18 May 1803. The Coalition's war aims changed over the course of the conflict: a general desire to restore the French monarchy became closely linked to the struggle to stop Bonaparte.

Bonaparte declared France an Empire on 18 May 1804 and crowned himself Emperor at Notre-Dame on 2 December.

Previous wars had seen France lose most of its colonial empire. Haiti had won its independence, the Louisiana Territory had been sold to the United States of America, and British naval superiority threatened any potential for France to establish colonies outside Europe. Beyond minor naval actions against British imperial interests, the Napoleonic Wars were much less global in scope than preceding conflicts such as Seven Years' War which historians would term a "world war".

NOTES

In 1806, Napoleon issued the series of Berlin Decrees, which brought into effect the Continental System. This policy aimed to eliminate the threat from Britain by closing French-controlled territory to its trade. Britain maintained a standing army of just 220,000 at the height of the Napoleonic Wars, whereas France's strength peaked at over 2,500,000, as well as several hundred thousand national guardsmen that Napoleon could draft into the military if necessary; however, British subsidies paid for a large proportion of the soldiers deployed by other coalition powers, peaking at about 450,000 in 1813. The Royal Navy effectively disrupted France's extra-continental trade — both by seizing and threatening French shipping and by seizing French colonial possessions — but could do nothing about France's trade with the major continental economies and posed little threat to French territory in Europe. Also, France's population and agricultural capacity far outstripped that of Britain. However, Britain had the greatest industrial capacity in Europe, and its mastery of the seas allowed it to build up considerable economic strength through trade. That sufficed to ensure that France could never consolidate its control over Europe in peace. However, many in the French government believed that cutting Britain off from the Continent would end its economic influence over Europe and isolate it.

War of the Third Coalition 1805

As Britain was gathering the Third Coalition against France, Napoleon planned an invasion of Great Britain, and massed 180,000 effectives at Boulogne. However, in order to mount his invasion, he needed to achieve naval superiority — or at least to pull the British fleet away from the English Channel. A complex plan to distract the British by threatening their possessions in the West Indies failed when a Franco-Spanish fleet under Admiral Villeneuve turned back after an indecisive action off Cape Finisterre on 22 July 1805. The Royal Navy blockaded Villeneuve in Cádiz until he left for Naples on 19 October; the British squadron subsequently caught and defeated his fleet in the Battle of Trafalgar on 21 October (the British commander, Lord Nelson, died in the battle). Napoleon would never again have the opportunity to challenge the British at sea. By this time, however, Napoleon had already all but abandoned plans to invade England, and had again turned his attention to enemies on the Continent. The French army left Boulogne and moved towards Austria.

In April 1805, the United Kingdom and Russia signed a treaty with the aim of removing the French from the Batavian Republic (roughly present-day Netherlands) and the Swiss Confederation (Switzerland). Austria joined the alliance after the annexation of Genoa and the proclamation of Napoleon as King of Italy on 17 March 1805. Sweden, which had already agreed to lease Swedish Pomerania

NOTES

as a military base for British troops against France, formally entered the coalition on 9 August.

The Austrians began the war by invading Bavaria with an army of about 70,000 under Karl Mack von Leiberich, and the French army marched out from Boulogne in late July 1805 to confront them. At Ulm (25 September – 20 October) Napoleon surrounded Mack's army, forcing its surrender without significant losses. With the main Austrian army north of the Alps defeated (another army under Archduke Charles manoeuvred inconclusively against André Masséna's French army in Italy), Napoleon occupied Vienna. Far from his supply lines, he faced a larger Austro-Russian army under the command of Mikhail Kutuzov, with the Emperor Alexander I of Russia personally present. On 2 December, Napoleon crushed the joint Austro-Russian army in Moravia at Austerlitz (usually considered his greatest victory). He inflicted a total of 25,000 casualties on a numerically superior enemy army while sustaining fewer than 7,000 in his own force.

Austria signed the Treaty of Pressburg (26 December 1805) and left the Coalition. The Treaty required the Austrians to give up Venetia to the French-dominated Kingdom of Italy and the Tyrol to Bavaria.

With the withdrawal of Austria from the war, stalemate ensued. Napoleon's army had a record of continuous unbroken victories on land, but the full force of the Russian army had not yet come into play.

War of the Fourth Coalition 1806–1807

Within months of the collapse of the Third Coalition, the Fourth Coalition (1806–07) against France was formed by Prussia, Russia, Saxony, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. In July 1806, Napoleon formed the Confederation of the Rhine out of the many tiny German states which constituted the Rhineland and most other western parts of Germany. He amalgamated many of the smaller states into larger electorates, duchies and kingdoms to make the governance of non-Prussian Germany smoother. Napoleon elevated the rulers of the two largest Confederation states, Saxony and Bavaria, to the status of kings.

In August 1806, the Prussian king, Friedrich Wilhelm, III decided to go to war independently of any other great power except the distant Russia. The Russian army, an ally of Prussia, was still far away when Prussia declared war. In September, Napoleon unleashed all the French forces east of the Rhine. Napoleon himself defeated a Prussian army at Jena (14 October 1806), and Davout defeated another at Auerstädt on the same day. Some 160,000 French soldiers (increasing in number as the campaign went on) attacked Prussia, moving with such speed that they destroyed the entire Prussian army as an effective military force. Out of 250,000 troops the Prussians sustained 25,000 casualties, lost a further 150,000 prisoners 4,000 artillery pieces, and over 100,000 muskets. At Jena, Napoleon had fought

NOTES

only a detachment of the Prussian force. Auerstädt involved a single French corps defeating the bulk of the Prussian army. Napoleon entered Berlin on 27 October 1806. He visited the tomb of Frederick the Great and instructed his marshals to remove their hats there, saying, "If he were alive we wouldn't be here today". In total, Napoleon had taken only 19 days from beginning his attack on Prussia until knocking it out of the war with the capture of Berlin and the destruction of its principal armies at Jena and Auerstädt. By contrast, Prussia had fought for three years in the War of the First Coalition with little achievement.

In the next stage of the war the French drove Russian forces out of Poland and instituted a new state, the Duchy of Warsaw. Then Napoleon turned north to confront the remainder of the Russian army and to try to capture the temporary Prussian capital at Königsberg. A tactical draw at Eylau (7–8 February 1807) forced the Russians to withdraw further north. Napoleon then routed the Russian army at Friedland (14 June 1807). Following this defeat, Alexander had to make peace with Napoleon at Tilsit (7 July 1807). By September, Marshal Brune completed the occupation of Swedish Pomerania, allowing the Swedish army, however, to withdraw with all its munitions of war.

During 1807, Britain attacked Denmark and captured its fleet. The large Danish fleet could have greatly aided the French by replacing many of the ships France had lost at Trafalgar in 1805. The British attack helped bring Denmark into the war on the side of France.

At the Congress of Erfurt (September–October 1808), Napoleon and Alexander agreed that Russia should force Sweden to join the Continental System, which led to the Finnish War of 1808–09 and to the division of Sweden into two parts separated by the Gulf of Bothnia. The eastern part became the Russian Grand Duchy of Finland.

War of the Fifth Coalition 1809

The Fifth Coalition (1809) of the United Kingdom and Austria against France formed as the UK engaged in the Peninsular War against France.

Again the UK stood alone, and the sea became the major theatre of war against Napoleon's allies. During the time of the Fifth Coalition, the Royal Navy won a succession of victories in the French colonies.

On land, the Fifth Coalition attempted few extensive military endeavours. One, the Walcheren Expedition of 1809, involved a dual effort by the British Army and the Royal Navy to relieve Austrian forces under intense French pressure. It ended in disaster after the Army commander, John Pitt, 2nd Earl of Chatham, failed to capture the objective, the naval base of French-controlled Antwerp. For the most part of the years of the Fifth Coalition, British military operations on land apart from in the Iberian Peninsula remained restricted to hit-and-run

NOTES

operations executed by the Royal Navy, which dominated the sea after having beaten down almost all substantial naval opposition from France and its allies and blockading what remained of France's naval forces in heavily fortified French-controlled ports. These rapid-attack operations were aimed mostly at destroying blockaded French naval and mercantile shipping and the disruption of French supplies, communications, and military units stationed near the coasts. Often, when British allies attempted military actions within several dozen miles or so of the sea, the Royal Navy would arrive and would land troops and supplies and aid the Coalition's land forces in a concerted operation. Royal Navy ships even provided artillery support against French units when fighting strayed near enough to the coastline. However, the ability and quality of the land forces governed these operations. For example, when operating with inexperienced guerrilla forces in Spain, the Royal Navy sometimes failed to achieve its objectives simply because of the lack of manpower that the Navy's guerrilla allies had promised to supply.

Economic warfare also continued: the French Continental System against the British naval blockade of French-controlled territory. Due to military shortages and lack of organisation in French territory, many breaches of the Continental System occurred as French-dominated states engaged in illicit (though often tolerated) trade with British smugglers. Both sides entered additional conflicts in attempts to enforce their blockade; the British fought the United States in the War of 1812 (1812–15), and the French engaged in the Peninsular War (1808–14). The Iberian conflict began when Portugal continued trade with the UK despite French restrictions. When Spain failed to maintain the continental system, the uneasy Spanish alliance with France ended in all but name. French troops gradually encroached on Spanish territory until they occupied Madrid, and installed a client monarchy. This provoked an explosion of popular rebellions across Spain. Heavy British involvement soon followed.

Austria, previously an ally of France, took the opportunity to attempt to restore its imperial territories in Germany as held prior to Austerlitz. Austria achieved a number of initial victories against the thinly spread army of Marshal Berthier. Napoleon had left Berthier with only 170,000 men to defend France's entire eastern frontier (in the 1790s, 800,000 men had carried out the same task, but holding a much shorter front).

Napoleon had enjoyed easy success in Spain, retaking Madrid, defeating the Spanish and consequently forcing a withdrawal of the heavily out-numbered British army from the Iberian Peninsula (Battle of Corunna, 16 January 1809). But when he left, the guerrilla war against his forces in the countryside continued to tie down great numbers of troops. Austria's attack prevented Napoleon from successfully wrapping up operations against British forces by necessitating his departure for Austria, and he never returned to the Peninsular theatre. In his

NOTES

absence and that of his best marshals (Davout remained in the east throughout the war) the French situation in Spain deteriorated, and then became dire when Sir Arthur Wellesley arrived to take charge of British-Portuguese forces.

The Austrians drove into the Duchy of Warsaw, but suffered defeat at the Battle of Raszyn on 19 April 1809. The Polish army captured West Galicia following its earlier success.

Napoleon assumed personal command in the east and bolstered the army there for his counter-attack on Austria. After a few small battles, the well-run campaign forced the Austrians to withdraw from Bavaria, and Napoleon advanced into Austria. His hurried attempt to cross the Danube resulted in the massive Battle of Aspern-Essling (22 May 1809) — Napoleon's first significant tactical defeat. But the Austrian commander, Archduke Charles, failed to follow up on his indecisive victory, allowing Napoleon to prepare and seize Vienna in early July. He defeated the Austrians at Wagram, on 5–6 July. (It was during the middle of that battle that Marshal Bernadotte was stripped of his command after retreating contrary to Napoleon's orders. Shortly thereafter, Bernadotte took up the offer from Sweden to fill the vacant position of Crown Prince there. Later he would actively participate in wars against his former Emperor.)

The War of the Fifth Coalition ended with the Treaty of Schönbrunn (14 October 1809). In the east, only the Tyrolese rebels led by Andreas Hofer continued to fight the French-Bavarian army until finally defeated in November 1809, while in the west the Peninsular War continued.

In 1810, the French Empire reached its greatest extent. On the continent, the British and Portuguese remained restricted to the area around Lisbon (behind their impregnable lines of Torres Vedras) and to besieged Cadiz. Napoleon married Marie-Loüise, an Austrian Archduchess, with the aim of ensuring a more stable alliance with Austria and of providing the Emperor with an heir (something his first wife, Josephine, had failed to do). As well as the French Empire, Napoleon controlled the Swiss Confederation, the Confederation of the Rhine, the Duchy of Warsaw and the Kingdom of Italy. Territories allied with the French included:

- the Kingdom of Spain (under Joseph Bonaparte, Napoleon's elder brother),
- the Kingdom of Westphalia (Jérôme Bonaparte, Napoleon's younger brother),
- the Kingdom of Naples (under Joachim Murat, husband of Napoleon's sister Caroline),
- the Principality of Lucca and Piombino (under Elisa Bonaparte (Napoleon's sister) and her husband Felice Baciocchi); and Napoleon's former enemies, Prussia and Austria.

THE INVASION OF RUSSIA 1812

NOTES

The Treaty of Tilsit in 1807 resulted in the Anglo-Russian War (1807–12). Emperor Alexander I declared war on the United Kingdom after the British attack on Denmark in September 1807. British men-of-war supported the Swedish fleet during the Finnish War and had victories over the Russians in the Gulf of Finland in July 1808 and August 1809. However, the success of the Russian army on the land forced Sweden to sign peace treaties with Russia in 1809 and with France in 1810 and to join the Continental Blockade against Britain. But Franco-Russian relations became progressively worse after 1810, and the Russian war with the UK effectively ended. In April 1812, Britain, Russia and Sweden signed secret agreements directed against Napoleon.

In 1812, at the height of his power, Napoleon invaded Russia with a pan-European Grande Armée, consisting of 650,000 men (270,000 Frenchmen and many soldiers of allies or subject areas). He aimed to compel Emperor Alexander I to remain in the Continental System and to remove the imminent threat of a Russian invasion of Poland. The French forces crossed the Niemen River on 23 June 1812. Russia proclaimed a Patriotic War, while Napoleon proclaimed a Second Polish war. The Poles supplied almost 100,000 men for the invasion-force, but against their expectations, Napoleon avoided any concessions to Poland, having in mind further negotiations with Russia.

The Grande Armée marched through Russia, winning a number of relatively minor engagements and the major Battle of Smolensk on 16–18 August. However, in the same days, a part of the French Army led by Marshal Nicolas Oudinot was stopped in the Battle of Polotsk by the right wing of the Russian Army, under command of General Peter Wittgenstein. This prevented the French march on the Russian capital, Saint Petersburg; the fate of the invasion was to be decided in Moscow, where Napoleon himself led his forces.

Russians used scorched-earth tactics, and harried the Grande Armée with light Cossack cavalry. The Grande Armée did not adjust its operational methods in response. This refusal led to most of the losses of the main column of the Grande Armée, which in one case amounted to 95,000 men, including deserters, in a single week.

At the same time, the main Russian army retreated for almost three months. This constant retreat led to the unpopularity of Field Marshal Michael Andreas Barclay de Tolly and a veteran, Prince Mikhail Kutuzov, was made the new Commander-in-Chief by Tsar Alexander I. Finally, the two armies engaged in the Battle of Borodino on 7 September, in the vicinity of Moscow. The battle was the largest and bloodiest single-day action of the Napoleonic Wars, involving more than 250,000 men and resulting in at least 70,000 casualties. The French captured

the main positions on the battlefield, but failed to destroy the Russian army; logistical difficulties meant that French losses were irreplaceable, unlike Russian ones.

NOTES

Napoleon entered Moscow on 14 September, after the Russian Army retreated yet again. But by then, the Russians had largely evacuated the city and even released criminals from the prisons to inconvenience the French; furthermore, the governor, Count Fyodor Rostopchin, ordered the city to be burnt. Alexander I refused to capitulate, and the peace talks, attempted by Napoleon, failed. In October, with no sign of clear victory in sight, Napoleon began the disastrous Great Retreat from Moscow.

At the Battle of Maloyaroslavets the French tried to reach Kaluga, where they could find food and forage supplies. But the replenished Russian Army blocked the road, and Napoleon was forced to retreat the same way he had come to Moscow, through the heavily ravaged areas along the Smolensk road. In the following weeks, the Grande Armée was dealt a catastrophic blow by the onset of the Russian Winter, the lack of supplies and constant guerilla warfare by Russian peasants and irregular troops.

When the remnants of the Napoleon's army crossed the Berezina River in November, only 27,000 fit soldiers remained, with some 380,000 men dead or missing and 100,000 captured. Napoleon then left his men and returned to Paris to prepare to defence against the advancing Russians, and the campaign effectively ended on 14 December 1812, when the last enemy troops left Russia. The Russians had lost around 210,000 men, but with their shorter supply lines, they soon replenished their armies.

War of the Sixth Coalition 1812–1814

Seeing an opportunity in Napoleon's historic defeat, Prussia, Sweden, Austria, and a number of German states re-entered the war. Napoleon vowed that he would create a new army as large as the one he had sent into Russia, and quickly built up his forces in the east from 30,000 to 130,000 and eventually to 400,000. Napoleon inflicted 40,000 casualties on the Allies at Lützen (2 May 1813) and Bautzen (20–21 May 1813). Both battles involved total forces of over 250,000, making them some of the largest conflicts of the wars so far.

Meanwhile, in the Peninsular War, Arthur Wellesley renewed the Anglo-Portuguese advance into Spain just after New Year in 1812, besieging and capturing the fortified towns of Ciudad Rodrigo, Badajoz, and in the Battle of Salamanca (which was a damaging defeat to the French). As the French regrouped, the Anglo–Portuguese entered Madrid and advanced towards Burgos, before retreating all the way to Portugal when renewed French concentrations threatened to trap them. As a consequence of the Salamanca campaign, the French were forced to

end their long siege of Cadiz and to permanently evacuate the provinces of Andalusia and Asturias.

In a strategic move, Wellesley planned to move his supply base from Lisbon to Santander. The Anglo–Portuguese forces swept northwards in late May and seized Burgos. On 21 June, at Vitoria, the combined Anglo-Portuguese and Spanish armies won against Joseph Bonaparte, finally breaking French power in Spain. The French had to retreat out of the Iberian peninsula, over the Pyrenees.

NOTES

The belligerents declared an armistice from 4 June 1813 (continuing until 13 August) during which time both sides attempted to recover from the loss of approximately a quarter of a million total men in the preceding two months. During this time Coalition negotiations finally brought Austria out in open opposition to France. Two principal Austrian armies took the field, adding an additional 300,000 men to the Coalition armies in Germany. In total the Allies now had around 800,000 front-line soldiers in the German theatre, with a strategic reserve of 350,000 formed to support the frontline operations.

Napoleon succeeded in bringing the total imperial forces in the region to around 650,000—although only 250,000 came under his direct command, with another 120,000 under Nicolas Charles Oudinot and 30,000 under Davout. The remainder of imperial forces came mostly from the Confederation of the Rhine, especially Saxony and Bavaria. In addition, to the south, Murat's Kingdom of Naples and Eugène de Beauharnais's Kingdom of Italy had a total of 100,000 armed men. In Spain, another 150,000 to 200,000 French troops steadily retreated before Anglo–Portuguese forces numbering around 100,000. Thus in total, around 900,000 Frenchmen in all theatres faced around 1,800,000 Coalition soldiers (including the strategic reserve under formation in Germany). The gross figures may mislead slightly, as most of the German troops fighting on the side of the French fought at best unreliably and stood on the verge of defecting to the Allies. One can reasonably say that Napoleon could count on no more than 450,000 men in Germany—which left him outnumbered about four to one.

Following the end of the armistice, Napoleon seemed to have regained the initiative at Dresden (August 1813), where he once again defeated a numerically superior Coalition army and inflicted enormous casualties, while sustaining relatively few. However, the failures of his marshals and a slow resumption of the offensive on his part cost him any advantage that this victory might have secured. At the Battle of Leipzig in Saxony (16–19 October 1813), also called the "Battle of the Nations", 191,000 French fought more than 300,000 Allies, and the defeated French had to retreat into France. Napoleon then fought a series of battles, including the Battle of Arcis-sur-Aube, in France itself, but the overwhelming numbers of the Allies steadily forced him back. His remaining ally Denmark-Norway became isolated and fell to the coalition.

NOTES

The Allies entered Paris on 30 March 1814. During this time Napoleon fought his Six Days Campaign, in which he won multiple battles against the enemy forces advancing towards Paris. However, during this entire campaign he never managed to field more than 70,000 men against more than half a million Coalition soldiers. At the Treaty of Chaumont (9 March 1814), the Allies agreed to preserve the Coalition until Napoleon's total defeat.

Napoleon determined to fight on, even now, incapable of fathoming his massive fall from power. During the campaign he had issued a decree for 900,000 fresh conscripts, but only a fraction of these ever materialized, and Napoleon's schemes for victory eventually gave way to the reality of the hopeless situation. Napoleon abdicated on 6 April. However, occasional military actions continued in Italy, Spain, and Holland throughout the spring of 1814.

The victors exiled Napoleon to the island of Elba, and restored the French Bourbon monarchy in the person of Louis XVIII. They signed the Treaty of Fontainebleau (11 April 1814) and initiated the Congress of Vienna to redraw the map of Europe.

Gunboat War 1807–1814

Initially, Denmark-Norway declared itself neutral in the Napoleonic Wars, established a navy, and traded with both sides. But the British attacked and captured nor destroyed large portions of the Dano-Norwegian fleet in the First Battle of Copenhagen (2 April 1801), and again in the Second Battle of Copenhagen (August–September 1807). This ended Dano-Norwegian neutrality, beginning a engaged in a naval guerrilla war in which small gunboats would attack larger British ships in Danish and Norwegian waters. The Gunboat War effectively ended with a British victory at the Battle of Lyngør in 1812, involving the destruction of the last large Dano-Norwegian ship—the frigate Najaden.

War of 1812

Coinciding with the War of the Sixth Coalition but not considered part of the Napoleonic Wars by most Americans, the otherwise neutral United States, owing to various transgressions (such as impressment), by the British Royal Navy, declared war on the United Kingdom and attempted to invade British North America. The war ended in the status quo ante bellum under the Treaty of Ghent, signed on 24 December 1814, though sporadic fighting continued for several months (most notably, the Battle of New Orleans). Apart from the seizing of then-Spanish Mobile by the United States, there was negligible involvement from other participants of the broader Napoleonic War. Notably, a series of British raids, later called the Burning of Washington, would result in the burning of the White House, the Capitol, the Navy Yard, and other public buildings. The main effect of

NOTES

the War of 1812 on the wider Napoleonic Wars was to force Britain to divert troops, supplies and funds to defending Canada. This inadvertently helped Napoleon in that Britain could no longer use these troops, supplies and funds in the war against France.

War of the Seventh Coalition 1815

The Seventh Coalition (1815) pitted the United Kingdom, Russia, Prussia, Sweden, Austria, the Netherlands and a number of German states against France. The period known as the Hundred Days began after Napoleon escaped from Elba and landed at Cannes (1 March 1815). Travelling to Paris, picking up support as he went, he eventually overthrew the restored Louis XVIII. The Allies rapidly gathered their armies to meet him again. Napoleon raised 280,000 men, whom he distributed among several armies. To add to the 90,000-strong standing army, he recalled well over a quarter of a million veterans from past campaigns and issued a decree for the eventual draft of around 2.5 million new men into the French army. This faced an initial Coalition force of about 700,000—although Coalition campaign-plans provided for one million front-line soldiers, supported by around 200,000 garrison, logistics and other auxiliary personnel. The Coalition intended this force to have overwhelming numbers against the numerically inferior imperial French army—which in fact never came close to reaching Napoleon's goal of more than 2.5 million under arms.

Napoleon took about 124,000 men of the Army of the North on a pre-emptive strike against the Allies in Belgium. He intended to attack the Coalition armies before they combined, in hope of driving the British into the sea and the Prussians out of the war. His march to the frontier achieved the surprise he had planned, catching the Anglo-Dutch Army in a dispersed arrangement. The Prussians had been more wary, concentrating 3/4 of their Army in and around Ligny. The Prussians forced the Armée du Nord to fight all the day of the 15th to reach Ligny in a delaying action by the Prussian 1st Corps. He forced Prussia to fight at Ligny on 16 June 1815, and the defeated Prussians retreated in some disorder. On the same day, the left wing of the Armée du Nord, under the command of Marshal Michel Ney, succeeded in stopping any of Wellington's forces going to aid Blücher's Prussians by fighting a blocking action at Quatre Bras. Ney failed to clear the cross-roads and Wellington reinforced the position. But with the Prussian retreat, Wellington too had to retreat. He fell back to a previously reconnoitred position on an escarpment at Mont St Jean, a few miles south of the village of Waterloo.

Napoleon took the reserve of the Army of the North, and reunited his forces with those of Ney to pursue Wellington's army, after he ordered Marshal Grouchy to take the right wing of the Army of the North and stop the Prussians re-

NOTES

grouping. In the first of a series of miscalculations, both Grouchy and Napoleon failed to realize that the Prussian forces were already reorganized and were assembling at the village of Wavre. In any event the French army did nothing to stop a rather leisurely retreat that took place throughout the night and into the early morning by the Prussians. As the 4th, 1st, and 2nd Prussian Corps marched through the town towards the Battlefield of Waterloo the 3rd Prussian Corp took up blocking positions across the river, and although Grouchy engaged and defeated the Prussian rearguard under the command of Lt-Gen von Thielmann in the Battle of Wavre (18–19 June) it was 12 hours too late. In the end, 17,000 Prussians had kept 33,000 badly needed French reinforcements off the field.

Napoleon delayed the start of fighting at the Battle of Waterloo on the morning of 18 June for several hours while he waited for the ground to dry after the previous night's rain. By late afternoon, the French army had not succeeded in driving Wellington's forces from the escarpment on which they stood. When the Prussians arrived and attacked the French right flank in ever-increasing numbers, Napoleon's strategy of keeping the Coalition armies divided had failed and a combined Coalition general advance drove his army from the field in confusion.

Grouchy organized a successful and well-ordered retreat towards Paris, where Marshal Davout had 117,000 men ready to turn back the 116,000 men of Blücher and Wellington. Militarily, it appeared quite possible that the French could defeat Wellington and Blücher, but politics proved the source of the Emperor's downfall. In any event Davout was defeated at Issy and negotiations for surrender had begun.

On arriving at Paris three days after Waterloo, Napoleon still clung to the hope of a concerted national resistance; but the temper of the legislative chambers, and of the public generally, did not favour his view. The politicians forced Napoleon to abdicate again on 22 June 1815. Despite the Emperor's abdication, irregular warfare continued along the eastern borders and on the outskirts of Paris until the signing of a cease-fire on 4 July. On 15 July, Napoleon surrendered himself to the British squadron at Rochefort. The Allies exiled him to the remote South Atlantic island of Saint Helena, where he died on 5 May 1821.

Meanwhile in Italy, Joachim Murat, whom the Allies had allowed to remain King of Naples after Napoleon's initial defeat, once again allied with his brother-in-law, triggering the Neapolitan War (March to May, 1815). Hoping to find support among Italian nationalists fearing the increasing influence of the Habsburgs in Italy, Murat issued the Rimini Proclamation inciting them to war. But the proclamation failed and the Austrians soon crushed Murat at the Battle of Tolentino (2 May to 3 May 1815), forcing him to flee. The Bourbons returned to

the throne of Naples on 20 May 1815. Murat tried to regain his throne, but after that failed, a firing squad executed him on 13 October 1815.

NOTES

Political Effects

The Napoleonic Wars brought great changes both to Europe and the Americas. Napoleon had succeeded in bringing most of Western Europe under one rule—a feat that had not been accomplished since the days of the Roman Empire (although Charlemagne had nearly done so around 800 CE). However, France's constant warfare with the combined forces of the other major powers of Europe for over two decades finally took its toll. By the end of the Napoleonic Wars, France no longer held the role of the dominant power in Europe, as it had since the times of Louis XIV. In its place, the United Kingdom emerged as by far the most powerful country in the world and the Royal Navy gained unquestioned naval superiority across the globe. This, coupled with Britain's large and powerful industrial economy, made it perhaps the first truly global superpower and ushered in the Pax Britannica that lasted for the next 100 years.

In most European countries, subjugation in the French Empire bought with it many products of the French Revolution including democracy, due process in courts, abolition of privileges, etc. The increasing prosperity of the middle classes with rising commerce and industry meant that restored European monarchs found it difficult to restore pre-revolutionary absolutism, and had to retain many of the reforms enacted during Napoleon's rule. Institutional legacies remain to this day in the form of civil-law legal systems, with clearly redacted codes compiling their basic laws—an enduring legacy of the Napoleonic Code.

During the wake of the Napoleonic period, nationalism, a relatively new movement, became increasingly significant. This would shape much of the course future European history. Its growth spelled the beginning of some states and the end of others, as the map of Europe changed dramatically in the hundred years following the Napoleonic Era. Rule by fiefdoms and aristocracy was widely replaced by national ideologies based on shared origins and culture. Importantly, Bonaparte's reign over Europe sowed the seeds for the founding of the nation-states of Germany and Italy by starting the process of consolidating city-states, kingdoms and principalities.

The Napoleonic wars also played a key role in the independence of the American colonies from their European motherlands. The conflict significantly weakened the authority and military power of the Spanish Empire, especially after the Battle of Trafalgar, which seriously hampered the contact of Spain with its American possessions. Evidence of this are the many uprisings in Spanish America after the end of the war, which eventually led to the wars of independence. In Portuguese America, Brazil experienced greater autonomy as it now served as

NOTES

seat of the Portuguese Empire and ascended politically to the status of Kingdom. These events also contributed to the Portuguese Liberal Revolution in 1820 and the Independence of Brazil in 1822.

After the war, in order to prevent another such war, Europe was divided into states according to the balance of power theory. This meant that, in theory, no European state would become strong enough to dominate Europe in the future.

Another concept emerged – that of a unified Europe. After his defeat, Napoleon deplored the fact that his dream of a free and peaceful "European association" remained unaccomplished. Such a European association would share the same principles of government, system of measurement, currency and Civil Code. Some one-and-a-half centuries later, and after another major conflagration (the Second World War), several of these ideals re-emerged in the form of the European Union.

2.4 THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

During the 1800s the Industrial Revolution spread throughout Britain. The use of steam-powered machines, led to a massive increase in the number of factories (particularly in textile factories or mills).

From Country to Town

As the number of factories grew people from the countryside began to move into the towns looking for better paid work. The wages of a farm worker were very low and there were less jobs working on farms because of the invention and use of new machines such as threshers. Also, thousands of new workers were needed to work machines in mills and foundries and the factory owners built houses for them. Cities filled to overflowing and London was particularly bad. At the start of the 19th Century about 1/5 of Britain's population lived there, but by 1851 half the population of the country had set up home in London. London, like most cities, was not prepared for this great increase in people. People crowded into already crowded houses. Rooms were rented to whole families or perhaps several families. If there was no rooms to rent, people stayed in lodging houses.

Housing

The worker's houses were usually near to the factories so that people could walk to work. They were built really quickly and cheaply. The houses were cheap, most had between 2-4 rooms - one or two rooms downstairs, and one or two rooms upstairs. Victorian families were big with 4 or 5 children. There was no running water or toilet. A whole street would have to share an outdoor pump and a couple of outside toilets. Most houses in the North of England were "back to backs" (built in double rows) with no windows at the front, no backyards and

NOTES

a sewer down the middle of the street. The houses were built crammed close together, with very narrow streets between them. Most of the houses were crowded with five or more people possibly crammed into a single room. Even the cellars were full. Most of the new towns were dirty and unhealthy. The household rubbish was thrown out into the streets. Housing conditions like these were a perfect breeding grounds for diseases. More than 31,000 people died during an outbreak of cholera in 1832 and lots more were killed by typhus, smallpox and dysentery.

Pollution

Chimneys, bridges and factory smoke blocked out most of the light in the towns. A layer of dirty smoke often covered the streets like a blanket. This came from the factories that used steam to power their machines. The steam was made by burning coal to heat water. Burning coal produces a lot of dirty, black smoke.

Improvements

Gradually, improvements for the poor were made. In 1848, Parliament passed laws that allowed city councils to clean up the streets. One of the first cities to become a healthier place was Birmingham. Proper sewers and drains were built. Land owners had to build houses to a set standard. Streets were paved and lighting was put up.

Over time slums were knocked down and new houses built. However, these changes did not take place overnight. When slums were knocked down in 1875 the poor people had little choice but to move to another slum, making that one worse. Few could afford new housing.

Child Labour

Many factory workers were children. They worked long hours and were often treated badly by the supervisors or overseers. Sometimes the children started work as young as four or five years old. A young child could not earn much, but even a few pence would be enough to buy food.

Coal Mines

The coal mines were dangerous places where roofs sometimes caved in, explosions happened and workers got all sorts of injuries. There were very few safety rules. Cutting and moving coal which machines do nowadays was done by men, women and children.

The younger children often worked as "trappers" who worked trap doors. They sat in a hole hollowed out for them and held a string which was fastened to the door. When they heard the coal wagons coming they had to open the door by

NOTES

pulling a string. This job was one of the easiest down the mine but it was very lonely and the place were they sat was usually damp and draughty.

Older children might be employed as "coal bearers" carrying loads of coal on their backs in big baskets.

The Mines Act was passed by the Government in 1842 forbidding the employment of women and girls and all boys under the age of teen down mines. Later it became illegal for a boy under 12 to work down a mine.

Mills

While thousands of children worked down the mine, thousands of others worked in the cotton mills. The mill owners often took in orphans to their workhouses, they lived at the mill and were worked as hard as possible. They spent most of their working hours at the machines with little time for fresh air or exercise. Even part of Sunday was spent cleaning machines. There were some serious accidents, some children were scalped when their hair was caught in the machine, hands were crushed and some children were killed when they went to sleep and fell into the machine.

Factories and Brick Works

Children often worked long and gruelling hours in factories and had to carry out some hazhardous jobs. In match factories children were employed to dip matches into a chemical called phosphorous. This phosphorous could cause their teeth to rot and some died from the effect of breathing it into their lungs.

Chimney Sweeps

Although in 1832 the use of boys for sweeping chimneys was forbidden by law, boys continued to be forced through the narrow winding passages of chimneys in large houses. When they first started at between five and ten years old, children suffered many cuts, grazes and bruises on their knees, elbows and thighs however after months of suffering their skin became hardened.

Street Children

Hordes of dirty, ragged children roamed the streets with no regular money and no home to got to. The children of the streets were often orphans with no-one to care for them. They stole or picked pockets to buy food and slept in outhouses or doorways. Charles Dickens wrote about these children in his book "Oliver Twist".

Some street children did jobs to earn money. They could work as crossing-sweepers, sweeping a way through the mud and horse dung of the main paths to make way for ladies and gentlemen. Others sold lace, flowers, matches or muffins etc out in the streets.

NOTES

COUNTRY CHILDREN

Poor families who lived in the countryside were also forced to send their children out to work. Seven and eight year olds could work as bird scarers,out in the fields from four in the morning until seven at night. Older ones worked in gangs as casual labourers.

CHANGES FOR THE BETTER

It took time for the goverment to decide that working children ought to be protected by laws as many people did not see anything wrong with the idea of children earning their keep. They also believed that people should be left alone to help themselves and not expect others to protect or keep them. They felt children had a right to send their children out to work. People such as Lord Shaftesbury and Sir Robert Peel worked hard to persuade the public that it was wrong for children to suffer health problems and to miss out on schooling due to work.

2.5 TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS IN 19TH CENTURY BRITAIN

Transport was greatly improved during the 18th century in Britain. Groups of rich men formed turnpike trusts. Acts of Parliament gave them the right to improve and maintain certain roads. Travellers had to pay tolls to use them. The first turnpikes were created as early as 1663 but they became far more common in the 18th century.

Transporting goods was also made much easier by digging canals. In the early 18th century goods were often transported by packhorse. Moving heavy goods was very expensive. However in 1759 the Duke of Bridgewater decided to build a canal to bring coal from his estate at Worsley to Manchester. He employed an engineer called James Brindley. When it was completed the Bridgewater canal halved the price of coal in Manchester. Many more canals were dug in the late 18th century and the early 19th century. They played a major role in the industrial revolution by making it cheaper to transport goods.

Travel in the 18th century was made dangerous by highwaymen. The most famous is Dick Turpin (1705-1739). Originally a butcher Turpin does not deserve his romantic reputation. In reality he was a cruel and brutal man. Like many of his fellow highwaymen he was hanged.

Smuggling was also very common in the 18th century. It could be very profitable as import duties on goods like rum and tobacco were very high.

In the mid 19th century transport was revolutionised by railways. They made travel much faster. (They also removed the danger of highwaymen). The Stockton and Darlington railway opened in 1825. However the first major railway

NOTES

was from Liverpool to Manchester. It opened in 1830. In the 1840s there was a huge boom in building railways and most towns in Britain were connected. In the late 19th century many branch lines were built connecting many villages.

The first underground railway in Britain was built in London in 1863. Steam locomotives pulled the carriages. The first electric underground trains began running in London in 1890. The Central Line opened in 1900. The Bakerloo Line and the Piccadilly Line both opened in 1906. Meanwhile the Paris Metro opened in 1900.

From 1829 horse drawn omnibuses began running in London. They soon followed in other towns. In the 1860s and 1870s horse drawn trams began running in many towns.

Karl Benz and Gottlieb Daimler made the first cars in 1885 and 1886. The motorbike was patented in 1885. Also, safety bicycle was invented and cycling soon became a popular hobby.

Meanwhile at sea transport was revolutionised by the steam ship. By 1815 steamships were crossing the English Channel. Furthermore it used to take several weeks to cross the Atlantic. Then in 1838 a steam ship called the Sirius made the journey in 19 days. However steam did not completely replace sail until 1897 when Charles Parsons invented the steam turbine.

Sports in 19th Century Britain

In 1871 the Bank Holiday Act gave workers a few paid holidays each year. Also in the 1870s some clerks and skilled workers began to have a weeks paid annual holiday. However even at the end of the 19th century most people had no paid holidays except bank holidays.

In the early 19th century everyone had Sunday off. In the 1870s some skilled workers began to have Saturday afternoon off. In the 1890s most workers gained a half day holiday on Saturday and the weekend was born.

During the 19th century sports became organised. The London Football Association devised the rules of football in 1863. The first international match was held between England and Scotland in 1872. In 1867 John Graham Chambers drew up a list of rules for boxing. They were called the Queensberry Rules after the Marquis of Queensberry. The Amateur Athletics Association was founded in 1880.

Several new sports and games were invented during the 19th century. William Webb Ellis is supposed to have invented Rugby at Rugby school in 1823 when he picked up a football and ran with it. Although a form of tennis was played since the Middle Ages lawn tennis was invented in 1873. Snooker was invented in India in 1875. Volleyball was invented in 1895.

NOTES

At the end of the 19th century bicycling became a popular sport. The safety bicycle was invented in 1885 and in 1892 John Boyd Dunlop invented pneumatic tyres (much more comfortable than solid rubber ones!) Bicycling clubs became common.

Ludo was originally an Indian game. It was introduced into Britain c. 1880.

Archery was considered a suitable sport for women. It was 'ladylike'.

Reading was also popular in the 19th century. In 1841 Edgar Allen Poe published the first detective story "The Murders In The Rue Morgue". The first Sherlock Holmes story "A Study in Scarlet" was published in 1887 by Arthur Conan Doyle.

Many middle class Victorians enjoyed musical evenings when they gathered around a piano and sang.

Middle class Victorians were very fond of the theatre. In the late 19th century there were also music halls where a variety of acts were performed.

In the 19th century going to the seaside was very popular with those who could afford it. The first pleasure pier was built at Brighton in 1823 and soon they appeared at seaside resorts across Britain.

The steam driven printing press was invented in 1814 allowing newspapers to become more common. Stamp duty on newspapers was abolished in 1855, which made them cheaper. However newspapers did not become really common until the end of the 19th century. In 1896 the Daily Mail appeared. It was written in a deliberately sensational style to attract readers with little education.

One new hobby in the 19th century was photography. Henry Fox Talbot took the first photograph in 1835. However photography was more than just a pastime. In 1871 a writer said that one of the great comforts for the working class was having a photo of a family member who was working a long way off. They could be reminded what their loved one looked like.

The first cheap camera was invented in 1888 by George Eastman. Afterwards photography became a popular hobby.

In the late 19th century town councils laid out public parks for recreation. The first children's playground was built in a park in Manchester in 1859.

Lastly, for those who like shopping, the first department store opened in London in 1863.

In the 19th century the 'modern' Christmas evolved. Before then Christmas wasn't especially important. It was one of only many festivals celebrated during the year. However the Victorians invented the Chistmas card and the Christmas cracker. The Christmas tree was known in England before the 19th century but it was really made popular when the royal were shown in a magazine illustration

NOTES

with one. Father Christmas or Santa Claus became the figure we know today in the 19th century.

2.6 EDUCATION IN BRITAIN IN 19TH CENTURY

By 1901 Literacy had become widespread and education highly regarded as important for keeping society together. People were regulated by written instructions so were expected to be literate. Education was originally conducted by charity or workhouse based schools for many children. 'Public Schools', misnamed private establishments educated few. There were many small village schools run by a 'literate' local person. Sundays schools had originally been the important source of education for the working classes but they could not meet the need for proper literacy. There were sectarian problems in educational developments, but educational Parliament Acts allowed for school developments and state involvement. The 1880 Act allowed for elementary education for 5-10 year olds. The system allowed for children to be educated to accept their place in society. Educational projects became more respectable, whilst mechanics institutes educated working men, museums and Art Galleries fed inspiration to citizens, but failed to reach most working class people.

People read books (sometimes from lending libraries and reading rooms making 'superstars' of some authors), periodicals, magazines, newspapers and comics. Some major literary works of the time were influenced by their original periodical form New types of books developed for train reading. Printing and publishing developed and an educated working class found for the first time that it could communicate with itself, develop new ideas and join new workers groups. New training could take place for the new technical innovations that were coming into being in science and industry.

The events that lead directly to the birth of the modern system of education in England are to be sought mainly in the second half of the 19th-century.

There were certain individuals at the beginning of the 19th century who were in favour of widespread education, however, for a number of reasons, they did not have the backing either of the government or of the people. Later on in the century leaders of the Chartist Movement and the Radicals were in favour of some sort of national system of education. However, it is safe to say that there was no widespread desire for the education of the population as a whole. In the social legislation of this period education did not become a real priority until the year of the first Education Act, 1870.

Obstacles in way of a national system of free compulsory education

The establishment of a national system of education came late in England mainly because of the social, economic and religious climate of the century.

1. The higher classes of society had no interest in advocating the cultural development of the working classes. On the contrary, the effects of the revolutionary spirit in Europe reinforced conservative attitudes that were certainly not conducive to advocating the development of the critical faculties of the people as a whole.
2. Neither did the vast majority of the working class have any real interest in education. Child labour was common practice in this period and working-class families were very reluctant to give up the earnings of their children for the benefit of education. The employment of children continued to increase even after 1850.
3. Also the effect of Protestantism, with its emphasis on individualism, personal salvation, the private reading and interpretation of Scripture, ran contrary to any sort of collectivist thought.
4. Religious conflict also delayed the establishment of a national system of education. One example of this can be seen in the reaction to the clauses regarding education in the 1843 Factory Bill. There was violent opposition on the part of nonconformists and Catholics alike because, according to the Bill, headmasters had to be of the Church of England. Furthermore, the children were to be taught the catechism and be present at liturgical celebrations as well as service on Sundays. The Bill failed.
5. The idea of secular education had never been popular during the century. Education had almost exclusively been under the control of the established church. Furthermore, we should not forget the conflict between secular and religious thought that characterised the century, especially the latter half. Given the cultural and religious climate of the century it became obvious that any nondenominational system of education would be well nigh impossible. It was only in the 20th century, with the rise of indifference towards religious teaching, that general nondenominational schooling became possible. Denominational education was further reinforced by the increase in the Catholic population due to the wave of Irish immigrants during and following the Great Famine in Ireland (1845-50).
6. It was also thought that the voluntary school system was quite successful and that it was better not to encourage government intervention. Furthermore, the dominant laissez-faire theory of the time meant that, as in most areas, any direct intervention on the part of the state in the field of education was to be discouraged. The state was only too happy to leave education to the private sector, voluntary or otherwise. Education could not constitute an exception to the tenaciously upheld doctrine of laissez-faire. However, these voluntary institutions did not have the influence or power to construct a nationwide system.

NOTES

Economic development and the increase of wealth were seen to be priority issues. The question of education only attracted very limited attention.

Tendencies and events favouring national education

Not everything was negative; there were quite distinct undercurrents of thought beginning to emerge that eventually led to the 1870 Education Act. During the century, and particularly during the second half, we have the beginnings of a national system of education that owes its birth to many factors.

1. From the first decade of the 19th-century there emerged indications of new thinking in the field of education. Of particular interest is the Bill introduced into the House of commons by Samuel Whitbread in 1807.
2. In 1807 Samuel Whitbread proposed to deal with the whole of the Poor Law with the introduction of a Bill in the House of Commons. Of particular interest is the first part of the Bill, which dealt specifically with education. Whitbread advocated making the parish responsible for education and proposed that each child should have two years of education between the ages of 7 and 14. He thought this would reduce crime and pauperism.
3. It was considered too expensive to implement and it was also thought that the introduction of such a scheme would take the people away from manual work and make them dissatisfied with their social situation. Although unsuccessful the thought of generalised education for the masses was even then being expressed and was later to be reiterated constantly throughout the century eventually leading up to the 1870 Education Act.
4. The idea of widespread education was also helped by the gradual increase in collectivist thought especially after 1865. This is quite evident in the works of Carlyle and Ruskin. It was only after this date that any idea of widespread state intervention in the field of education could find fertile ground.
5. The various Factory Acts of 1833, 1844, and 1867 were another contributory factor towards the general tendency towards national education. These acts focused not only on the condition of workers but they also had the effect of imposing certain restrictions on child labour, which in turn favoured the opportunity of an alternative: education for the child.
6. In the second half of the 19th-century crime and pauperism increased, so did riots strikes and social unrest. The commercial and manufacturing supremacy of Britain was in decline and this was seen to be mostly due to the fact that other European countries had a more developed technical education system. Political stability and economic prosperity now seemed to be associated with the education of the people. Education now seemed financially viable.

NOTES

7. In 1869 two other societies were established: the Education League, which turned secular and the National Education Union, which was conservative and Anglican. It was mainly due to these two societies that the Education Act of 1870 was passed.

THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1870

It was with the Education Act of 1870, also known as the "Forster Act", that we have the real birth of the modern system of education in England. This not only gave rise to a national system of state education but also assured the existence of a dual system-voluntary denominational schools and nondenominational state schools.

The act required the establishment of elementary schools nationwide. These were not to replace or duplicate what already existed but supplement those already run by the churches, private individuals and guilds.

The country was divided into school districts and in those areas where there was inadequate provision school boards were to be elected. These were responsible for raising sufficient funds to maintain the schools. The schools were often called " board schools".

These elementary schools had to be non-denominational. The school boards could charge a weekly fee not exceeding 9 pence. For a limited period the school boards could pay the fees if the parents were unable to do so. The Voluntary Schools could also receive such payment of fees from the school boards.

They had to guarantee attendance for all children in their respective districts between the ages of 5 and 13. The School Board could appoint officers to enforce attendance. These officers or "Board Men", as they were commonly known, became one of those terribly menacing figures firmly implanted in the minds of young schoolboys. This figure was an effective deterrent in playing truant. All the more menacing because the child could only picture him in his imagination (if he faithfully attended school, that is!!). He was also known as the School Attendance Officer.

Religious instruction was an integral part of the school curriculum but was not compulsory. This was to be nondenominational.

Since 1870 Voluntary Schools declined except Roman Catholic Schools because Boards Schools provided better buildings and higher pay for teachers.

Elementary education became effectively free with the passing of the 1891 Education Act.

2.7 CANADA AND AMERICAN WAR OF 1812

The War of 1812 was fought between the United States and Great Britain from June 1812 to the spring of 1815; although the peace treaty ending the war

NOTES

was signed in Europe in December 1814. The main land fighting of the war occurred along the Canadian border, in the Chesapeake Bay region, and along the Gulf of Mexico; extensive action also took place at sea.

BACKGROUND

From the end of the American Revolution in 1783, the United States had been irritated by the failure of the British to withdraw from American territory along the Great Lakes; their backing of the Indians on America's frontiers; and their unwillingness to sign commercial agreements favorable to the United States.

American resentment grew during the French Revolutionary Wars (1792-1802) and the Napoleonic Wars (1803-15), in which Britain and France were the main combatants.

In time, France came to dominate much of the continent of Europe, while Britain remained supreme on the seas. The two powers also fought each other commercially: Britain attempted to blockade the continent of Europe, and France tried to prevent the sale of British goods in French possessions. During the 1790s, French and British maritime policies produced several crises with the United States, but after 1803 the difficulties became much more serious. The British Orders in Council of 1807 tried to channel all neutral trade to continental Europe through Great Britain, and France's Berlin and Milan decrees of 1806 and 1807 declared Britain in a state of blockade and condemned neutral shipping that obeyed British regulations. The United States believed its rights on the seas as a neutral were being violated by both nations, but British maritime policies were resented more because Britain dominated the seas. Also, the British claimed the right to take from American merchant ships any British sailors who were serving on them. Frequently, they also took Americans. This practice of impressment became a major grievance.

The United States at first attempted to change the policies of the European powers by economic means. In 1807, after the British ship Leopard fired on the American frigate CHESAPEAKE, President Thomas Jefferson urged and Congress passed an EMBARGO ACT banning all American ships from foreign trade. The embargo failed to change British and French policies but devastated New England shipping. Later and weaker economic measures were also unsuccessful.

Failing in peaceful efforts and facing an economic depression, some Americansbegan to argue for a declaration of war to redeem the national honor. The Congress that was elected in 1810 and met in November 1811 included a group known as the War Hawks who demanded war against Great Britain. These men were all Democratic-Republicans and mostly from the West and South. Among their leaders were John C. Calhoun of South Carolina, Henry Clay of Kentucky, and Felix Grundy of Tennessee. They argued that American honor

NOTES

could be saved and British policies changed by an invasion of Canada. The FEDERALIST PARTY, representing New England shippers who foresaw the ruination of their trade, opposed war.

Napoleon's announcement in 1810 of the revocation of his decrees was followed by British refusals to repeal their orders, and pressures for war increased. On June 18, 1812, President James MADISON signed a declaration of war that Congress—with substantial opposition—had passed at his request. Unknown to Americans, Britain had finally, two days earlier, announced that it would revoke its orders.

Campaigns of 1812-13

U.S. forces were not ready for war, and American hopes of conquering Canada collapsed in the campaigns of 1812 and 1813. The initial plan called for a three-pronged offensive: from Lake Champlain to Montreal; across the Niagara frontier; and into Upper Canada from Detroit. The attacks were uncoordinated, however, and all failed. In the West, Gen. William HULL surrendered Detroit to the British in August 1812; on the Niagara front, American troops lost the Battle of Queenston Heights in October; and along Lake Champlain the American forces withdrew in late November without seriously engaging the enemy.

American frigates won a series of single-ship engagements with British frigates, and American privateers continually harried British shipping. The captains and crew of the frigates CONSTITUTION and United States became renowned throughout America. Meanwhile, the British gradually tightened a blockade around America's coasts, ruining American trade, threatening American finances, and exposing the entire coastline to British attack.

American attempts to invade Canada in 1813 were again mostly unsuccessful. There was a standoff at Niagara, and an elaborate attempt to attack Montreal by a combined operation involving one force advancing along Lake Champlain and another sailing down the Saint Lawrence River from Lake Ontario failed at the end of the year. The only success was in the West. The Americans won control of the Detroit frontier region when Oliver Hazard PERRY's ships destroyed the British fleet on Lake Erie (Sept. 10, 1813). This victory forced the British to retreat eastward from the Detroit region, and on Oct. 5, 1813, they were overtaken and defeated at the battle of the Thames (Moraviantown) by an American army under the command of Gen. William Henry HARRISON. In this battle the great Shawnee chief TECUMSEH, who had harassed the northwestern frontier since 1811, was killed while fighting on the British side.

Campaigns of 1814

In 1814 the United States faced complete defeat, because the British, having defeated Napoleon, began to transfer large numbers of ships and experienced

NOTES

troops to America. The British planned to attack the United States in three main areas: in New York along Lake Champlain and the Hudson River in order to sever New England from the union; at New Orleans to block the Mississippi; and in Chesapeake Bay as a diversionary maneuver. The British then hoped to obtain major territorial concessions in a peace treaty. The situation was particularly serious for the United States because the country was insolvent by the fall of 1814, and in New England opponents of the war were discussing separation from the Union. The HARTFORD CONVENTION that met in Connecticut in December 1814 and January 1815 stopped short of such an extreme step but suggested a number of constitutional amendments to restrict federal power.

The British appeared near success in the late summer of 1814. American resistance to the diversionary attack in Chesapeake Bay was so weak that the British, after winning the Battle of Bladensburg (August 24), marched into Washington, D.C., and burned most of the public buildings. President Madison had to flee into the countryside. The British then turned to attack Baltimore but met stiffer resistance and were forced to retire after the American defense of FORT MCHENRY, which inspired Francis Scott KEY to write the words of the "Star-Spangled Banner."

In the north, about 10,000 British veterans advanced into the United States from Montreal. Only a weak American force stood between them and New York City, but on Sept. 11, 1814, American Capt. Thomas MACDONOUGH won the naval battle of Lake Champlain (Plattsburg Bay), destroying the British fleet. Fearing the possibility of a severed line of communications, the British army retreated into Canada.

Peace Treaty and the Battle of New Orleans

In late 1814 New Orleans was home to a population of French, Spanish, African, Anglo and Creole peoples dedicated to pursuing economic opportunism and the joys of life. It also occupied a strategic place on the map. Located just 100 miles upstream from the mouth of the Mississippi River, the Crescent City offered a tempting prize to a British military still buoyant over the burning of Washington, D.C. To capture the city, Admiral Sir Alexander Cochrane fitted out a naval flotilla of more than 50 ships to transport 10,000 veteran troops from Jamaica. They were led by Sir Edward Pakenham, the 37-year-old brother-in-law of the Duke of Wellington and a much-decorated general officer.

For protection, the citizens of southern Louisiana looked to Major General Andrew Jackson, known to his men as "Old Hickory." Jackson arrived in new Orleans in the late fall of 1814 and quickly prepared defenses along the city's many avenues of approach.

Meanwhile, the British armada scattered a makeshift American fleet in Lake Borgne, a shallow arm of the Gulf of Mexico east of New Orleans, and evaluated their options. Two British officers, disguised as Spanish fishermen, discovered an unguarded waterway, Bayou Bienvenue, that provided access to the east bank of the Mississippi River barely nine miles downstream from New Orleans. On December 23 the British vanguard poled its way through a maze of sluggish streams and traversed marshy land to emerge unchallenged an easy day's march from their goal.

Two American officers, whose plantations had been commandeered by the British, informed Jackson that the enemy was at the gates. "Gentlemen, the British are below, we must fight them tonight," the general declared. He quickly launched a nighttime surprise attack that, although tactically a draw, gained valuable time for the outnumbered Americans. Startled by their opponents' boldness, the British decided to defer their advance toward New Orleans until all their troops could be brought in from the fleet.

Old Hickory used this time well. He retreated three miles to the Chalmette Plantation on the banks of the Rodriguez Canal, a wide, dry ditch that marked the narrowest strip of solid land between the British camps and New Orleans. Here Jackson built a fortified mud rampart, 3/5 mile long and anchored on its right by the Mississippi River and on the left by an impassable cypress swamp.

While the Americans dug in, General Pakenham readied his attack plans. On December 28 the British launched a strong advance that Jackson repulsed with the help of the Louisiana, an American ship that blasted the British left flank with broadsides from the river. Four days later Pakenham tried to bombard the Americans into submission with an artillery barrage, but Jackson's gunners stood their ground.

The arrival of fresh troops during the first week of January 1815 gave the British new hope. Pakenham decided to cross the Mississippi downstream with a strong force and overwhelm Jackson's thin line of defenders on the river bank opposite the Rodriguez Canal. Once these redcoats were in position to pour flank fire across the river, heavy columns would assault each flank of the American line, then pursue the insolent defenders six miles into the heart of New Orleans. Units carrying fascines — bundled sticks used to construct fortifications — and ladders to bridge the ditch and scale the ramparts would precede the attack, which would begin at dawn January 8 to take advantage of the early morning fog.

It was a solid plan in conception, but flawed in execution. The force on the west bank was delayed crossing the river and did not reach its goal until well after dawn. Deprived of their misty cover, the main British columns had no choice but to advance across the open fields toward the Americans, who waited

NOTES

expectantly behind their mud and cotton-bale barricades. To make matters worse, the British forgot their ladders and fascines, so they had no easy means to close with the protected Americans.

Never has a more polyglot army fought under the Stars and Stripes than did Jackson's force at the Battle of New Orleans. In addition to his regular U.S. Army units, Jackson counted on dandy New Orleans militia, a sizable contingent of black former Haitian slaves fighting as free men of color, Kentucky and Tennessee frontiersmen armed with deadly long rifles and a colorful band of Jean Lafitte's outlaws, whose men Jackson had once disdained as "hellish banditti." This hodgepodge of 4,000 soldiers, crammed behind narrow fortifications, faced more than twice their number.

Pakenham's assault was doomed from the beginning. His men made perfect targets as they marched precisely across a quarter mile of open ground. Hardened veterans of the Peninsular Campaign in Spain fell by the score, including nearly 80 per cent of a splendid Scottish Highlander unit that tried to march obliquely across the American front. Both of Pakenham's senior generals were shot early in the battle, and the commander himself suffered two wounds before a shell severed an artery in his leg, killing him in minutes. His successor wisely disobeyed Pakenham's dying instructions to continue the attack and pulled the British survivors off the field. More than 2,000 British had been killed or wounded and several hundred more were captured. The American loss was eight killed and 13 wounded.

Jackson's victory had saved New Orleans, but it came after the war was over. The Treaty of Ghent, which ended the War of 1812 but resolved none of the issues that started it, had been signed in Europe weeks before the action on the Chalmette Plantation.

2.8 CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT IN BRITAIN

The civil rights movement was a worldwide political movement for equality before the law occurring between approximately 1950 and 1980. In many situations it took the form of campaigns of civil resistance aimed at achieving change by nonviolent forms of resistance. In some situations it was accompanied, or followed, by civil unrest and armed rebellion. The process was long and tenuous in many countries, and many of these movements did not fully achieve their goals although, the efforts of these movements did lead to improvements in the legal rights of previously oppressed groups of people.

In America there has been a long history of civil rights abuse towards African-Americans, but in the UK during the 1950s and 1960s civil rights were also lacking. In 1963 a young black protester in Britain echoed the action of Rosa

Parks in America and began a bus boycott that helped bring in Britain's anti-discrimination law.

NOTES

Early History of British Immigrants

The slave trade in Britain was first documented around 1562 and by the early 18th century there were 14,000 black people living in Britain. Few had any real freedom, and it was not until the abolitionists began protesting that slavery across all of the British Empire was banned in 1833. By 1892 Britain had its first Indian Member of Parliament, Dadabhai Naoroji. After World War II 150,000 Poles arrived in Britain along with hundreds of men from the West Indies and multi-cultural Britain had arrived.

Racial Discrimination

Racial discrimination is now a legal offence in the UK and these civil and human rights are afforded to every man, woman and child. Racial discrimination includes discrimination on the grounds of colour, race, nationality and ethnicity. It is an offence to discriminate on these grounds in areas such as employment, education, housing, and the provision of goods and services. It is also an offence for public authorities such as the police or government departments to discriminate in its activities on these grounds.

Other Civil Rights of UK

Racial discrimination is not the only discrimination that can be pursued as a legal offence. It is also an offence to discriminate on the grounds of religion, sexuality, gender and disability. Discrimination for any of these reasons can lead to legal consequences. It is important that people are aware of their civil rights in the UK as it is the best protection they have against discrimination.

The fight for equality and freedom has been a struggle in America, Britain and many other countries around world. Hopefully this struggle will help future generations live in a more equal society.

Political repression

But how exceptional was Britain? Did it avoid revolution by divine intervention, by good management and wise statesmanship - or simply by luck? Historians nowadays are far less likely to ascribe Britain's largely peaceful progress in the 19th century to divine intervention. Some have argued that the threat of violent revolution was indeed real and that Britain escaped it, not by the hand of God but by the skin of its teeth.

The French Revolution inspired reformers in Britain as much as it frightened the British Crown and landowning classes. It is worth remembering that the

NOTES

Hanoverian dynasty, which provided Britain with its monarchs from 1714 to 1901, was only rarely popular, and was frequently criticised for its lack of understanding of the British people. Anti-government cartoons in the 1790s often included the most scabrous, even treasonable, representations of King George III.

In that decade, a number of political movements emerged to press for parliamentary reform. Some, like the London Corresponding Society, were organised and directed by skilled craftsmen and depended on the support of working people. They embraced political objectives drawn directly from French examples. They wanted to replace royal and aristocratic rule with representative government based on the Rights of Man - the influential political pamphlet by Thomas Paine.

The government of William Pitt the Younger, already at war with revolutionary France, was thoroughly alarmed by the prospect that revolutionary ideas might be exported to Britain, and it responded to these ideas with political repression. From 1794, radical political leaders could be arrested without trial. In 1795, during a period of high food prices and severe public agitation, stones were thrown at the King's carriage as he went to Westminster to open a new session of parliament. In the fevered atmosphere of the time, such actions could easily be interpreted as portending revolution. Within weeks, a parliament dominated by fearful landowners had passed legislation that redefined the law of treason, and that made it almost impossible to hold public meetings in support of reform.

Disaffected Radicals

Pitt's policies succeeded, at least on one level. Throughout the remainder of the wars with France, which went on until 1815, support for reform never again approached the heights of 1795. Support among all ranks in society for what was increasingly seen as a patriotic war also boosted the government. However, the most determined of the disaffected radicals were merely driven underground, and in the years 1796-1803 government spies found evidence of revolutionary conspiracy.

Much of this evidence centred around Irishmen. Radicals in fact attempted revolution in Ireland in 1798, against British domination of their lands. Had the hoped-for substantial French support for the insurgents been forthcoming, the endeavour might have come much closer to success. In the event, the most important consequence was the creation of a new 'United Kingdom' of Great Britain and Ireland in 1801, to which substantial numbers of Irish folk were never reconciled. The Society of United Irishmen was undoubtedly a revolutionary organisation, whose objective was the forcible overthrow of the British government, linked through a series of secret networks to cells of English revolutionaries.

NOTES

No doubt the numbers of such revolutionaries were small. However, few, if any, revolutions succeed because of weight of numbers - whatever the new revolutionary regimes might claim after they have installed themselves securely in power. Neither the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 in Russia, nor the Chinese revolution of 1949, could plausibly claim to have a democratic mandate. Assassins and revolutionaries may fail many times against superior forces. If they succeed once, however, they have achieved their objective. British politicians were well aware of this.

Revolutionary Activities

Against the lowering and portentous backdrop of revolution in France, the most important influence on the political lives of two generations of politicians from the younger Pitt (1759-1806) to Robert Peel (1788-1850), all threats of revolution were taken seriously. The authorities hastily assembled an extensive spy network. Both the Irish-inspired Despard Conspiracy of 1803 and the so-called Cato Street Conspiracy of 1820 to blow up Lord Liverpool's cabinet - to take only the best-known examples of revolutionary activity in the period - were forestalled. Their leaders were executed amid a blaze of publicity designed to confirm the government's control of the situation. Beneath the surface, however, and despite overwhelming evidence of support from the propertied classes, politicians were more concerned than they could admit.

This was because support for radical parliamentary reform never disappeared. During periods of economic turbulence, such as 1815-20 and during the so-called Reform Act crisis of 1829-32, masses of people could appear on the streets in support of either democracy or republicanism. The most famous such occasion was in August 1819 when a large crowd assembled at St Peter's Fields in central Manchester to hear a pro-reform speech from Henry 'Orator' Hunt, the most gifted radical speaker of his day. Fearing uncontainable disorder, and perhaps even revolution, the Manchester authorities over-reacted. They sent in troops to disperse the crowd by force. Eleven people were killed and the radicals were given a huge propaganda boost by referring to the event as 'Peterloo', in a grim analogy with the Duke of Wellington's famous victory over Napoleon at Waterloo four years earlier.

During the European revolutionary wars of the 1790s British government propaganda could - just about - confect George III as the symbol of the nation. His eldest son, George, however, first as Prince Regent from 1810 and then as George IV from 1820 to 1830, provoked more contempt than respect. The early 19th-century monarchy was unable to inspire national unity. Indeed, it was part of the problem.

NOTES

The claim that Britain came close to revolution in 1830-32 is by no means fanciful. Support for parliamentary reform reached unprecedented heights. 'Political unions' were formed in most large towns to press for radical change. The wife of the Russian ambassador wrote to her brother: 'We... in England, are just on the brink of a revolution.' In November 1830, the Duke of Wellington's Tory government was forced to resign after the Duke had asserted - against mountainous evidence to the contrary - that the people of Britain still had confidence in the unreformed political system that ruled their lives.

2.9 REVOLUTION IN 19TH CENTURY ENGLAND (PETERLOO AND CATO STREET)

During the 19th century Britain was transformed by the industrial revolution. In 1801, at the time of the first census, only about 20% of the population lived in towns. By 1851 the figure had risen to over 50%. By 1881 about two thirds of the population lived in towns.

Furthermore in 1801 the majority of the population still worked in agriculture or related industries. Most goods were made by hand and many craftsmen worked on their own with perhaps a labourer and an apprentice. By the late 19th century factories were common and most goods were made by machine.

Unrest in the Early 19th Century

The early 19th century was an era of political and social unrest in Britain. In the early 19th century a group of Evangelical Christians called the Clapham Sect were active in politics. They campaigned for an end to slavery and cruel sports. They gained their name because so many of them lived in Clapham.

Then on 11 May 1812 a man named John Bellingham shot Tory prime minister Spencer Perceval. He was the only British prime minister ever to be assassinated.

Bellingham was a lone madman but in 1820 there was a plot to kill the whole cabinet. Arthur Thistlewood led the Cato Street Conspiracy but the conspirators were arrested on 23 February 1820. Thistlewood and 4 of his companions were hanged.

Meanwhile in 1811-1816 textile workers in the Midlands and the north of England broke machines, fearing they would cause unemployment. The wreckers were called Luddites and if caught they were likely to be hanged.

In March 1817 textile workers from Manchester tried to march to London to petition the Prince Regent. They were called blanketeers because many of them carried blankets. However even though the march was peaceful the blanketeers were stopped by soldiers at Stockport.

Then on 16 August 1819 a crowd of about 60,000 people gathered at St Peter's Field in Manchester to hear a man named Henry Hunt. Even though the crowd were unarmed and the peaceful the authorities sent in soldiers. As a result 11 people were killed and hundreds were wounded. Afterwards people called the event 'The Peterloo Massacre' in a grim mockery of Waterloo.

In 1830 farm labourers in Kent and Sussex broke agricultural machinery fearing it would cause unemployment. The riots were called the Swing Riots because a man named Captain Swing supposedly, led them. As a result of the riots 4 men were hanged and 52 were transported to Australia.

In 1834 6 farm labourers in Tolpuddle, Dorset tried to form a trade union. However they were prosecuted for making illegal oaths. (Not for forming a union, which was legal). They were sentenced to transportation to Australia. The case caused an outcry and they returned to Britain in 1838.

Political Reform

In 1822 a Tory government was formed which introduced some reforms. At that time you could be hanged for over 200 offences. (Although the sentence was often commuted to transportation). In 1825–1828 the death penalty was abolished for more than 180 crimes.

Peel also formed the first modern police force in London in 1829. The police were called 'bobbies' or 'peelers' after him.

From 1828 to 1830 the Duke of Wellington (1769-1852) was prime minister. He introduced the Catholic Emancipation Act (1829). Since the Reformation Catholics had been unable to become MPs or to hold public office. The Act restored those rights to them.

However Wellington was strongly opposed to any change to the electoral system.

At that time there were two types of constituency, country areas and towns or boroughs. In the countryside only the landowners could vote. In boroughs the franchise varied but was usually limited. However the constituencies had not been changed for centuries and they no longer reflected the distribution of the population. Industrial towns like Birmingham and Manchester did not have MPs of their own. On the other hand some settlements had died out but they were still represented in parliament! In 'rotten' or 'pocket' boroughs there might be only one or two voters!

In the early 19th century there were increasing demands for reforms. Most people wanted constituencies distributed more fairly and they also wanted the franchise extended but Wellington's party, the Tories, resisted.

However in 1830 the Whigs formed a government and they tried to introduced reform. The House of Commons eventually voted for a reform bill

NOTES

but the House of Lords rejected it. The King, William IV, warned that he would create more peers, who favoured the bill unless the Lords agreed to accept it. Eventually the House of Lords backed down and passed the Great Reform Bill. It received the royal assent on 7 June 1832.

The franchise was only extended slightly but much more importantly the new industrial towns were now represented in parliament. Before 1832 Britain was ruled by an oligarchy of landowners. After 1832 the urban middle class had an increasing say.

However the working class were excluded from the reforms. From 1838 a working class protest movement called the Chartists was formed. (They were named after their People's Charter). The Chartists had several demands. They wanted all men to have the vote. Furthermore at that time you had to own a certain amount of property to become an MP. Chartists wanted the property qualification abolished. They also wanted MPs to be paid. Chartists also wanted all constituencies to be equal in size and they wanted voting to be by secret ballot.

The first Chartist rally was held in Manchester in 1838. In 1839 the Chartists delivered a petition to parliament, which was rejected out of hand. Another petition delivered in 1842 was also rejected. Finally in 1848 another great petition was sent to parliament but it turned into a farce. Some of the signatures were obvious fakes.

Chartism then fizzled out. For one thing it lacked middle class support and had no support among MPs. For another in the late 1840s conditions for the working class in Britain were improving and discontent was declining.

However further reform did eventually follow. In 1867 most workers in the towns were given the vote and in 1872 the Ballot Act introduced voting by secret ballot. In 1884 farm labourers were given the vote.

Meanwhile in 1835 the Municipal Corporations Act reformed town governments. A uniform system of town government was formed.

The Corn Laws

During the Napoleonic Wars 1799-1815 Britain could not import large amounts of grain from Europe. That all changed in 1815. British landowners feared that cheap foreign grain would be imported so they passed the Corn Laws.

Import duties would be charged on imported wheat unless the average price of British wheat reached £4 a quarter and unless the price of British barley reached £2 a quarter. However from 1828 a sliding scale was used. Import duties were gradually increased as the price of British grain fell.

In 1839 John Bright and Richard Cobden formed an Anti-Corn Law League. Prime Minister Peel finally abolished the corn laws in 1846. (Robert Peel lived from 1788 to 1850. He was prime minister in 1834-35 and 1841-46).

NOTES

Meanwhile by the 1840s public opinion changed in favour of free trade. Most people believed that government should interfere in the economy as little as possible. They also believed that countries should trade without import duties. So in the early 1840s Peel abolished many tariffs.

The Railways

The first passenger railway opened in 1825 between Stockton and Darlington. In 1830 a line was opened between Manchester and Liverpool. William Huskisson MP for Liverpool was killed but nothing could stop the growth of the railways.

By 1848 there were 5,000 miles of railways in Britain and the network continued to expand rapidly in the later 19th century.

Railways provided a great boost to other industries such as iron. They also revolutionised transport. Journeys that would have taken days by stagecoach took hours by train.

The Factory Acts

The industrial revolution created an unprecedented demand for female and child labour. Children had always worked alongside their parents but before the 19th century they usually worked part time. In the new textile factories women and children were often made to work very long hours (often 12 hours a day or even longer).

The government was aware of the problem and in 1819 they passed an act that made it illegal for children under 9 to work in cotton mills. However the act lacked 'teeth' as there were no factory inspectors to check the mills. Another act was passed in 1833 but this time inspectors were appointed. Children under 9 were banned from working in textile mills. Children aged 9 to 13 were not allowed to work for more than 12 hours a day or a total of more than 48 hours a week. Children aged 13 to 18 must not work for more than 69 hours a week. Furthermore nobody under 18 was allowed to work at night (from 8.30 pm to 5.30 am).

In 1844 another act banned women from working more than 12 hours a day (although it also reduced the minimum age for working in a mill to 8). Then in 1847 women and children were banned from working more than 10 hours a day in textile factories.

In 1850 the law was changed slightly. Women were allowed to work for 10.5 hours but textile factories could not be open for more than 12 hours a day. All workers, including men, were allowed 1.5 hours for meal breaks.

In 1867 the law was extended to all factories. (A factory was defined as a place where more than 50 people were employed in a manufacturing process).

NOTES

The 1878 Factory Act defined a factory as any place where machines were used in manufacturing.

Meanwhile in 1842 the Miners Act banned women and children under 10 from working underground in mines.

By the 1860s the 10 hour day was common, but not universal. In 'sweated industries' such as making matchboxes and lace people were paid piece rates (i.e. they were paid so much for each one they made). People often worked in their own homes and very often they had to work from dawn to dusk to make a living.

Nevertheless in 1871 bank holidays were created. In the 1870s some skilled workers were given a week's annual paid holiday. (Although it was not until 1939 that everybody had annual paid holidays). However by the 1890s the weekend was common as many people had Saturday afternoon off.

19TH CENTURY TRADE UNIONS

In 1799 and 1800 the government passed laws called the Combination Acts, which made it illegal for men to combine to demand higher wages. The Combination Acts were repealed in 1824 but it was still doubtful if trade unions were legal.

It was not until 1871 that trade unions were definitely made legal. In 1875 the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act made peaceful picketing legal.

In the 1850s and 1860s skilled workers formed moderate trade unions called New Model Unions. In return for subscriptions members were given sickness and unemployment benefits. However the New Model Unions were keen to be seen as 'respectable' and tried to negotiate rather than strike. The TUC was founded in 1868.

In the late 19th century unskilled workers began to form powerful trade unions. In 1888 a woman named Annie Besant managed to organise a strike among the girls who worked making matches for Bryant and May. The girls were very poorly paid and they suffered from an illness called 'phossy jaw' caused by working with phosphorous. The strike was successful and the employers were forced to raise their pay. In 1889 the match girls formed a trade union.

In March 1889 the Gas Workers and General Labourers Union was formed. Then on 14 August 1889 the Great London Dock strike was held. It lasted 5 weeks and was a great success. The Dockers demanded a minimum wage of 6 pence an hour (the 'Docker's tanner'). Also in 1889 a Seaman's Union and the General Railway worker's Union was formed.

19TH CENTURY HOUSING

In the early 19th century much working class housing was appalling. It was overcrowded and unsanitary. Of course, poor people's housing had always been

bad. However things grew much worse when vast numbers of people lived together in a small area.

NOTES

Furthermore towns had been dirty and unsanitary for centuries. In the 18th century in many towns bodies of men called Paving Commissioners or Improvement Commissioners were formed with powers to pave, clean and light the streets. However in those days England was divided into parishes and the commissioners only had powers in certain parishes.

However in the 19th century towns spread to new parishes. Huge numbers of houses were built where previously there had only been fields and small villages. The commissioners had no powers in these new 'suburbs'. In them streets were often unpaved and unlit. There were no drains and when it rained streets turned to mud. People threw dirty water in the streets and stagnant pools formed. Furthermore toilets were often shared by several houses and queues formed on Sunday mornings.

In the early 19th century in most towns there were no building regulations. Builders simply built as they pleased. Usually they tried to cram as many houses as possible onto every piece of land. Many houses were 'back-to-backs'. These houses were literally back to back. The back of one house joined the back of another. They usually consisted of two or three rooms. Worst of all were cellar dwellings. In cities like Liverpool families lived in cellars, which were damp and poorly ventilated as well as crowded. Very poor people slept on straw because they could not afford beds.

Skilled workers lived in 'through' houses, so called because you could walk through them from front to back. However in the 1840s town councils began to take action. Cellar dwellings were banned and new back-to-backs could not be built. It was impossible to demolish and replace existing back-to-backs all at once. It took decades and some people were still living in them in the 20th century.

In the early 19th century toilets were usually cesspits, which were infrequently emptied and sometimes overflowed. Or urine might seep through the ground into wells from which people drew drinking water.

Given these disgusting conditions it is not surprising there were outbreaks of cholera in many towns in 1831-32, 1848-49, 1854 and 1865-66.

In 1848 a Public Health Act was passed. The act made it compulsory to form local Boards of Health in towns if the annual death rate exceeded 23 per 1,000 or if 10% of the population wanted it. Local Boards of Health could demand that all new houses have drains and lavatories. They could also organise a water supply, street cleaning and refuse collection.

In 1875 a Public Health Act strengthened previous acts. All local authorities were forced to appoint Medical Officers of Health who could prosecute people

NOTES

who sold food or drink unfit for human consumption. The councils were also required to provide refuse collection.

Town councils also began to provide public parks and most passed by-laws, which laid down minimum standards for new houses. Furthermore in the 1860s and 1870s sewers were dug in most large towns. In the 1870s water supplies were created in most towns. As a result of these measures towns were much healthier and cleaner by the end of the 19th century than at the beginning.

In 1875 the Artisan's Dwellings Act was passed which gave councils the power to demolish slums but large scale slum clearance did not begin till the 20th century.

Furthermore in the second half of the 19th century living standards rose. Gradually houses grew larger. In the late 19th century 'two-up, two-downs' were common. (Houses with two bedrooms and a kitchen and 'front room'. Many skilled workers lived in houses with three bedrooms.

However even at the end of the 19th century there were some poor families still living in just one room.

The Poor Law

In 1792 well meaning magistrates met at Speenhamland in Berkshire and devised a system for helping the poor. Low wages were supplemented with money raised by a poor rate. Many areas of England adopted the system but it proved very expensive and the government decided to change things.

In 1834 they passed the Poor Law Amendment Act. In future the poor were to be treated as harshly as possible to dissuade them from seeking help from the state. In future able bodied people with no income were to be forced to enter a workhouse. (In practice some of the elected Boards of Guardians sometimes gave the unemployed 'outdoor relief' *i.e.*, they were given money and allowed to live in their own homes).

For the unfortunate people made to enter workhouses life was made as unpleasant as possible. Married couples were separated and children over 7 were separated from their parents. The inmates were made to do hard work like breaking stones to make roads or breaking bones to make fertiliser.

The poor called the new workhouses 'bastilles' (after the infamous prison in Paris) and they caused much bitterness. However as the century went on the workhouses gradually became more humane.

Living Standards in the 19th Century

At first the industrial revolution did cause much suffering to some people. However in the end it made a much higher standard of living possible for ordinary people. In the 18th century when goods were made by hand they were scarce and

NOTES

therefore expensive. Machines meant that goods could be mass produced and so they became much cheaper.

It is true that in the early 19th century many people worked very long hours and they lived in appalling conditions in overcrowded towns. However by the late 19th century housing for most people was better than in the 18th century.

People were also better fed. Inventions like trains and steamships made it possible to import cheap food from abroad, wheat from North America and meat from Australia and New Zealand. For thousands of years bread was the staple diet of ordinary people. The poor lived mainly on bread. By the end of the century bread was ceasing to be the 'staff of life' and most people were eating a varied diet.

Furthermore a host of inventions made life more comfortable and convenient. Railways made travel much faster. Waterproof clothing also made life more comfortable. So did anaesthetics. Furthermore today we take street lighting for granted but in the 19th century gas street lights made going out at night much easier and safer.

We also take photography for granted but people in the 19th century thought it was wonderful. For the first time ordinary people could have pictures of their loved ones to remember them by if they lived far away.

It is true that poverty was common in the 19th century but things had always been that way. A large part of the population lived at subsistence level - or below it but that was nothing new.

The Decline of Britain

In the middle of the 19th century Britain was the richest and most powerful nation in the world. However in the late 19th century Britain's power declined. It was inevitable. Britain was the first country to industrialise. She therefore had a head start over other nations. However the other countries began to catch up. France, Germany and USA industrialised. By the end of the 19th century Russia, Sweden, (North) Italy and Japan were also industrialising. As a result Britain became relatively less important.

British Foreign Policy in the 19th Century

The 19th century was a relatively peaceful era for Britain. After the defeat of Napoleon in 1815 Britain only fought one war with another European power, the Crimean War against Russia (1854-1846). Other wars were colonial wars involving small numbers of soldiers.

During the 19th century Britain built up a great overseas empire including South Africa, Australia and New Zealand. In 1857-58 they crushed the uprising called the Indian Mutiny and in 1877 Queen Victoria was made Empress of India.

NOTES

Meanwhile in 1819 Sir Stafford Raffles founded Singapore. Britain also took Burma in stages during the 19th century.

In the late 19th century Britain took large swathes of Africa (Zimbabwe, Zambia, Malawi, Kenya and Nigeria. The British also took control of Egypt and Sudan.

Nevertheless by the end of the 19th century it was obvious that Britain was no longer as powerful as she had once been and needed allies in Europe.

2.10 THE QUEEN'S TRIAL DEATH OF CAST LEREAGH

During the last half-dozen years of the war, the official Whig leaders went politically to sleep in their country seats, muttering pessimistic prophecies of the impossibility of conquering Napoleon. But the social and political revolt beginning in the new middle class against the Tory aristocracy found more vigorous expression in the self-assertive and ubiquitous energy of Henry Brougham, the very type of novus homo, with his square, plebeian nose, restless movements and hard yet lively features.

It was Brougham who had organised the agitation against the Orders in Council.1 As soon as the war was over, he compelled Government by a similar agitation to drop the Income Tax, which the middle classes, before Peel taught them to think more wisely, regarded as an inquisitorial interference with liberty and property, not to be borne save in war-time. The unpopular tax, which is one of the chief claims of Pitt to the gratitude of posterity, was bringing in fifteen millions in 1815. Its removal, due to Brougham's agitation, was one of the main reasons of the slow progress of fiscal reform and trade recovery prior to the time of Peel.

With the revival of the spirit of opposition after the war, Brougham gave voice to the growing indignation of all classes with the sinecures and pensions. To abolish them would have done much less to relieve the economic misery of the land than he and Cobbett made people believe, but it was a peculiarly gross insult to starving millions to make rich parasites richer out of taxes. Brougham also put his universal energies at the disposal of the champions of the negro, who were already preparing against slavery the same sort of campaign that had proved fatal to the slave-trade. And, true to his Scottish upbringing, he gave, as we have seen, his own vigour to the movement for popular education in England.

Though north-English by birth, Brougham belonged to the group of lawyers and University men at the Scottish capital who had founded the Edinburgh Review. They included the Rev. Sydney Smith, also of England, and the Scot, Francis Jeffrey. At first these young partisans had only their wits to protect them in a time and country in which, as one of them said retrospectively, ' it was almost safer to be a felon than a Reformer.' But their caution and ability gained a hearing

NOTES

for the new school of liberal ideas in fashionable and learned society throughout Great Britain. In days when the means of diffusing knowledge and opinion were scanty, the Edinburgh Reviewers played an indispensable part in preparing the mind of the coming age. But their want of firmness over the Peninsular War incited Sir Walter Scott and other Tories to found the rival Quarterly. Judged by Victorian standards of criticism and science the early numbers of the Edinburgh and Quarterly seem very thin; but they were in their day a great advance.

The close connection of poetry and literature with political faction, illustrated by the history of these two famous Reviews and by the lives of Scott and Byron, Wordsworth and Cole-ridge, Shelley and Keats, though it had its regrettable side, was due to the high importance attached to poetry and to the Muses by the active world of that era as distinguished from our own. The lives of many of our greatest poets and painters also remind us how little the Napoleonic wars interrupted the daily work of civilisation in our island, when it was reaching a higher point of literary achievement than it had ever touched since the age of Shakespeare.

It would be difficult to find a better instance of that favourite maxim of our grandfathers that 'the pen is mightier than the sword,' than the effect upon British institutions of the uneventful life of Jeremy Bentham, a shy recluse of unimpressive speech and appearance, who was so little of a politician that even in 1817 he was not prosecuted for publishing his highly 'seditious' Reform Catechism in favour of household suffrage. Born in 1748, and dying in 1832 just when his principles were beginning to invade the seats of power, he was never the man of the moment, but his influence was a force in history during more than hundred years. As early as 1776, that seminal year when the Declaration of Independence, Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations and the first volume of Gibbon's History were given to the world, young Bentham's Fragment on Government also appeared. It challenged the legal doctrine of the age, sanctioned by Blackstone himself, that law was a fixed and authoritative science and the British Constitution perfect. Bentham, on the other hand, proclaimed both law and politics to be perpetual experiments in the means of promoting 'utility' or happiness.

For the rest of his long life Bentham's propaganda among the higher intellect of the country was never intermitted, though the French Revolution and the anti-Jacobin reaction, both of which he disliked, delayed the acceptance of his doctrine. In his old age, and after his death, his ideas inspired the slow but sure reform of British institutions, as the ideas of Rousseau had inspired the cataclysm of old France.

Bentham impressed upon his countrymen the notion that existing institutions were not to be taken for granted, but to be judged by their results, and perpetually readjusted so as to produce 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number'.

NOTES

He did not invent that useful formula, which he had taken from Priestley, but he drove it into men's minds, and by reiterating it for half a century with a thousand different applications, he undermined the easy acceptance of chartered inefficiency and corruption, characteristic of the eighteenth century. Parliamentary, municipal, scholastic, ecclesiastical, economic reform all sprang from the spirit of Bentham's perpetual inquiry, 'what is the use of it'? His universal shibboleth, that proved in the end the real English antidote to Jacobinism. The weakness of his system, even in the realm of politics, was the mechanical nature of its psychology, which misrepresented the multiform workings of the human mind.

Although the principles of his 'utilitarian' philosophy were applied in the end to all spheres of government, his most direct and measurable success was the application that he him self made of the 'utility' test in the realm of law. Brougham said of him that 'he was the first legal philosopher that had appeared in the world,' and Dicey in our own day has quoted this judgment with approval. As law reformer, Bentham was fertile in practical invention as he was broad in principle. To him is owing the first suggestion of almost every one of the long series of law reforms which, beginning about 1820, in forty years swept away the sanguinary and unintelligent code which Eldon loved, that hanged men for theft and struck about in blind panic with the sword of justice. In the dry tree of Parliament from 1808 to 1818, Sir Samuel Romilly preached Bentham's doctrine of law reform to unwilling ears; after Romilly's tragic suicide, Sir James Mackintosh took up the work in the green tree of a more hopeful era.

Bentham's utilitarianism was most directly connected with the creed of the 'philosophic Radicals' like James Mill and Francis Place, and with the sweeping away of abuses and privileges to clear the path for democratic individualism and laissez-faire. But it also inspired the movement towards Socialism, co-operation and State interference, which grew up side by side with 'classical' economics and radical politics, though not at first with such rapid growth. All were in debt to Bentham, even common-sense Whigs like Macaulay, though he was provoked to write Edinburgh articles against the pedantry of the Utilitarian sect.

Robert Owen was the first to find the Socialistic application of the doctrines of ' utility.' He was the father of the factory laws and of the cooperative movement.

Never was there such a combination as in Robert Owen of business ability with moral simplicity and earnestness, and visionary insight, occasionally running to the absurd. Brought up in a Welsh village in the days of Wesley, his destiny lay in wider realms of thought and space, but his mind and character never lost the mark of an upbringing among poor people and among people aspiring earnestly towards an ideal outlook on everyday things. After a village schooling he went off into the great world and worked his way unaided up the ladder of the new industrialism, to become, before he was thirty, part owner and sole manager of

NOTES

the cotton mills of New Lanark in Scotland. In early life he was a magnificent example of 'self-help'.

While Napoleon was winning and losing Europe, Owen the time. In fifteen years he had made it a model of humane was quietly working out his social experiment. The Scottish factory, when he took it over, was as bad as other factories of and intelligent provision for mind and body, with moderate hours, good pay, healthy conditions both in the factory and the village, and good education, including the first infant school in the island. The outcome was a high morale among the hands. It was, he imagined, his great discovery that 'the character of man is formed for him, and not by him,' or, as we should now say, that 'environment makes character.' To prove it, he had by environment made the characters of the New Lanark employees; and at the same time he had made the fortune of the New Lanark Mills!

Owen's double success proved that if the social aspects of the Industrial Revolution had been attended to, its worst evils could have been avoided without a lowering of production, and that even in that age the big factory might have been used as a new and powerful engine of social amelioration. The world of that day admitted the facts; thousands of visitors drove all the way from the Thames to the Clyde, and the monarchs of Europe sent embassies to see the miracle of a happy factory-town. Men could not deny, yet would not believe, the living proof that Owen had set before their eyes.

In the year of Waterloo, Owen, having failed to persuade his brother manufacturers of the things that pertained to their peace, went up to London to persuade the Government itself. He was not by temperament and theory a democrat. He had been the patriarch of New Lanark, gently forming his men's characters 'for them.' He now wanted the Tory Cabinet to be equally paternal in its protection of all the factory hands in the island. With the simplicity of Parsifal, he came up to town expecting to make a convert of Castlereagh and a pupil of Parliament. His failure did not sour him, but it turned him back to the working-men themselves, whom he now regarded as the only possible agents of his vision of a new society.

His failure, though fundamental, had not been complete. Cabinet Ministers treated him with politeness, but gave no help. His plans were, however, taken up in Parliament by Sir Robert Peel, father of the great Sir Robert, a Lancashire millowner, originally of no good reputation as such, who had the family honesty to own that he had changed his mind on the need for factory legislation.

During Napoleon's Hundred Days, Owen and Peel drew up the first real Factory Bill. It applied not merely to cotton, but to all factories; it forbade the employment of any child under ten years old, or after that for more than ten and a half hours a day; paid inspectors were to enforce its provisions. But the other

NOTES

manufacturers hastened up to London to protest against the insanity of these two eccentric members of their order. They established before a Committee the point that Owen was an infidel, and argued the more doubtful thesis that the children were well and happy in the mills. After four years' delay, a useless shadow of Peel's Bill was passed, for cotton only, with no important provision except the prohibition of child labour under nine. As there were to be no inspectors, the Act was ignored whenever employers and parents joined to break it.

The first campaign was lost, but Owen had started on the right lines the hundred years' war for State control. Thanks to him and to his successor, Lord Shaftesbury, not only children but parents have since found protection in an area of legislation ever widening down to our own day.

Owen himself, meanwhile, despairing of the governors, turned to the governed. He abandoned politics for labour association. Parliament had failed him; he did not propose to get it reformed, but to set the labourers to work out their own salvation. He became in a certain sense a democrat, but not, like Place and Cobbett, a Radical. He put himself at the head of the economic as distinct from the political action of the working-class. He devoted himself in the latter half of his life to starting the co-operative and extending the Trade Union movement. But that part of his life belongs to a later chapter of British history.

In spite of Owen's indifference to the cause, the movement for Parliamentary Reform, suppressed in the days of Pitt, revived first among the working-men, before it captured the middle classes. The reason is clear. While the middle classes were upon the whole prospering, except for severe fluctuations of trade, many of the workmen were suffering terribly, and their misery was much increased by the action of Parliament. While new laws were passed and enforced to prevent them from combining to keep up their wages, old laws which empowered the authorities to fix a fair wage were repealed, and finally, when peace promised a fall in the price of bread, a new Corn Law prohibited importation till wheat was 80s. a quarter. Parliament, in the interest now of employers, now of landlords, was always the enemy of working-men. They ate the rotten boroughs in their bread. Hence, their hatred of the ' borough-mongers ' was more intense than that of the middle class, and made emphatic entry on the political stage a dozen years before the ' respectable classes ' under Whig patronage secured the first Reform Bill.

No doubt Owen understood the causes and some of the cures of working-class misery far better than Cobbett, whose economics were as wild as his history, and who disliked enclosures and factories too much to see anyway out except an impossible return to the vanished 'yeoman' world of his boyhood. Yet William Cobbett was the man who diverted the working-class from rick-burning and machine-breaking to agitate for Parliamentary Reform. His Weekly Political

NOTES

Register and the literature that sprang from it did much to convert the masses into thinking politicians, despite the Government's anxiety to shut them out from all aspects of citizenship. Cobbett's extravagance of theory, recklessness of statement and violence of diction obscured the fact that the whole tendency of his propaganda was to avert revolution and to guide the proletariat into the paths of constitutional action.

At the same time he made the wrongs and sufferings of the poor known to educated men. He angrily drew aside the curtain that hid their lives from public notice and sympathy. He proclaimed rich and poor to be one English nation, and demanded that the Constitution should include them both.

In spite of his gross unfairness and inaccuracy, Cobbett left his impress on all, even on those who hated him, because of his rare literary power, because of the fundamental sincerity and courage that underlay a good deal of posing, and because he was native of the soil. Paine, Bentham, Owen were citizens of the world. Burke, though he sang Britain's praises, had not our island note. But Cobbett, though he abused all that Burke praised, was John Bull incarnate.

The 'rights of man' were nothing to him in the abstract, and foreigners were antipathetic. Born of Surrey peasants of the old breed, his heart's desire was to restore their rights and liberties as he had known them in his boyhood, and as he imagined them to have existed in even greater degree in the idealised English history of his vision. In one sense he was the only consistent Tory, for he was averse to the economic and social revolution which the nominal Tories were hurrying on. He was neither a 'philosophic Radical' nor a Socialist. But he was the father of the unphilosophic Radicalism which played so great a part in English working-class opinion during the nineteenth century, because he saw that the only way to control economic change was to speed along political change till it had caught up with the furious pace of the Industrial Revolution.

Throughout the period of the Peninsular War, which he noisily and ignorantly opposed, Cobbett had been carrying on a Reform campaign in his Political Register, partly from prison where he lay two years to expiate his protest against the flogging of English militiamen at Ely by German soldiers. He invented a catchword, ' The Thing,' for the union of Ministers, boroughmongers, pensioners, squires, clergy and manufacturers, by which he conceived England to be bound, bullied and bled; giving thus to all those in power one head that he might break it. But the register cost more than a shilling, and most of those who could afford a shilling a week dreaded Cobbett, or dreaded being seen to read him. The working-men clubbed to buy copies and read them aloud, a method particularly useful in those days of illiteracy, but gatherings held for this purpose were broken up and penalised. It was in 1816, when he boldly reduced the price to twopence,

NOTES

that he became the real leader of the masses in the manufacturing districts, among whom a fierce agitation had at length broken out.

Nevertheless, Peterloo was the moral death-blow of the old Toryism. It might have passed unchallenged twenty years before, but coming when it did, it was fatal. The long sterile reign of anti-Jacobinism had been compressed into one dramatic scene, revealing like a flash of lightning the real relations of rulers and ruled. Popular prints for a dozen years to come made all men familiar with the symbolic figure of a mounted yeoman in his shako, prancing over a heap of shrieking women and sabring them on the ground. British history had made it impossible for this island to be governed for long on such terms. The laurels of the victors of Waterloo hung tarnished, and young men began to look elsewhere for their heroes and deliverers.'

The change of feeling had its effect on some of the rising generation of Tory leaders. Men as sensitive as Canning, as central-minded as Peel, as much in touch with the merchant community as Huskisson could feel in their bones that the great wind which had been blowing for thirty years at length had shifted its quarter.

But for three more years the old spirit was still supreme in the counsels of government. Indeed, if Peterloo was not to be disowned, there was no course open but further coercion, for the working-men of the North were clamouring for revenge. The 'Six Acts,' passed in the winter of 1819, were no more than an inevitable outcome of the policy previously adopted.

The Six Acts were not all of a piece. The Act that prohibited drilling was wise and has never been repealed. The Act to prevent large public meetings, at best a pitiable confession of the incompetence of the authorities, ran for five years and was not renewed. The most lasting injury to the community was done by the Act imposing a fourpenny stamp on all periodical publications, even though they were not newspapers. The object was to kill the Radical Press of the type of Cobbett's Register and the Black Dwarf, but incidentally it made it more difficult for the poor to get literature of any sort. The duty was reduced from fourpence to a penny in 1836 as a result of Radical pressure on the Whig Government of that later day, and the remaining ' taxes on knowledge ' were repealed in the course of the 'fifties and 'sixties.

The year that followed Peterloo and the Six Acts, the first of George IV as king, was the year of the Cato Street conspiracy and of the Queen's trial.

In February, Arthur Thistlewood, head of a gang of ' physical force' Radicals prevented by the Six Acts from raising disturbance in other ways, plotted to murder the whole Cabinet as they dined together at Lord Harrowby's in Grosvenor Square. The conspirators, over twenty strong, met in a loft in Cato Street, off

NOTES

Edgware Road, where they were attacked by the Bow Street runners. Half of them fought their way out, but all were arrested within a few days. The reaction in favour of Government was naturally strong, but, considering the enormity of the fact, curiously evanescent. Thistlewood and four of his accomplices were executed on the first of May, and by the end of June Ministers were more universally popular than ever before, on account of Queen Caroline. Yet the Cato Street conspiracy was almost as bloody in its intention as the Gunpowder Plot, and more so than the assassination plots against Charles II and William III, which had ruined the parties in whose interest they had been designed. One of the intended victims was the Duke of Wellington, who had saved the country five years before, and lived to be the popular demigod of Victorian England. If, then, Cato Street caused no such prolonged reaction and left no such tradition as Gunpowder Plot, Rye House and Turnham Green, it was partly because the Queen's trial supervened, and partly because the system of government for which the Duke and his colleagues stood was no longer so well rooted in any large section of popular opinion as the systems represented by James I, Charles II, or William III.

The Queen's affair, which swallowed up every other topic from June to November, was caused by the return from abroad of the new King's official wife, Caroline, unappeasably claiming her Royal rank. The King's reply was to induce his Ministers, in an evil hour for their good name, to set on foot divorce proceedings. The 'Queen's trial,' for adultery, took the form of a Bill of Pains and Penalties introduced first into the House of Lords, and conducted there by the examination of evidence as in a Court of justice. The chief witnesses were Italians of a low type, whom the British people believed to have been suborned. The principal one, Majocchi, broke down under Brougham's cross-examination, and blundered out again and again Non mi ricordo ('I don't remember') a phrase that for a generation to come was current coin in England.

Non mi ricordo was fatal to the good repute of the existing establishment in Church and State.' The Radical cartoonists, strong in the rising genius of Cruikshank, battened on the shapeless figure of George IV, who was represented to his subjects in every abject guise that malice could suggest, now lolling on the couch as an Oriental voluptuary, now stammering out Non mi ricordo at the bar of public opinion. And though Caroline was in a sense the 'heroine,' her low vulgarity was in itself an argument for republicans and levellers. As the Queen's trial dragged its foul length along week after week, an utter contempt for their rulers, Royal and other, sank deep into men's hearts, and prepared the way for change.

Whether Caroline was guilty or not no man can with certainty say. On the other hand, it is certain that her marriage had been a legalised bigamy, since her

NOTES

husband had previously been married in secret to Mrs. Fitzherbert, who was still alive. It is also certain that George had cast off Caroline almost at once, before he had any ground against her, and that he had lived and was still living in open relations with a number of other women. Our ancestors passionately determined that a wife who had undergone such treatment, whether she were innocent or guilty, should not be divorced by such a man. The national instinct for fair play was too much for the loyalty of many Tories who had supported the Government on the Six Acts. The Cabinet found itself more nearly in collision with the whole nation than any Government since James II. Only the withdrawal of the Bill of Pains and Penalties saved the State from convulsion.

After Peterloo and Cato Street the Queen's trial comes like low comic relief in a too sombre tragedy. Indeed it did much to restore the good humour of the nation. All classes of a divided society had united in a common enthusiasm. And it helped the cause of reconciliation that the Cabinet had been disgraced and defeated; its working-class victims could laugh and feel themselves avenged. And so, with the help of a few years of better trade, the more liberal policy adopted by the Tory Cabinet after Castlereagh's death was launched on less troubled waters.

The history of the Queen's trial illustrates the law of political hydrostatics, that if the current of public opinion is denied course through constitutional channels, it will make its way out by the sewers. There had been other instances of such abnormal excitement, as when in 1809 the country had risen in fury to support the charges against the King's son, the Duke of York, then Commander-in-Chief, of selling military commissions through his mistress, Mrs. Clarke. These unsavoury controversies, and many others, now well forgotten, gave proof of a savage hatred of the Royal family, due in equal degrees to the bad private character of George III's sons, and to the political position of George III and George IV after him as acknowledged chiefs of the extreme Tory party. The all-important change that afterwards took place in the popularity of the Royal family, was due alike to its retirement from political leadership and to its changed private record.

But, for the present the Crown still made and maintained Ministries. The Tory Cabinet survived the measureless shame and unpopularity of the Queen's trial, because George IV, much as he hated the Ministers for bungling the Bill of Pains and Penalties, hated the Whigs still more for voting against it, and for their association with his arch-enemy, Brougham, who had conducted the Queen's case in the Lords with astonishing eloquence and freedom.

Now, the choice of the Prime Minister effectually rested with the King. The Whigs only mustered some 170 votes in Opposition, and largely owing to the rotten boroughs and the limited franchise, could not materially increase the number at election time. They would do nothing on the one hand to court the King for office, and for the considerable number of votes in the House which was

NOTES

the perquisite of his Ministers as such. Nor on the other hand would they lead the Radicals in an agitation for a really extensive reform of Parliament. Ten years later, under another King, the Whigs did both these things at once, and only so managed to maintain themselves in office long enough to remodel the Constitution, heavily weighted in the interest of their rivals.

The Whigs had become for a while more lukewarm in the cause of Reform than in 1797, when they had voted 91 strong for household suffrage. The fact that they had held office even for a few months in 1806 - 7 on the basis of leaving the anti-Jacobin system of society and politics untouched, had compromised the future of Reform inside their body, and increased the mutual suspicion between Whigs and Radicals. Many old Whig families who had left the party in the days of Burke and the French Revolution, but had never had the heart to leave Brooks's, came back to the party fold, and the alliance with the Tory Grenvilles continued until 1817. Such connections rendered it difficult for the Whigs to adopt a popular programme. Indeed if they had ever taken office again in a Coalition such as 1807, their connections with reform would have been snapped altogether, and the historic purpose for which fate was preserving them would have been frustrated.

Lord Grey, in 1819–20, refused to take the field in a campaign for Parliamentary Reform, because, as he wrote to his confidant, Lord Holland, the proposal of any large measure would split the Whig party. He declared indeed that he himself favoured the abolition of no less than a hundred of the rotten borough seats, and was sure that any smaller proposal would fail to arouse popular enthusiasm without which no reform had the least chance of being carried. Partly because he knew that so large a proposal would break up the Parliamentary party that he led, partly because he shrank from open alliance with the disreputable Radicals, partly because he preferred domestic ease and studious leisure at Howick, the Whig chief put off the hour of action. In refusing to give the country any more positive lead than a denunciation of Peterloo and the Six Acts, Grey left the Tories another decade in which to make good, and, under Canning, Huskisson and Peel, they did not let the opportunity slip.

The ground was cleared for change in the Tory counsels by the death of Castlereagh in 1822. The great British statesman who had done more than any European diplomat to bring about Napoleon's fall and to establish peace in Europe, had identified himself in his last years with the anti-Jacobin domestic policy in its final stage of decay. He had beaten Napoleon and made a peace that gave us security for a hundred years, but he had introduced the Six Acts into the House of Commons. When he died, it was the less fortunate side of his career that was uppermost in men's minds, but to us at a century's remove it seems the less important, as it was certainly the less enduring. His death by his own hand was

NOTES

hailed by most of his poorer fellow-countrymen with revengeful glee, which found voice in the horrible cheers that greeted his coffin as it passed into Westminster Abbey.1 Posterity can look more impartially at the whole career of a man who was sometimes right and sometimes wrong, but who had in the main wrought greatly and beneficently, and had always, according to the light that was in him, devoted powers of the first order to his country's service.

2.11 LIBERAL IN 19TH CENTURY ENGLAND

The Liberal Party grew out of the Whigs, which had its origins as an aristocratic faction in the reign of Charles II. The Whigs were in favour of reducing the power of The Crown and increasing the power of the Parliament. Although their motives in this were originally to gain more power for themselves, the more idealistic Whigs gradually came to support an expansion of democracy for its own sake. The great figures of reformist Whiggery were Charles James Fox (died 1806) and his disciple and successor Earl Grey. After decades in opposition the Whigs came to power under Grey in 1830 and carried the First Reform Act in 1832.

The Reform Act was the climax of Whiggery but also brought about the Whigs' demise. The admission of the middle classes to the franchise and to the House of Commons led eventually to the development of a systematic middle class liberalism and the end of Whiggery, although for many years reforming aristocrats held senior positions in the party. In the years after Grey's retirement the party was led first by Lord Melbourne, a fairly traditional Whig, and then by Lord John Russell, the son of a Duke but a crusading radical, and Lord Palmerston, a renegade Irish Tory and essentially a conservative, although capable of radical gestures.

As early as 1839 Russell had adopted the name Liberal Party, but in reality the party was a loose coalition of Whigs in the House of Lords and Radicals in the Commons. The leading Radicals were John Bright and Richard Cobden, who represented the manufacturing towns that had gained representation under the Reform Act. They favoured social reform, personal liberty, reducing the powers of the Crown and the Church of England (many of them were Nonconformists), avoidance of war and foreign alliances (which were bad for business), and above all free trade. For a century free trade was the one cause which could unite all Liberals.

In 1841 the Liberals lost office to the Conservative Party under Sir Robert Peel, but their period in opposition was short, because the Conservatives split over the repeal of the Corn Laws, a free trade issue, and a faction known as the Peelites (but not Peel himself, who died soon after), defected to the Liberal side. This allowed ministries led by Russell, Palmerston and the Peelite Lord Aberdeen

to hold office for most of the 1850s and 1860s. The leading Peelite was William Ewart Gladstone, who was a zealous reforming Chancellor of the Exchequer in most of these governments. The formal foundation of the Liberal Party is traditionally traced to 1859 and the formation of Palmerston's second government.

The Whig-Radical amalgam could not become a true modern political party, however, while it was dominated by aristocrats, and it was not until the departure of the "Two Terrible Old Men", Russell and Palmerston, that Gladstone could become the first leader of the modern Liberal Party. This was brought about by Palmerston's death in 1865 and Russell's retirement in 1868. After a brief Conservative interlude (during which the Second Reform Act was passed by agreement between the parties), Gladstone won a huge victory at the 1868 election and formed the first Liberal government. The establishment of the party as a national membership organisation came with the foundation of the National Liberal Federation in 1877.

The Gladstonian Era

For the next thirty years Gladstone and Liberalism were synonymous. The "Grand Old Man", as he became known, was Prime Minister of the United Kingdom four times and the powerful flow of his rhetoric dominated British politics even when he was out of office. His rivalry with the Conservative leader Benjamin Disraeli became legendary. Gladstone was a High Church Anglican and enjoyed the company of aristocrats, but he grew ever more progressive as he grew older: he was, as one wit put it, "a Tory in all but essentials". Queen Victoria, who had grown up as a Whig supporter under the tutelage of Melbourne, became a Conservative in reaction to Gladstone's moralising Liberalism.

Gladstone's great achievements in office were his reforms to education, land reform (particularly in Ireland, where he ended centuries of landlord oppression), the disestablishment of the (Anglican) Church of Ireland through the Irish Church Act 1869, the introduction of democratic local government, reform allowing the secret ballot (the Ballot Act 1872) and removing electoral corruption, the abolition of patronage in the civil service and the army, and the Third Reform Act which greatly extended the vote to almost all adult males. Gladstone's reforming tendencies were borne partly out of his visit to Lancashire during The Cotton Famine, where he was impressed by working class qualities. It was during the 1860s that Gladstone became known as 'The People's William'.

In foreign policy, Gladstone was in general against foreign entanglements but did not resist the reality of imperialism. For example, he approved of the occupation of Egypt by British forces in 1882.

In the 1874 general election Gladstone was defeated by the Conservatives under Disraeli during a sharp recession. He formally resigned as Liberal leader

NOTES

and was succeeded by the Marquess of Hartington, but he soon changed his mind and returned to active politics. He strongly disagreed with Disraeli's pro-Ottoman foreign policy and in 1880 he conducted the first outdoor mass-election campaign in Britain, known as the Midlothian campaign. The Liberals won a large majority in the 1880 election. Hartington ceded his place and Gladstone resumed office.

Among the consequences of the Third Reform Act (1884–85) was the giving of the vote to the Catholic peasants in Ireland, and the consequent creation of an Irish Parliamentary Party led by Charles Stewart Parnell. In the 1885 general election this party won the balance of power in the House of Commons, and demanded Irish Home Rule as the price of support for a continued Gladstone ministry. Gladstone personally supported Home Rule, but a strong Liberal Unionist faction led by Joseph Chamberlain, along with the last of the Whigs, Hartington, opposed it.

The result was a catastrophic split in the Liberal Party, and heavy defeat in the 1886 election at the hands of Lord Salisbury. There was a final weak Gladstone ministry in 1892, but it also was dependent on Irish support and failed to get Irish Home Rule through the House of Lords. Gladstone finally retired in 1894, and his ineffectual successor, Lord Rosebery, led the party to another heavy defeat in the 1895 general election.

Another consequence of the Third Reform Act was the rise of Lib-Lab candidates, in the absence of any committed Labour Party. The Act split all county constituencies (which were represented by multiple MPs) in to single-member constituencies, roughly corresponding to population patterns. In areas with working class majorities, in particular coal-mining areas, Lib-Lab candidates were popular, and they received sponsorship and endorsement from trade unions. In the first election after the Act was passed (1885), thirteen were elected, up from two in 1874. The Third Reform Act also facilitated the demise of the Whig old guard: in two-member constituencies, it was common to pair a Whig and a radical under the Liberal banner. After the Third Reform Act, fewer Whigs were selected as candidates.

The Liberal Zenith

The Liberals languished in opposition for a decade, while the coalition of Salisbury and Chamberlain held power. The 1890s were marred by infighting between the three principal successors to Gladstone, party leader William Harcourt, former Prime Minister Lord Rosebery, and Gladstone's personal secretary, John Morley. This intrigue finally led Harcourt and Morley to resign their positions in 1898 as they continued to be at loggerheads with Rosebery over Irish home rule and issues relating to imperialism. Replacing Harcourt as party

NOTES

leader was Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman. Harcourt's resignation briefly muted the turmoil in the party, but the beginning of the Second Boer War soon nearly broke the party apart, with Rosebery and a circle of supporters including important future Liberal leaders H.H. Asquith, Edward Grey, and Richard Burdon Haldane forming a clique dubbed the "Liberal Imperialists" that supported the government in the prosecution of the war. On the other side, more radical members of the party formed a Pro-Boer faction that denounced the conflict and called for an immediate end to hostilities. Quickly rising to prominence among the Pro-Boers was David Lloyd George, a relatively new MP and a master of rhetoric, who took advantage of having a national stage to speak out on a controversial issue to make his name in the party. Harcourt and Morley also sided with this group, though with slightly different aims. Campbell-Bannerman tried to keep these forces together at the head of a moderate Liberal rump, but in 1901 he delivered a speech on the government's "methods of barbarism" in South Africa that pulled him further to the left and nearly tore the party in two. The party was saved after Salisbury's retirement in 1902 when his successor, Arthur Balfour, pushed a series of unpopular initiatives such as a new education bill and Joseph Chamberlain called for a new system of protectionist tariffs. Campbell-Bannerman was able to rally the party around the traditional liberal platform of free trade and land reform and led them to the greatest election victory in their history. This would prove the last time the Liberals won a majority in their own right.

Although he presided over a large majority, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman was overshadowed by his ministers, most notably Herbert Henry Asquith at the Exchequer, Edward Grey at the Foreign Office, Richard Burdon Haldane at the War Office and David Lloyd George at the Board of Trade. An ill Campbell-Bannerman retired in 1908 and died later that year. He was succeeded by Asquith, who stepped up the government's radicalism. Lloyd George succeeded Asquith at the Exchequer, and was in turn succeeded at the Board of Trade by Winston Churchill, a recent defector from the Conservatives.

The Liberals pushed through much legislation, including the regulation of working hours, National Insurance and welfare. It was at this time that a political battle over the so called People's Budget resulted in the passage of an act ending the power of the House of Lords to block legislation. The cost was high, however, as the government was required by the king to call two general elections in 1910 to validate its position and ended up frittering away most of its large majority, being left once again dependent on the Irish Nationalists.

As a result Asquith was forced to introduce a new third Home Rule bill in 1912. Since the House of Lords no longer had the power to block the bill, the Unionist's Ulster Volunteers led by Sir Edward Carson, launched a campaign of

NOTES

opposition that included the threat of armed resistance in Ulster and the threat of mutiny by army officers in Ireland in 1914. In their resistance to Home Rule the Ulster Protestants had the full support of the Conservatives, whose leader, Andrew Bonar Law, was of Ulster-Scots descent. The country seemed to be on the brink of civil war when World War I broke out in August 1914.

The war struck at the heart of everything British Liberals believed in. The party became divided over the distinctly illiberal policies that were introduced under her auspices, including conscription and the Defence of the Realm Act. Several Cabinet ministers resigned, and Asquith, the master of domestic politics, proved a poor war leader. Lloyd George and Churchill, however, were zealous supporters of the war, and gradually forced the old pacifist Liberals out. The poor British performance in the early months of the war forced Asquith to invite the Conservatives into a coalition (on 17 May 1915). This marked the end of the last all-Liberal government. This coalition fell apart at the end of 1916, when the Conservatives withdrew their support from Asquith and gave it to Lloyd George instead, who became Prime Minister at the head of a coalition government largely made up of Conservatives. Asquith and his followers moved to the opposition benches in Parliament and the Liberal Party was split once again.

2.12 SUMMARY

- No consensus exists as to when the French Revolutionary Wars ended and the Napoleonic Wars began. Possible dates include 9 November 1799, when Bonaparte seized power in France; 18 May 1803, when Britain and France ended the only period of peace in Europe between 1792 and 1814, and 2 December 1804, when Bonaparte crowned himself Emperor.
- The Fifth Coalition (1809) of the United Kingdom and Austria against France formed as the UK engaged in the Peninsular War against France. Again the UK stood alone, and the sea became the major theatre of war against Napoleon's allies. During the time of the Fifth Coalition, the Royal Navy won a succession of victories in the French colonies.
- Transport was greatly improved during the 18th century in Britain. Groups of rich men formed turnpike trusts. Acts of Parliament gave them the right to improve and maintain certain roads. Travellers had to pay tolls to use them. The first turnpikes were created as early as 1663 but they became far more common in the 18th century.
- The War of 1812 was fought between the United States and Great Britain from June 1812 to the spring of 1815, although the peace treaty ending the war was signed in Europe in December 1814. The main land fighting of the war occurred along the Canadian border, in the Chesapeake Bay

region, and along the Gulf of Mexico; extensive action also took place at sea.

2.13 REVIEW QUESTIONS

NOTES

1. What was the background of Napoleonic war?
2. Discuss the condition of education in England in 19th century.
3. State the dimensions of Canada and American war.
4. What was the British foreign policy of 19th century?
5. Discuss the role of liberal in 19th century England.

2.14 FURTHER READINGS

- Andrew Marr, *A History of Modern*, Publisher : Macmillan (17 May 2007).
- Padmaja Ashok, *The Social History of England*, Publisher : Orient Blackswan, 2011.
- Thomas Babington Macaulay and Hugh Trevor-Roper, *The History of England*, Publisher: Penguin Classics (April 26, 1979).

NOTES

CHAPTER— 3

CONTEMPORARY PERIOD OF ENGLAND

STRUCTURE

3.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After studying the chapter, students will be able to :

- understand the history of Canning;
- explain the revolution of Spain;
- discuss the foreign policies of Canning towards many countries.

3.2 INTRODUCTION

In Great Britain, in 1815, the aristocrat-dominated Parliament passed the Corn Law, which raised tariffs on grain to make imports impossible. The high tariffs also raised prices beyond the reach of the working class. In December 1816, starving workers rioted in London. Meanwhile, in Manchester, the ascendant industrialists who dominated the city had been hoping to get Parliamentary representation for some time. Realizing how discontented the workers were, the industrialists helped organize 80,000 workers to demonstrate at St. Peters Field against the Corn Law and for universal male suffrage. The protest was peaceful, but British soldiers nonetheless fired into the crowd, killing several. The event became a national scandal, called the Peterloo Massacre.

NOTES

The Tory Parliament, frightened of the potential for worker revolts, passed acts in 1819 aimed at stopping mass political organization. Not appeased, a group of workers decided to try and assassinate the Tory cabinet. This group, known as the Cato Street Conspiracy, was discovered in 1820. Several members were executed. Here, in this chapter we will discuss the period after this when Canning came in power.

Britain was on the verge of a new era of foreign policy when Viscount Castlereagh was first thrown into the international arena in 1814.

Despite being one of the victors of the Napoleonic Wars the imperial power still faced a number of challenges, the main one being how to balance all the interests of the European powers who were growing in confidence daily.

Viscount Castlereagh started his reign as foreign secretary in a mayor meeting of the post war allied powers at the Congress of Vienna in 1814. The congress was the first in a series of congresses that were designed to keep peace in Europe after the Napoleonic Wars. Terms imposed by the congresses on France were very strict as the country was forced to lose a number of important territories.

Initial talks between the countries involved broke down with Russia, Austria and Prussia not keen on reforming their political and economic systems therefore Britain and France took part in discussions less and less.

The resulting Treaty of Vienna in 1815 effectively ended the Napoleonic Wars and attempted to keep the current status quo of Europe. Germany, however was changed substantially and lost a number of independent states.

Britain was very keen to keep their colonies and an attempt to do this joined the Quadruple Alliance which meant it would guarantee 60,000 troops if France violated any further treaties.

One alliance Castlereagh was not keen to join however was the Holy Alliance which was later used as a tool for suppressing liberalism in Western Europe. The foreign secretary referred to it as a piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense.' He was often referred to as some by a conservative reactionary in Britain and a dangerous liberal in foreign affairs, and his views led a split in the Congress system after 1815.

Castlereagh remained foreign secretary until his suicide in 1822.

His successor Canning continued very much along a similar vein despite their personal differences. The pair famously fought in a duel in 1809 and the two men had been sworn enemies ever since. Despite this they had a very similar approach to foreign policy.

Canning's views on certain issues however were even stronger than Castlereagh's and he believed that imperial powers should not interfere in affairs beyond their areas of jurisdiction.

NOTES

He was a very keen supporter of the Greek rebellion in the 1820s which led to the formation of the modern Greece we see today. Canning was also involved in stopping revolts against the Spanish rule in South America and was famously quoted as saying "I have brought in a New World to redress the balance of the old."

3.3 CANNING AND HIS ERA

George Canning (April 11, 1770 – August 8, 1827) was a British statesman and politician who served as Foreign Secretary and, briefly, Prime Minister. Canning rose quickly in British politics as an effective orator and writer. His speeches in Parliament as well as his essays gave the followers of William Pitt the Younger a rhetorical power they had previously lacked. Canning's skills saw him gain leverage within the Pittite faction that allowed him influence over its policies along with repeated promotions in the Cabinet. Over time, Canning became a prominent public speaker as well, and was one of the first politicians to campaign heavily in the country.

As a result of his charisma and promise, Canning early on drew to himself a circle of supporters who would become known as the Canningites. Conversely though, Canning had a reputation as a divisive man, as many felt alienated by him. His most significant achievements included support for various freedom struggles against imperial rule and in helping to restrict the great powers from undue interference in the affairs of other nations. He recognized the independence from Spain of emerging republics in the New World, and famously suggested that the Old World needed the New World to amend for its mistakes. He supported the Greeks in their revolt against the Ottoman Empire, and prevented France from helping Spain crush rebellions in the Americas.

Early Life

Canning was born in Marylebone, London. His father, George Canning Sr. of Garvagh, County Londonderry, was a gentleman of limited means, a failed wine merchant and lawyer, who renounced his right to inherit the family estate in exchange for payment of his substantial debts. George Sr. eventually abandoned the family and died in poverty on April 11, 1771, his son's first birthday, in London. Canning's mother, Mary Ann Costello, took work as a stage actress, a profession not considered respectable at the time.

Because Canning showed unusual intelligence and promise at an early age, family friends persuaded his uncle, London merchant Stratford Canning (father to the diplomat Stratford Canning), to become his nephew's guardian. George Canning grew up with his cousins at the home of his uncle, who provided him

with an income and an education. Stratford Canning's financial support allowed the young Canning to study at Eton College and Christ Church, Oxford.

While at school, Canning gained renown for his skill in writing and debate. He struck up friendships with Lord Liverpool, Granville Leveson-Gower, and John Hookham Frere. Canning began practicing Law after receiving his BA from Oxford in the summer of 1791. Yet, he wished to enter politics.

NOTES

Canning married Joan Scott on July 8, 1800, with John Hookham Frere and William Pitt the Younger as witnesses. They had four children: George Charles, William Pitt, Harriet Canning, and Charles John.

Entry into Politics

Stratford Canning was a Whig and would introduce his nephew, in the 1780s, to prominent Whigs such as Charles James Fox, Edmund Burke, and Richard Brinsley Sheridan. George Canning's friendship with Sheridan would last for the remainder of Sheridan's life.

George Canning's impoverished background and limited financial resources, however, made unlikely a bright political future in a Whig party whose political ranks were led mostly by members of the wealthy landed aristocracy in league with the newly rich industrialist classes. Regardless, along with Whigs such as Burke, Canning himself would become considerably more conservative in the early 1790s, after witnessing the excessive radicalism of the French Revolution.

So, when Canning decided to enter politics he sought and received the patronage of the leader of the "Tory" group, William Pitt the Younger. In 1793, thanks to the help of Pitt, Canning became a Member of Parliament for Newtown.

Elevation to Office

On November 2, 1795, Canning received his first ministerial post: Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. In this post he proved a strong supporter of Pitt, often taking his side in disputes with the Foreign Secretary Lord Grenville. He resigned this post on April 1, 1799.

In 1799, Canning became a commissioner of the Board of Control, followed by Paymaster of the Forces in 1800. When Pitt the Younger resigned in 1801, Canning loyally followed him into opposition and again returned to office in 1804, with Pitt, becoming Treasurer of the Navy.

Canning left office with the death of Pitt the Younger, but was appointed Foreign Secretary in the new government of the Duke of Portland the following year. Given key responsibilities for the country's diplomacy in the Napoleonic Wars, he was responsible for planning the terror attack on Copenhagen in September 1807, much of which he undertook at his country estate, South Hill Park at Easthampstead in Berkshire.

NOTES

Duel with Castlereagh

In 1809, Canning entered into a series of disputes within the government that were to become famous. He argued with the Secretary of State for War and the Colonies, Lord Castlereagh, over the deployment of troops that Canning had promised would be sent to Portugal, but which Castlereagh sent to the Netherlands. The government became increasingly paralyzed in disputes between the two men. Portland was in deteriorating health and gave no lead, until Canning threatened resignation unless Castlereagh was removed and replaced by Lord Wellesley. Portland secretly agreed to make this change as soon as it became possible.

Castlereagh discovered the deal in September of 1809, and became furious, demanding redress. He challenged Canning to a duel, and Canning accepted. It was fought on September 21, 1809. Canning had never before fired a pistol. In the duel Canning missed; Castlereagh wounded his opponent in the thigh. There was much outrage that two cabinet ministers had resorted to such a method. Shortly afterwards the ailing Portland resigned as Prime Minister and Canning offered himself to George III as a potential successor. However, the King appointed Spencer Perceval instead, and Canning left office once more. He did take consolation though, in the fact that Castlereagh also stood down.

Return to Government

Upon Perceval's assassination in 1812, the new Prime Minister, Lord Liverpool offered Canning the position of Foreign Secretary once more. Canning refused, as he also wished to be Leader of the House of Commons and was reluctant to serve in any government with Castlereagh. In 1814, he became the British Ambassador to Portugal, returning the following year. He received several further offers of office from Liverpool and in 1816, he became President of the Board of Control.

Canning resigned from office once more in 1820, in opposition to the treatment of Queen Caroline, estranged wife of the new King George IV. Canning and Caroline were personal friends.

Another Return

In 1822, Castlereagh, now Marquess of Londonderry, committed suicide. Canning succeeded him as both Foreign Secretary and Leader of the House of Commons. In his second term of office he sought to prevent South America from coming into the French sphere of influence and in this he was successful. He also gave support to the growing campaign for the abolition of slavery. Despite personal issues with Castlereagh, he continued many of his foreign policies, such as the view that the powers of Europe (Russia, France, etc.) should not be allowed

to meddle in the affairs of other states. This policy enhanced public opinion of Canning as a liberal. He also prevented the United States from opening trade with the West Indies.

NOTES

Prime Minister

Liverpool retired as Prime Minister in 1827, and Canning was chosen to succeed him, in preference to both the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel. Neither man agreed to serve under Canning and they were followed by five other members of Liverpool's Cabinet as well as forty junior members of the government.

The Tory Party was now heavily split between the "High Tories" (or "Ultras," nicknamed after the contemporary party in France) and the moderates supporting Canning, often called "Canningites." As a result Canning found it difficult to form a government and chose to invite a number of Whigs to join his Cabinet, including Lord Lansdowne. The government agreed not to discuss the difficult question of parliamentary reform, which Canning opposed but the Whigs supported.

However Canning's health by this time was in steep decline. He died on August 8, 1827, in the very same room where Charles James Fox met his own end, 21 years earlier. To this day Canning's total period in office remains the shortest of any Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, 119 days. He is buried in Westminster Abbey.

Legacy

Canning has come to be regarded as a "lost leader," with much speculation about what his legacy could have been had he lived. His government of Tories and Whigs continued for a few months under Lord Goderich but fell apart in early 1828. It was succeeded by a government under the Duke of Wellington, which initially included some Canningites but soon became mostly "High Tory" when many of the Canningites drifted over to the Whigs. Wellington's administration would soon go down in defeat as well. Some historians have seen the revival of the Tories from the 1830s onwards, in the form of the Conservative Party, as the overcoming of the divisions of 1827. What would have been the course of events had Canning lived is highly speculative. The Canningites were distinct within the Tory party because they favored Roman Catholic emancipation and freer trade.

To some later Conservatives, most prominently Benjamin Disraeli, Canning came to be regarded as a model and forerunner of One Nation Conservatism, providing a contrast to Sir Robert Peel, whom Disraeli attacked bitterly.

NOTES

3.4 REVOLUTION ON THE IBERIAN PENNINSULA (SPAIN)

Upon entering office in 1822, Canning was immediately faced with the problem of Revolution in Spain. The Congress of Verona was assembling, and Canning did not even have time to draw up new instructions for the Duke of Wellington, attending on behalf of Great Britain. This hardly mattered because Canning would not have differed from Castlereagh's directive not to get involved in any escapades in Spain, or make any real commitment to the Allies. Canning's policy on Spain, and later Portugal, was essentially to allow each nation to work out its own internal constitution, while being extremely wary of any outside interference. If Spanish revolutionaries had created a radically republican government that their King did not approve of, it should be left to them to figure out the details. Canning consistently supported the notion of 'selfdetermination', although his allies in the Quintuple Alliance did not agree with him.

Throughout his tenure in office, he had to devote time and energy trying to contain the conflicts that raged across the Iberian Peninsula. Spain had been in turmoil ever since Napoleon unceremoniously deposed King Ferdinand VII during the Napoleonic War. After the war, the Bourbon King was restored to power. Yet many liberals still remembered the 1812 Constitution which had tried to establish a constitutional monarchy with very strong republican overtones. After the peace, Spain's main priority was to reclaim its overseas colonies. Spanish soldiers were shipped off to the New World to fight a losing war against revolutionaries proclaiming new republics. By 1820 this situation had become untenable, and the spark that set off a new Revolution in Spain was mutinous soldiers in Cadiz refusing to sail for the Americas. Republicans seized control of government and forced the 1812 Constitution on an unwilling monarch. The Spanish revolutionaries adopted the form and even the language of their French counterparts. In their documents, one finds many references to the nation, reason, and liberty. For example one reads

> It was natural for a change of this nature to produce some Malcontents. This is the inevitable consequence of every Reform which has for object the correction of abuses. There will always be persons in a Nation who will not submit themselves to the empire of reason and justice.

One can see the strength of purpose and faith in reason in this passage, alongside veiled threats of Malcontents and justice. Also this was not the work of some Spanish Murat, but from the higher echelons of government. The Spanish Revolution was consciously emulating the French one in language and tone.

The Great Powers were alarmed by this turn of events. For Metternich and his increasingly devoted disciple Alexander I, here were the Jacobins they had

NOTES

fought so hard against, providing a chance to utilize the Quintuple Alliance. Here were those republicans resurrected and ready to set fire to Europe once again. The only problem being they were located in far-off Spain, where neither Austria nor Russia could easily reach. These sentiments were of course an oversimplification of how foreign courts pictured the Spanish Revolution. There were more practical concerns, such as how France would respond or the potential for the Revolution to spread, as one would so dramatically in 1848. Yet this view of reactionary courts was the image liberals across Europe, and particularly in Spain, gleaned from the situation. These type of perspectives help explain why Canning was seen as a hero for standing up to the pretensions of the Holy Alliance.

There were very practical reasons the Quintuple Alliance could not act in Spain. Great Britain refused to co-operate with its Allies, so that left only France with any real scope of action. Alexander had offered to help restore the king, but no one else could allow Russian troops to march across Europe. A restored Bourbon France saw in Spain an opportunity to expand its influence, restore its monarchist credentials, and shore up support for its own government. Even before the Congress of Verona, France had begun to build up an Army of Observation in the Pyrenees. Going into Verona it was clear who was capable and willing to act in Spain.

The Congress of Verona 1822 was the last great Congress in tradition of the Congress of Vienna. There were later Congresses, but over much more limited matters and called infrequently. After Verona, the idea of regular Congresses establishing a very loose supra-national government died. The hostility of the British to multilateral action and rifts between Russia and Austria, especially after Alexander's death, discouraged the assembly of anymore Congresses for a long time. Some part of this hesitation to use

Congresses was due to the experience of the Congress of Verona. The Duke of Wellington was the only voice of opposition at the Congress, simply rejecting any sort of interference in Spain. He wrote with some understatement to Canning that "A marked difference of opinions as to the mode of action has appeared between the Continental Courts on the one hand, and England on the other." The other Great Powers could not agree on any particular plan of action. The tsar's plan of marching Russian troops across Germany and France into Spain was unacceptable to the other Powers, and impossible without their approval. The British ambassador in Berlin described how the Russians, unable to actual act themselves, were pushing the French towards war with Spain. The end result of the Congress was simply the Powers deploring the Spanish Revolution, and leaving the door open for France to intervene.

The British were disappointed by the result of the Congress of Verona, but not surprised. They recalled memories of the Peninsular campaign against

NOTES

Napoleon, when the British aided the Spanish in driving the French out. The Duke of Wellington had achieved fame in Spain; even the Ultras were outraged by the re-entrance of French troops into Spain. British public opinion supported their government in opposing France, and radical leaders went so far as to advocate armed resistance to a French invasion. Most importantly for Canning and those who formulated foreign policy were the explosive possibilities inherent in any French campaign. Henry Wellesley, the British Representative in Spain wrote to Canning "If the French send any troops into Spain be assured that there will be just such another war there as the last, and that sooner or later all Europe will be dragged into it." He was hardly alone in his apprehension of war. Canning himself wrote many times of his fear, dreading "the war much more for France than Spain." The fear was a French defeat could destabilize the French monarchy to the point that revolutionaries could take over in Paris. Most commentators had little faith that a French intervention could be easy or bloodless. The French Army had shed most of its Napoleonic veterans. Many thought the French would once again be bogged down in a guerilla campaign as they had under Napoleon. There was also the memory of the French Revolution, when foreign invasion radicalized the Revolution. Canning wrote to the Spanish that

> The spirit of revolution, which, shut up within the Pyrenees, might exhaust itself in struggles, trying indeed to Spain, but harmless to her neighbors, if called forth from within those precincts by the provocation of foreign attack, might find perhaps in other Countries fresh aliment for its fury and might renew, throughout Europe, the miseries of the five and twenty years which preceded the peace of 1815.

Canning and those around him were extremely wary of the possibilities which could potentially arise from a French invasion. The only party truly wishing for a war in Spain, even an extended one if possible, was the United States. Stratford Canning, cousin of the foreign minister describes how "The prospect of a good lasting extensive conflict in Europe is, of course, very flattering to Jonathon's [Quincy Adams] commercial views." An extended war in Spain would have ended attempts to reclaim Spanish colonies. While the British desired the wars in Latin America to end, there was much more at stake on the Continent. Hoping to avoid conflict, Canning implored both sides in a vain to stop an increasingly probable French invasion.

The British government made overtures to the Spanish to moderate their government and guarantee the safety of the Spanish royal family. The Duke of Wellington, famous in Spain for his exploits during the war, was the ideal vehicle for this type of overture without offending the sensibilities of the Spanish. Wellington sent his representative Somerset to Madrid, making it very clear that this was not an official act of the British government. He advised the Spanish to

NOTES

restore more power to the monarchy in order to prevent a French invasion and stave off the threats of the Revolution: "the very foundations of social order and government are in a state of risk." The British had to be circumspect about their advice, in order to follow their own principle of noninterference, and hopefully so the Spanish would follow their advice. In the end, despite many debates on the issue, the Revolutionaries did not alter the Constitution of 1812.

The only course left to the British was to make it crystal clear to the Spanish where the British stood, and discourage any hopes the Spanish might entertain of British aid. Shortly before the war began, Canning wrote to the ambassador in Madrid to tell the Spanish that "We wish for Peace therefore in Europe: but Peace for ourselves we determined of all events to preserve." He made it clear that Britain will observe a strict neutrality in the upcoming conflict, and the Spanish would be left alone to deal with the French invaders.

The Spanish were at least somewhat receptive to British appeals, and tried to reorganize their government in vain. The French on the other hand were calmly dismissive of the British. The British made an offer to the French for mediate, which they declined politely. Canning grew frustrated by the whole ordeal, because it was entirely unclear what the French desired in Spain. Perhaps partly out of frustration, but more likely to appeal to the British public, Canning made a speech on April 30, 1823 in front of Parliament intimating that he hoped for a Spanish victory in order to avoid the most feared consequences of the conflict. This speech drew the anger of the other Great Powers: Bagot in St. Petersburg tells of the Russian disdain for "dragging the Allies before Parliament." This speech did not help Canning's position abroad, but no one supported the British on the matter of Spain anymore.

Meanwhile Canning urged the British ambassador to Paris to stress the importance of peace in consolidating the fragile French political system. The British ambassador Stuart failed to change the French King's mind, and the build-up towards war continued unabated. The war was not solely a French affair; they had the support of Austria, Russia, and Prussia in their endeavor. While only French troops were involved, they were given moral support from the Holy Alliance. All of the Allies, except Britain of course, had decided to withdraw their ambassadors to Madrid in protest at the same time for virtually the same reasons36. The Eastern powers were obviously supporting the French invasion. They colluded together in this matter to show their support of the French efforts to restore the legitimate authority of the Spanish monarch.

As a prelude to the war in Spain, the French King gave a speech before the Chamber of Deputies giving his reasons for going to war. In the speech the King espoused the principles of Legitimacy, arguing that only the Spanish King could consent to divesting any of his authority, and any system imposed on him was

NOTES

unlawful. This speech enraged the British, not enough to get involved in the war, but a bitter pill to swallow along with the French invasion. Stuart in Paris wrote to Canning that the speech struck "at the root of the British Constitution." Canning shared his outrage at the French King's speech, and wrote back to him a warning that he was embarking on a "contest of extreme principles which has already desolated Europe ... if reopened now, neither we nor our sons' sons may see the conclusion." He saw that the French King was all too willing to make this war one of ideologies, and feared that doing so would make it a Pan-European conflict. He informed the French where British sympathies lied :

> "If I were called to choose between the principles laid down in the speech if H.M. the king of France, and its antagonistic principle, the sovereignty of the people, I should feel myself compelled to acknowledge that the former is the more alien of the two to the British Constitution."

Canning gave the French King a rather blunt reminder where the British stand on the subject. The French King sent his response through the British ambassador that the British system was entirely based on religious motives from the past and as such "entirely inapplicable to other countries." While the Spanish constitution may have been radical, Louis XVIII had recognized limits on his own authority upon returning to power. Charles X was pushing his own absolutist principles onto French foreign policy. Even though the Holy Alliance may have approved, these ideas are partially what led to Charles X's overthrow in 1830. This interchange between king and minister helps one to understand what the major issues at stake were in Spain, France sought to define it in terms of ideological struggle between legitimacy and republicanism. Canning meanwhile, tried to sap the ideology out of the argument and insisted the issue revolves around an unprovoked invasion :

> Our difference with France and the Allies throughout, is not as to the Arrangements which it might be desirable to obtain from Spain, but as to the principle upon which France and the Allies propose to require them. We disclaim for Ourselves, and deny for other Powers, the right of requiring any Changes in the internal Institutions of Independent States, with the menace of hostile attack in the case of refusal.

Here, Canning laid out clearly where he differed from his Allies. He valued the independence of nations over and above any sort of ideological dispute. This was the crux of Canning's foreign policy, not just in Spain, but for all of Europe and will be seen in Latin America as well.

France soon crossed the frontier and entered into Spain. The British government, having failed to prevent the conflict, was now faced with the question of what exactly should be done. For Canning it was obvious which side they

NOTES

favored in the conflict: he wrote that even though "The king of Spain is as bad a King and the Cortes as bad a Government as one can conceive. But between invaded and invader the choice is clear." For the British, then, it was more of a question of how far they should take their support of Spain. They refused to withdraw their ambassador to Madrid as the other Great Powers had done in concert. A memorandum for the Cabinet, most likely drafted by Canning, dealt with the possibility of declaring war on France. It described how the British were still in debt from the previous war, how the army was not prepared, and how British entry into the war would have made intervention more popular in France. Beyond these reasons, the British feared the other Powers might side with France leaving Hanover vulnerable to Prussia. Also, a French controlled Spain could threaten Portugal, a British ally. The memorandum concluded that it was not in the interests of Great Britain to declare war over Spain. Canning therefore was willing to allow the French to enter Spain, yet there were British interests at stake of which the French had to be reminded.

One issue was the secret article of the 1814 treaty between Spain and France, of which Britain was a signatory. This article strictly forbade the French from trying to enter into any sort of family pact or alliance with Spain that "may affect the independence of Spain, [or] which may be injurious to the interests of His Britannic Majesty." The British could not allow the French to simply take over Spain or revive the fears of over a century earlier during the time of the War of Spanish Succession. The other concern for Britain was its longstanding ally Portugal, which would now be vulnerable to French forces. Finally, as will be seen below, Britain was concerned over the fate of the New World, and did not want the French to interfere there. In the end the only action Canning and the British government decided to take was a warning to France that they will be neutral in the conflict if France followed three restrictions. The French must not seek territorial gain or seek to dominate Spain, they must not violate Portugal, and they must not aid the Spanish in the New World.

The French followed the British guidelines, and despite all the dire predictions, they successfully marched on Madrid. The Revolutionary Government fled south to Cadiz, but soon were surrounded and defeated by the French armies who reinstated Ferdinand VII to the throne. By the end there was surprisingly little bloodshed; the Spanish did not turn out to fight the French when they only proclaimed to free their king. In short time the Spanish king was restored to power.

Yet to the consternation of the Charles X, King Ferdinand VII turned out to be an even more arch-conservative than the French King. After being returned to power, the Spanish King was confident that "the melancholy effects of the late disasters will soon be forever obliterated." In the aftermath of the Revolution, the

NOTES

king embraced a reactionary policy. He continued "I am resolved to preserve inviolate, and in all their plentitude, the legitimate rights of my sovereignty, without resigning, either now or at any other time, the smallest portion of them." The French government had hoped that the Spanish King would have enacted something like their Charter giving more political rights and representation to his subjects. Instead Ferdinand hanged the ringleaders of the Revolution, and imprisoned hundreds of others. As will been seen below, he also called for a new Congress to help Spain restore its authority in the New World. The French kept their forces in Spain, but it had turned into a drawn out presence that they themselves wanted to be released. The British over the rest of Canning's tenure made repeated demands that the French withdraw, and Canning was even raked over the coals in Parliament for not pressing the French hard enough. Yet general war had been avoided, and eventually Anglo-French relations improved.

So what was the final result of the Spanish Revolution and French invasion? Canning and the British had been isolated from the rest of the Allies, and the French had invaded despite British objections. The whole thing was a black-eye for the British. They had shed blood to drive the French out of Spain only to see them return ten years later, albeit in a very different manner. Canning had succeeded only in making the French agree to terms they would probably have followed regardless. The French themselves had gone from the pariah of Europe to a trusted member of the Alliance, while now Britain was the outsider. Yet by speaking out against French aggression so publicly, Canning had clearly established the shape of British foreign policy to Europe. He had become the darling of liberals, yet this in of itself was hardly what he had hoped to achieve. Perhaps the most he had in fact accomplished was consistency in his policy. He spoke out publicly about the views of Great Britain during the crisis and showed a remarkable level of transparency for the period, as opposed to Castlereagh who had objected in private while publicly supporting the Allies. As small consolation, the French invasion had not turned out to be what was expected. The French had to deal with an unpredictable Spanish King and keep soldiers there for many years. The British avoided the general war that was feared, and perhaps the best result coming out of the crisis was that it was diffused before it could escalate.

3.5 REVOLUTION ON THE IBERIAN PENNINSULA (PORTUGAL)

Portugal was an altogether different case than Spain, and the crisis there, while not as potentially harmful to Europe as a whole, was more acutely a threat to British interests. Portugal had a very different experience during the Napoleonic Wars. Portugal, like Spain, was occupied by Napoleonic forces, but the King escaped to Brazil under British escort, where he continued to rule. After the war,

NOTES

King John VI lingered in Brazil until 1821, and made a fateful decision on the future of his kingdom. He decided to return to Portugal to rule as king, but left his son Pedro to rule in Brazil which had grown used to being ruled from Rio de Janeiro. Upon his return to Portugal the king granted a liberal constitution that upset many conservatives, chiefly his own son Miguel. Miguel staged two attempted rebellions against his father, in 1821 and 1823, which led to his exile in 1824. Miguel fled to Vienna where he fostered a relationship with Metternich.

Meanwhile King John VI's more liberal son Pedro had declared independence in Brazil and had established himself as Emperor of Brazil. He too gave his nation a constitution. In Portugal the king did nothing to restore his authority in Brazil, in the expectation that upon his death they would be reunited in the person of his son. Upon his death in 1826 Brazil and Portugal were briefly united under the rule of Pedro IV, yet he had grown attached to Brazil. Pedro decided to grant Portugal an even more liberal constitution and then abdicate the throne in favor of his daughter Maria, who was only seven years old at the time. As regent, he appointed his conservative brother Miguel on the condition that he swear an oath to respect the constitution and marry his niece Maria. Although hesitating at first Miguel took the oath and returned to Lisbon.

Great Britain had a long-standing Alliance with Portugal, one they still greatly valued. Like Spain, Great Britain had fought in Portugal against Napoleon as well and renewed its alliance once again. From the beginning Britain took an acute interest in the political confusion in Portugal, and the example of Spain had made them wary of possible interference from other Powers. Yet there were key differences from Spain: Portugal was under the protection of Great Britain, for one. Also the Portuguese constitution was not as republican as the Spanish had been, and had been granted by the legitimate ruler of Portugal, even if it was his only major act as king. It was unclear as to exactly how far the Great Powers would push their reactionary agenda in the case of Portugal, and throughout the crisis Canning was leery of foreign meddling.

Even before the crisis truly came to a head, an interesting episode occurred concerning the French ambassador to Lisbon, one Neville. In order to deal with some rebels in northern Portugal, Neville had requested French troops to cross over into Portugal. Fortunately the French commander had enough sense to ask Paris for permission, which was denied and nothing came of this requested invasion. The French government recalled Neville, yet for some unknown reason the Russian ambassador in Paris convinced the government to change its mind and return Neville to Lisbon. This strange episode alerted the British of suspect designs by the Russians and French in Portugal, while not actually providing any sort of real transgression they could officially protest.

NOTES

The real worry was not so much over small plots or some underhanded diplomacy. Instead the British worried that Portugal would become like Spain had been a few years earlier, a battleground for the ideologies stemming from the French Revolution. Conservatives felt the new constitution was too liberal, and for them "Liberalism was a contagious moral disease which could not safely be tolerated on one's frontiers." The clash threatened to turn into civil war, especially dangerous considering Miguel's former revolts and his close ties to Metternich. Previously in 1823, the Portuguese had calling for British help to put down Miguel's rebellion. Canning was tempted to call in Hanoverian troops, which did not have to have the approval of Parliament. But Canning thought it unnecessary and only sent a squadron of ships to the harbor of Lisbon. This deployment proved to be quite fortuitous, for the Portuguese king himself was forced at one point in 1823 to take refuge on these British warships to escape from his son.

Events in Portugal so far had been tumultuous, yet had not yet reached a point where the Portuguese state truly needed British soldiers. Thus the British, while providing some small aid, were content to allow events to take their own course. This would change in 1826 when armed rebels increasingly began to win border skirmishes against the crown and the threat of an armed takeover of Lisbon loomed. The true threat laid in the fact that these men were for the most part deserters and followers of Miguel who had fled over the Spanish border. A treaty between Spain and Portugal stipulated that in just such a case, the men should be disarmed and either returned or sent away from the frontier. Yet the Spanish were not only refraining from taking their arms, but supplying them with more weapons and then sending them back into Portugal. It was not entirely clear who was responsible for this violation of the treaties. Local army commanders were the ones committing the acts, but it was not conclusively proven whether they were following orders from the Spanish government or even possibly the French. It was not even clear whether these soldiers were entirely Portuguese or made up of some Spanish recruited to the conservative cause. Dom Miguel was suspected of having ties to the leaders, but again there was not substantial proof of this connection.

Even though he was now in a position of authority in Lisbon, and could expect to be prince-consort to the Queen, he was not at all satisfied with the constitution he had sworn to uphold.

As the situation escalated, the Portuguese called upon the British to help them. Considering the increasing danger to the Portuguese state, along with foreign interference in the rebellion this time, Canning decided to send British troops to Lisbon. In one of his finest speeches before Parliament, Canning justifies this deployment as aid to an ancient ally threatened by foreign assault. This decision by Canning was extremely popular in England, especially among liberals

NOTES

who saw again an example of Canning defending the concept of a constitution against absolutist enemies. As a foreign policy decision, it was rather straightforward. Even though the connection to foreigners was not direct, Canning framed it as the defense of Portugal, to which Britain was obligated by treaties. Canning was protecting the internal institutions of Portugal, which he considered their right to determine. The only major question remaining was what would be the response of Spain and France to British intervention in Portugal.

The Spanish were the ones directly violating a treaty with Portugal over deserters crossing the border. There was some concern in the Cabinet and among the diplomatic corps that aiding Portugal could lead to war with Spain. While not an entirely likely outcome, Canning was considering the possibility. He writes to Liverpool that in such an eventuality, a peninsular war against Spain would be foolhardy. Instead he proposes that they focus on protecting Portugal while attacking Cuba, the base for Spanish operations for retaking its American empire. France still had troops in Spain at this time, and there was an even more remote possibility of the French getting involved.

The chief fear was that the French may argue that Portugal, like Spain in 1823, was not legitimate and attempt to invest Dom Miguel on the throne without the protections of the constitution. Yet this scenario was extremely unlikely, for as Hinde suggests, the French were "more interested in their private duel with England over Portugal than in European ideological solidarity." The French were interested in gaining influence in Portugal and hopefully weaken the British position there, but their policy was guided by pragmatism and they were not willing to face a direct confrontation with British over Portugal. Britain had a close relationship with Portugal since the seventeenth century, and it was seen as in the British orbit, much as Italy was in Austrian zone of influence and many of German lands under either Prussian or Austrian oversight.

Several thousand British soldiers entered Lisbon in 1826 to help shore up the Portuguese government. These troops did not see any action and were more of a symbol of British support than anything else. The British presence did allow Portuguese units to leave the capital for the frontier and the rebels were put down soon after. In the end the entire affair was of only secondary importance for British. The peace of Europe was not threatened by the crisis, and any sort of ideological overtones to the struggle were contained, if not solely in Portugal at least on the Iberian Peninsula. Yet these events represented a symbolic victory for Britain. It had proven Great Britain's resolve to aid a close ally and friend. Once again Canning had supported a constitutional monarchy against more conservative elements, yet as has been seen, he framed it solely in terms of the alliance. Even if claims of foreign interference were dubious, not even the Ultras in Great Britain opposed his actions.

NOTES

British aid could not ensure that the Portuguese government would be well-run however. Canning tried to give his advice to the Portuguese after this episode on how to effectively govern under a constitutional monarchy, arguing in favor of the minister Real and advising that they include those who differ in opinion from the government on only small points. In the end, this victory would prove to be rather short-lived, for in 1828 Wellington withdrew the British soldiers. Miguel promptly seized control of the throne and discarded the constitution. Wellington did not help at the time, but in 1834 Pedro defeated Miguel with the aid of the British under Palmerston to re-establish Maria. By 1834 the threat of outside interference had greatly diminished due to the Revolution of 1830 in France and Carlist wars in Spain. Canning guaranteed that at a critical time, only Britain had the right to intervene in Portugal, one which he used sparingly.

Both of these crises on the Iberian Peninsula display how Canning's foreign policy worked in action. His position was to allow the internal politics of a nation go unhindered unless they become a threat to their neighbors. In the case of Spain this meant trying to prevent a French invasion backed by the rest of the Quintuple Alliance, although the stakes were simply too high for the British to support the Spanish militarily. In Portugal, an ally to Britain, this meant allowing inept government and only getting involved when foreigners threatened the state. From Canning's perspective, the threat laid not so much with Jacobins or republicans in Iberia, but with Britain's partners in the Quintuple Alliance who sought to impose their ideology on their weaker neighbors.

Canning was especially wary of the French, who had intervened in Spain and were a traditional enemy of Britain. These crises also highlight the ultimately pragmatic nature of Canning's policy. Taken to the extreme, his foreign policy should have dictated that he defend Spain against France who was the aggressor. Yet he knew that this would have accomplished little while threatening to reopen a general war. In Portugal as well, if he had rigidly followed his policy there would have been no need to send troops to Portugal, since the rebels were mostly Portuguese themselves and only armed by a foreign power. Canning was flexible on these points and willing to alter his policy slightly in order to better deal with real world situations and further the interests of Great Britain.

3.6 LATIN AMERICA AND RECOGNITION

Colonial expansion was perhaps the most important hallmark of Great Britain throughout most of the modern era. From the era of Drake and Raleigh until the collapse of the British Empire after World War II, Great Britain cultivated and amassed an overseas empire of unprecedented proportions. During the 1820's, the nature of the British Empire was changing, from one focused on the Western Hemisphere to one focused on long settled areas in Africa, Asia, and the Pacific.

NOTES

Yet the Americas remained the focus of Canning, as the dissolution of the Spanish Empire was of pressing importance for another feature of the British Empire, trade and markets for increasing industrial production. The Napoleonic Wars had disrupted Spanish America and laid the groundwork for independence, yet the Congress of Vienna virtually ignored what had happened across the Atlantic.

The old European colonial powers still had a stake in the New World, Great Britain through Canada and Caribbean islands as well as the new trade with Spanish America. France, though greatly diminished as a colonial power, still held some small islands and was thought to desire more. Spain still claimed the entirety of its empire stretching from California to Argentina, even though much of this was in open revolt. Portugal, although officially separated from Brazil, was still tied to it through the royal family, as seen above. Also a new power, the United States of America, had greatly increased it size through the Louisiana Purchase, and seemed bent on further increasing its size and influence. Although these factors made the Americas volatile, absorbing much of Canning's time and attention, they culminated in his greatest foreign policy achievements.

Although by this time, much of the New World had been parceled out and settled, there were still large tracts of territory in North America still unclaimed. The Pacific Northwest, Alaska, and much of the interior were still only inhabited by small tribes of native Americans. The Russian Empire had established small trading posts on the coast of Alaska, and based large territorial claims on these. The United States had commissioned Lewis and Clark to explore to the Pacific and was very interested in expanding in this direction. The United Kingdom also was interested in expanding its Canadian possessions to the Pacific. These issues, although Canning was very interested in them, would be left unresolved for the time being, but represented a potential conflict between colonizing powers.

The future of colonization itself was an issue, or rather who should be allowed to colonize the remaining areas or take possession of established colonies. Britain was keen not only to hold onto its current colonies, but also to expand its influence. The United States wanted to see the older European powers kept of the Americas, although it recognized that it had no way of doing so. This confluence of interests led to close negotiations between Britain and the United States, even though they had been at war 1812-1814, and resulted in the famous Monroe Doctrine. This doctrine, although proclaimed by the United States, was in fact in the interests of Britain, and only enforceable by the British navy. Although the Monroe Doctrine changed nothing in of itself, it represented a shared foreign policy over the future of the Americas which would have great importance for the future of the Western Hemisphere.

The most important issue for Britain concerning the New World was over the future of the Spanish Empire. When Napoleon had captured the Spanish

NOTES

King and invaded Spain, these colonies began to enjoy more self-governance. Also with the blockade of Europe, British merchants had infiltrated these colonies commercially, gaining access to raw materials and finding a market for finished goods. After the war ended, many of the colonies desired independence from Spain, beginning a long conflict stretching across all of Spanish America. The issue was further complicated when it became clear that many of these fledgling states were establishing republics. Even across the Atlantic, Britain could not escape revolutionary ideologies and democratic principles. Yet it was Britain that was in a position to intervene while the other major Powers could only look on.

Britain remained neutral in this conflict, but by the 1820's it became clear that Spain could not hold onto all of the colonies and Canning was faced with the difficult question of recognizing these new republics. The future of Spanish America was of major importance for Canning and represented a major bone of contention in his own government between him and the High Tories. Much of Canning's reputation as a liberal was due to his support of American republics, as his friend Strangford writes: "His South American and his Roman Catholic policy is more arch-liberal than anything poor Southey ever said or sang." With the Spanish Empire falling apart, and the French colonial empire at low ebb, the British alone were the only power capable of influencing these new republics either through support or coercion. In the end the British stood on the sidelines for the most part and gave recognition only when they were confident the Spanish would never be able to return.

Canning's policy towards the New World highlights several key features of his policy in general. Throughout his ministry he maintained a consistent policy which he plainly stated to the other powers involved. For instance, he repeatedly warned Spain that Britain would be forced to recognize the colonies before recognition actually occurred. A second feature was that Canning resisted basing his policy on ideological grounds. The new republics were not supported in their conflict nor recognized until a certain level of stability existed. At the same time Canning had no objection to Spain retaining parts of its empire, including Cuba and Peru. What really drove his policy was the national interests of Britain, as seen by his interests in colonial expansion into strategic areas and continued trade with the region. Finally Canning showed a willingness to co-operate with foreign powers, either the United States or even France over recognition of the new republics in Latin America. All of these features helped Canning's policies in the New World achieve great results. British commercial dominance of the New World was ensured for much of the nineteenth century, and the greatest fears for the area were avoided. Even with the complexities of the Spanish Revolution and French intervention, Canning managed to keep France out of the New World and maintain itself, through the British navy, as the greatest power in the region.

NOTES

NORTH AMERICA

As late as the eighteenth century, Great Britain had been embroiled in colonial wars against France and Spain over territory in the New World. Great Power politics had often spilled over into the Americas, and Britain especially took such issues very seriously. By the 1820's, much of the Western Hemisphere had already been claimed and colonized by European powers, and was entering a new phase of independence as will be seen below. Yet there still remained large unsettled lands mostly in North America that were been contended over. The Pacific Northwest was at the heart of these lands claimed by Russia, Britain, and the newly formed United States. While Russian influence was slight so far away from Europe, Canning was forced to deal with the upcoming United States over many issues concerning the Americas. Even though these issues never came to a crisis or threatened war, Canning's policies would have some important ramifications for the future of the Americas.

Most of northwestern North America was still sparsely settled by native American tribes, while three powers, Russia, United States, and Britain, all hoped to gain parts of this territory. The Russians had explored eastward from Siberia along the coast of Alaska, and in 1821 made a claim to an expansive part of this land. The Russians, in an ukase, claimed the entire northwest coast down to the 45 50' latitude, which would be just below the boundary between where Oregon and Washington meet today. The Russians also forbade "all foreign vessels not only to not only land ... but also to approach them within less than 100 Italian miles." The Russian not only claimed a large territory, but restricted its navigation to its own ships including a large area surrounding the coast. Both the United States and Great Britain protested this claim, especially considering it was based solely on Russian exploration and a small string of trading posts along the Alaskan coast. John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State, replied that "To exclude the Vessels of our citizens, from the shore beyond the ordinary distance to which the Territorial Jurisdiction extends, has excited still greater surprise." The Anglo-Americans saw no basis for such a large claim. In the end the Russians did not have the resources to enforce such a claim, and the British and Americans both in effect ignored it.

The British and Americans of course both had pretensions to the same territory. The United States had sent Lewis and Clark out to explore the territory to the Pacific Ocean although Americans were still busy settling the area of the Louisiana Purchase and would not really begin to settle this area until California was acquired. Canning was also very interested in gaining this region, especially along the Columbia River, for Britain. He foresaw this region as being vital for the future trade across the Pacific to China. These conflicting claims were not resolved until later, but this small issue does display some of the hypocrisy of Britain's and

Canning's policy. While they attempted to prevent other European powers from expanding and upsetting the balance of power, this same limitation did not apply to British colonial expansion.

NOTES

Britain was very keen to prevent other European powers from expanding their influence in the New World. As will be seen below, they took French intrigues in Latin America very seriously. Spain, as a declining power that had been established in the New World, was not seen as much of threat, more so when it was clear they could not hold onto the colonies they currently possessed. This policy closely mirrored the policy of the United States, which also did not want to see European nations getting involved in the Americas. Adams wrote to American ambassador Rush in London about official policy: "the American continents, henceforth, will no longer be subject to Colonization. Occupied by civilized, Independent Nations, they will be accessible to Europeans, and each other, on that footing alone." The similar policies of the United States and Britain led to co-operation despite having fought the War of 1812 not so long ago. Britain was certainly wary of the United States and its potential for expansion, but willing to work with them to achieve their own policy in the Americas.

Canning hoped to work with the United States, especially given the unsettled state of the rest of the New World. He was helped by the congenial U.S. ambassador Benjamin Rush. They tried to work out an arrangement that bound the two nations to a common policy towards the Americas, but Rush lacked the authorization to sign any agreement. While hoping to come to an agreement, Canning was surprised to learn that in late 1823 U.S. President Monroe had spelled out the Monroe Doctrine before Congress. This doctrine declared that the Western Hemisphere was closed to further European colonization and interference. Canning objected to the United States unilateral declaration when he was trying to negotiate a joint one, and also to those parts "which aimed at interdicting her [Britain's] from the right of future colonization in America." Yet the Monroe Doctrine resembled British policy closely enough, and was effective because the British supported it before the United States navy could effectively. This policy became a cornerstone of American foreign policy, while Canning and future ministers of Britain used it to prevent European intervention from other powers.

In North America, there was no crisis management necessary for Canning. A policy of colonial expansion was hardly novel for Britain, but he did see the importance of the Pacific coast for trade across the Pacific. For the most important achievement of Canning in North America, he had been cut out by the United States. Even though only the British navy could possibly enforce such a policy, it became the hallmark of the United States. Yet some credit must go to his ministry for working with the United States to co-ordinate policy and make it clear to the

rest of the world the new changing nature of the Americas. This new nature can best be seen by the emergence of new republican states across Latin America supplanting the Spanish Empire.

NOTES

LATIN AMERICA

The long process of gaining independence in Latin America began when Napoleon captured the Spanish king and the colonies enacted the so called Mask of Ferdinand where they claimed obedience to the Spanish king, but really began to devolve power to themselves. The long-term causes, such as tension between local elites and Spaniards and economic dissatisfaction, are too complex to go into here, but the most important result was that by the 1820s the colonies were in open revolt against the Spanish crown. Some areas were more successful and drove the Spanish out completely. Others like Peru and Mexico faced a long drawn-out conflict against Spanish soldiers.

The entire issue was further complicated by the Revolution in Spain and subsequent French occupation. By the end of Canning's ministry it had become clear that most if not all of the Spanish Empire would become independent republics. Great Britain played a pivotal role in the long series of events leading towards independence. During the Napoleonic Wars when Europe was under embargo, Britain had taken over the lion's share of trade with Latin America. Britain gained access to raw materials needed for the war, while finding markets for export denied in Europe. In Europe, Britain aided the Spanish guerillas while landing its own armies to fight off Napoleon. By the end of the war, a grateful Spain agreed to allow British trade in its colonies. By the 1820s the situation had grown worse in Latin America as full-scale war broke out. The Spanish grew wary of British trade; and worried about arms imports for the rebels. The British began to worry about how the unsettled political situation would adversely affect their trade. Castlereagh had warned Spain that recognition was a possibility if the situation persisted, and Canning took it further by repeatedly pressing Spain and eventually recognizing the new republics over the objections of the Quintuple Alliance. In the end, Britain managed to retain its economic influence over Latin America, only to be supplanted by a growing United States in the late nineteenth century.

From the beginning of Canning's ministry, British trade in the Americas was threatened by Spanish attempts to gain control of its colonial possessions. British merchants had their ships seized and faced stiff penalties for any perceived co-operation with the revolutionaries. One such example of the Spanish crackdown was a decree promulgated by the commanding Spanish general :

> Such foreigners as shall hereafter be taken or found in the Military Service, or in any branch of administration of the Enemy; such as shall

NOTES

be convicted of having a share in any Printing Office; or of being Editors or Compilers of any Journal, Pamphlet, or Work, relative to the present War, the Affairs of revolted America, the Roman Catholick Religion, or that shall be in any manner offensive to the Nation, its Government, or subjects, shall suffer death, after undergoing a short Military trial.

These harsh terms along with the very general nature of punishable crimes, infuriated the British. Along with these terms, the Spanish declared a blockade on the entire Spanish Main, obviously harmful to British trade. The British response was unequivocal and backed by the British navy. The British commander of the West Indies promised that "by seizing British Vessels ... I shall immediately reclaim them ... and if that be denied, I shall be under the necessity of directing them to be retaken by force, if necessary, and the Vessel of War, by which they may have been molested, to be brought into Port Royal."

The Spanish eventually backed down from the blockade and harsh measures in the face of a defiant Britain, but continued to periodically molest British shipping. After Trafalgar, the Spanish navy could hardly enforce an effective blockade over such a long coast anyway.

Canning and the British government took this matter very seriously. In his first memorandum to the Cabinet, Canning outlined his views for dealing with the problems in Latin America, and adhered remarkably to them throughout his entire ministry. He described the problems facing Britain in respect to the Americas, claiming it was disgraceful for the "first maritime power of the world" to be reduced to convoying ships into friendly ports during peacetime. He recommended that a fleet be sent to the New World to deal with Spanish privateers and blockade ports if necessary. He concludes that the new republics were going to have to be recognized eventually63. From the very beginning of his ministry Canning advocated this solution, especially given the intransigence of the Spanish over trade in the region and their draconian methods used to restore authority in the colonies.

Yet recognition was not an easy sell to the rest of the British Government. The Cabinet was divided with the Ultras opposing recognition. They feared the effects of recognizing revolutionary governments, especially given Britain's sizable colonial empire. They also remembered the American Revolution, and were reluctant to play the role France had then. While Canning had the support of Prime Minister Liverpool, it was the truculence of the Spanish and fear of the French which eventually allowed Canning to move towards recognition. While Canning could send representatives to the new states to assess their stability, full recognition had to be delayed. Meanwhile the British government followed a policy of neutrality in the conflict.

NOTES

Despite threatening recognition, Canning hoped to use his influence to try and end the conflict as soon as possible. He wrote to both the republics and Spain that moderation and negotiation were better paths to follow than war. After repeatedly sending advice to Spain to mediate a solution, Canning told them "this explicit recapitulation of the whole course of our sentiments and of our proceedings on this momentous subject, must at once acquit us of any indisposition ... and protect us against the suspicion of having any purpose to conceal from Spain or from the World."

Canning tried to distance the British from the mistakes of the Spanish and also make it clear that eventual recognition would not be some unexpected attack on Spain. Yet he was disingenuous in painting Britain as uninterested, since they did in fact have an substantial commercial at stake, jeopardized by continued conflict. At the same time Canning tried to convince the revolutionaries to try and negotiate a settlement as well. For example, he wrote to the Mexican mission telling them they should try to settle while they have an advantage, suggesting that if Mexico is reasonable, the "game will be greatly in their favour." Neither side followed Canning's advice, and the wars continued in the New World. Spain was being too intractable; and the revolutionaries were fully committed to independence.

The Latin American republics themselves were of course the most ardent advocates of recognition. They wanted to legitimize their newly formed states and ensure future commercial relations with Britain. The Colombian secretary of state for foreign affairs made an appeal to Britain in front of the Colombian Congress, stating that:

> Our anxiety to accomplish so desirable a measure [recognition] has been, and is, proportionate to the high degree of influence acquired by that abinet [British], not only in Europe, but in the whole universe, and more especially since the events of 1814 placed the British Empire in the political rank of Nations. The British, the most extensive in the World, has established everywhere, and in every clime, a commerce so vast, that there can remain but little to wish for. To us the friendship of Great Britain is of the highest importance; and the good will which the People of the opulent Empire have ever professed towards us, is a presage not a little consolatory of what we may hope from its government.

This address, even though a little overly laudatory, tells of the faith Colombia had in the good offices of the British. They knew Britain had the most interest in recognition, and was the most inclined power to do so. Even though the United States had recognized the republics at their inception; its similar government, common history, and relative influence made their recognition not nearly as crucial as Britain's. Britain represented a Great Power, part of the Quintuple Alliance that

NOTES

dominated Europe. Several of the new republics sent envoys all the way to London to plead their case.

The rest of the Alliance was not eager to recognize the republics. Only France had any real interest in the matter, but their American empire had dwindled to a few small Caribbean islands. Austria, Russia, and Prussia viewed Latin Americans as revolutionaries breaking away from a legitimate monarch. Ideology shaped their opinion since no national interests were at stake. If Canning was going to gain any support for his policies in America, it would be from France.

In 1823, Canning invited the French foreign minister, Polignac, to London for discussions on the New World. After several days of talks, Canning wrote out the major points in what became known as the Polignac Memorandum. He sent it to Polignac for a signature, which he was reluctant to give, and then sent it out as a circular to all the major courts of Europe. Canning had important objectives at stake. He convinced the French to renounce any attempts to control parts of the Spanish Empire, or any special commercial privileges. Britain likewise renounced these acts. Canning once again put into writing his views on recognition; while France only admitted that the relationship between Spain and its colonies could not return to its former state. Polignac refused to advocate recognition, claiming these new republics "had no government, and that recognition would be 'nothing less than a real sanction of anarchy.'" The major objection was the type of government being established. The French refused to recognize the states for the time being.

Another important feature of the Polignac Memorandum was the British assertion over the Americas. Canning made clear that Britain was not going to accept the decisions of its Continental allies concerning the Western Hemisphere. Canning states that "Great Britain was not prepared to go into a 'joint deliberation' upon the subject of Spanish America upon an equal footing with other Powers, whose minds were less formed upon that question and whose interests were less implicated in the decision of it." Canning was asserting that Britain was not going to let the Quintuple Alliance control the Americas in the same way they exercised authority in Europe. After the Napoleonic Wars, no other state was in a position to challenge the British hegemony at sea. In a sense, Canning was only stating what the other powers knew to be true. This type of statement was very characteristic of Canning. He asserted the national interests of Britain loudly over any claims the Quintuple Alliance may have had on Britain. While Castlereagh would have been more diplomatic over the entire conference, Canning approach did have results. The French, and the other powers, stayed away from the New World, even after the restored Spanish king pleaded for aid.

Upon regaining power, Ferdinand's regime in Spain made restoring authority in Latin America a top priority. They sought the aid of the Alliance in their objective,

NOTES

appealing to the principle of the Holy Alliance to enlist their aid. Spanish minister Ofalio sent a letter to Paris, Vienna, and St. Petersburg asking for a new Congress to deal with the situation in the Americas: "they will assist Him [Ferdinand] in accomplishing the worthy object of upholding the principles of order and legitimacy, the subversion of which, once commenced in America, would presently communicate to Europe." He intentionally emphasized the principles of order to appeal to the monarchs of Europe, while insinuating that revolution could easily cross the Atlantic and re-infect Europe.

Canning admits that "we may consider the whole Alliance as united against us upon the Colonial question." Although Russia, Prussia, and Austria appreciated the principles espoused by the Spanish and gave Spain moral support, they did not have an interest in trying to restore a failed monarch to his colonial possessions. Given the ambivalence of the French and the intransigence of the British, these designs eventually came to naught.

Canning and the British were concerned about this turn of events. Canning told his ambassador in Madrid that while in the call for a Congress "employment of force, by the Powers invited to the Conference, is not plainly indicated, it is not distinctly disclaimed." The British could not countenance a foreign power sending soldiers over to quell rebellion in the Americas. Any soldiers sent over, would probably never leave and could lead to hostile powers encroaching on an area of the world the British were dominant. In order to prevent any Congress from being formed to deal with the question of Latin America, Canning made his own proposal to the Allies. Since the United States had an interest in the affairs of Latin America, Canning wanted them to be invited to any Congress proposed to deal with the issue. Having the United States present would prevent the British from being isolated again in a Congress, and provide an alternative ideological view. Canning wrote that "The effect of the ultra-liberalism of our Yankee co-operators on the ultra-despotism of our Aix la Chapelle allies, gives me just the balance that I wanted." The rest of the Alliance could not accept an invitation to the United States, which Canning had "surmised would be too unpalatable to the champions of monarchial rule to stomach." In the end Canning managed to frustrate Spanish plans to open a new Congress, one that probably would not have decided in the interests of Britain.

The possibility of Allied intervention in Latin America, despite the distance and lack of national interests, was not entirely remote. Canning and the British were constantly concerned over possible intervention, and the constant vigilance over the matter greatly reduced the likelihood of such an event. The British perceived a threat to the Americas in most everything happening in Spain: for instance when the Russians offered the Spanish troops, Canning wrote that "This remark ... [refers to] not so much the peace in Europe as to the question between

NOTES

Spain and her colonies." Nothing came of this offer of troops, but illustrates how wary the British were of foreign interference between Spain and its colonies. These threats of foreign interference pushed Canning closer to a policy of recognition so that the political uncertainty in region could be resolved. Russia, being so remote and having little real interests in the affairs of Latin America, was hardly the main threat to the British.

The French, on the other hand, were entangled in Spanish politics after the occupation. Historically they had much greater influence in the Western Hemisphere, an influence they might wish to reassert. The French monarchy was still extremely unpopular, and could potentially use foreign adventure to shore up domestic support. The French navy could not challenge the British on the seas, but still represented the greatest potential threat to British naval hegemony at that time. For these reasons Canning was always the most sensitive to French meddling. As seen above, Canning had stipulated that British neutrality in the French occupation of Spain depended on the French leaving the Americas alone. In the Polignac Memorandum, the French had declared they had no interests in colonial expansion into the New World. Despite these assurances, Canning did not trust the French to remain uninvolved. This issue was critical for the peace of Europe as well, for war between Britain and France over the Americas would have torn the Quintuple Alliance apart.

Canning and the British were most troubled over the potential for the French to take Cuba from the Spanish. Cuba was of great strategic importance for the Caribbean. It lay right on the trade winds leading to Europe, which is why the Spanish had made Havana a gathering point for the treasure fleets. It also commanded the narrow straits between Cuba and Florida, and Cuba and Mexico. Cuba had not revolted against Spanish rule though. Cuba's large slave population and fear of following the path of Haiti had prevented a split. The Spanish had used Cuba as a base of operations to attack the revolutionaries on the mainland. The concern was the Spanish were willing to part with Cuba either as a reward for restoring the Bourbons in Spain, or helping to put down revolutionaries in other parts of Latin America.

Canning considered it unacceptable for any other power to gain control of Cuba: he wrote to his ambassador in Paris to "represent to Villele the impossibility of our allowing France ... to meddle in the internal affairs of that colony [Cuba] ... But what cannot or must not be, is that any great maritime Power should get possession of it." Canning was unwilling to allow British trade in the Caribbean, or British colonies such as Jamaica to be threatened by a hostile Cuba. Of even greater concern was the potential that France was being pushed into provocative action by the Allies. Canning continues to write that "in that part of the world the alliance ... would probably push him [Villele] on to anything which they hope

NOTES

would compromise him with England76." If in fact the Allies were encouraging France, Britain could not count on any support in curbing France. There is no evidence to suggest that this was the case, but Canning was worried by the possibility and it did influence his decision making process on this matter.

There was reason to believe that France was up to something in the New World, however. On one hand, they had toyed with the possibility of recognition, perhaps hoping to usurp Britain's commercial position with the new republics. On the other hand they were in close contact with the Spanish crown and seemed to be encouraging him to continue fighting. In the summer of 1825, an incident was reported to the British by the Colombians. It seems that French ships had been used by the Spanish to transport officers and dispatches across the Atlantic. For the British this incident provoked fears of French intervention: Canning wrote that "as it tends to involve France in the contest it becomes a matter of very serious consequence." The British worried this could be the prelude to a larger French force being sent to the Americas, or perhaps an attempt to see how diligently the British were watching over the area. The French government disavowed ever having approved such a measure, but Canning did not believe them. In the end, the French did not interfere in the events in Latin America, and recognized the new republics a few years after the British. Yet fears of French meddling in the area helped to push British policy closer towards recognition.

The intractability of the Spanish combined with threat of foreign interference helped Canning overcome domestic opposition to recognition. While the Ultras still did not like the idea, Liverpool and Canning finally received the support of the Cabinet to go ahead with it. Recognition was bestowed upon the Latin American republics piecemeal, dependent on the reports of British envoys on the political stability and the lack of any continued Spanish presence. Colombia was the first republic to be recognized on April 18, 1825, through the signing of a commercial treaty which recognized the new Colombian government. Canning made sure these treaties gave no special preference to British trade over that of other nations, in order to avoid the appearance of having sold recognition for economic advantage. More importantly they signified that Britain accepted the new countries and would in the future accept their representatives at court. Shortly afterwards Venezuela and Buenos Aires [Argentina] signed similar treaties. Other nations, like Peru and Mexico, still were fighting off Spanish forces and recognition would not occur until after Canning's death. Yet he had established a procedure for recognition that be applied eventually to all the new states of Latin America.

In Europe there was surprisingly little consequence to Canning's policy in the Americas. The Netherlands followed Britain's lead and quickly recognized the republics. Spain of course protested, but the other Powers of the Quintuple Alliance were perfectly willing to accept the situation. As will be seen below,

NOTES

much of this had to do with the changing configuration of the Alliance, with Russia and France more conciliatory towards Britain. By the end of Canning's ministry, France, too, had begun to recognize the Latin American states, although it would take over a decade after British recognition for the Spanish to finally concede to the independence of its colonies. Unfortunately for the new republics, they did not become like the United States, but instead followed the path of political and social instability of Spain. Britain had successfully maintained it economic advantage in Latin America, and would continue to be the chief trading partner for these new nations until it was supplanted by the United States in the late nineteenth century.

In the New World, Canning had been able to maintain Britain's position of dominance through a tumultuous revolution. His policy had prevented any other Great Power from asserting itself, had created amicable conditions with the United States through common policy, and had helped stabilize the new republics and assure British commercial relations with them. His foreign policy in this part of the world was his greatest achievement. He had once again stood up against his partners in the Quintuple Alliance, and asserted British interests. Liberals across Europe praised Canning for recognizing the new republics, while the new states commemorated Canning in street names and statues. Perhaps most importantly, Canning's policy helped keep Latin America in the economic and cultural orbit of Europe during a time of revolution, violence, and bitter ideological division.

3.7 GREECE AND THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

The Eastern Question is one of the great dilemmas of modern European history. British statesmen tried a variety of methods to solve the problem, from the Crimean War to the imperialistic takeover of Egypt. From the Battle of Vienna in 1683 until the collapse of the Ottoman Empire in 1918, the problem persisted in Central Europe and the Balkans over what exactly was to be done with the territory the Ottomans were no longer capable of holding. Closely linked to this question were issues over the expansion of Russia southwards and the growing nationalism of various ethnic groups across the region. These questions over nationality, religion, and politics were never really successfully resolved even to this day. During the 1820s the major problem facing European policymakers was over a revolt in Greece against the Ottomans that threatened to embroil Russia in yet another in a long series of wars against the Ottoman Empire.

The British had major interests at stake in the Eastern Mediterranean. The major source of concern was over the Straits, the narrow channels connecting the Black Sea to the Mediterranean. Ottoman control of the Straits guaranteed that Russian naval forces could not access the Mediterranean Sea. Russian ambitions to conquer Constantinople jeopardized the British position. The major

NOTES

reason the British needed to control the Mediterranean was access to India. Even before the Suez Canal, the British were moving goods from India through the region. The Ottoman Empire was not seen as a threat, but Britain could not allow a Great Power to control the region and possible choke off trade to the east.

Also, the expansion of Russia southwards threatened to upset the balance of power that helped to guarantee peace. The revolt in Greece had ideological issues entangled, while also calling to mind images of religious wars and ancient Greek culture. Unlike in Latin America, or even Spain to some degree, all the Great Powers had a deep interest in seeing the matter in Greece resolved for the sake of maintaining the balance of power. The situation had the potential to embroil Europe in another general war. As shown above, Britain had been isolated within the Quintuple Alliance over the issues of Spain and Latin America. The diplomacy that occurred in the course of trying to settle the Greek insurgency changed Britain's position within the alliance dramatically. Canning was able to break Russia away from the orbit of Metternich and Austria, and to bring France into their group. Together these three nations acted to end Ottoman operations in Greece and bring about a virtually independent Greek state. Yet even these efforts could not prevent Russia from declaring war shortly after Canning's death and biting away further at the edges of the Ottoman Empire. Canning's policy helped to end the short term crisis over Greece and reconfigure the Quintuple Alliance in Britain's favor, but did not manage to resolve the deeper issues surrounding the Eastern Question. In fact Canning's cousin Stratford Canning played a pivotal role in the future Crimean War over many of the same issues in 1853.

Stalemate and Neutrality

The Ottoman Empire was a vast realm encompassing the heartland of Islam. It spread from Northern Africa into the Arabian Peninsula and Mesopotamia, up into the Caucasus and westward into the Balkans. During the early modern period, the Ottoman Empire had been a rapacious power conquering the Byzantines and reaching the gates of Vienna in the heartland of Europe twice. Yet by the nineteenth century the Ottoman Empire had fallen behind western powers militarily, technologically, and economically.

They had lost Hungary and Crimea to Austria and Russia respectively. Despite these drawbacks, the Empire could still put a sizable army on the field with weapons comparable to other Powers. Nonetheless, the Ottomans felt compelled to call upon their nearly independent vassal in Egypt to help quell the Greek uprising. Mehemet Ali was promised a separate vassalage in Greece, and sent his son Ibrahim Pasha to the Peloponnese with an army. With this force, the Ottomans significantly outnumbered the Greeks and managed to field armies in both northern Greece and on the southern peninsula.

NOTES

In 1821 the Greeks began a revolt to throw off the Ottomans. The Greeks were at a great disadvantage numerically to the Ottoman forces and relied mainly on guerilla tactics. This type of warfare was ideally suited for the rugged terrain of Greece with its many mountains. The Ottomans garrisons were able to hold onto most of the key fortifications through Greece, and the long coastlines and their naval superiority allowed them to supply their forces effectively through much of northern Greece. Greek raiders and narrow mountainous passes prevented the Ottoman forces from operating effectively in the Peloponnese. The war turned into a stalemate, with neither side able to achieve victory.

The Greek revolutionary government barely controlled any of the countryside, and had virtually no money or sources of revenue. They had to rely on outside aid and plundered Ottoman resources to maintain the war effort. Commanders of the Greek armies also routinely ignored the dictates of the fledgling government. The Ottomans also suffered from problems with its army, which was multinational in character and relied on vassals such as Mehemet Ali's Egyptian forces and Armenian mercenaries. The Sultan was also in the process of trying to modernize his military. In the middle of the war the Porte decided to disband the legendary Janissaries, which led to a violent clash that decimated what remained of this group. All of these factors led to a prolonged struggle in which neither side could claim victory. Meanwhile Europe watched the struggle unwilling to get involved for the time being.

The British were in a position to feel the effects of this war immediately. Greek ships were turning to piracy. British subjects were raising funds and sending experts to aid the Greeks. The British protectorate over the Ionian Islands also put them in close proximity to the conflict. Canning responded to these pressures from the war by trying to stay neutral as far as possible. So while Canning recognized the Greeks as belligerents, to protect British shipping, he also prohibited British subjects from taking part in the war. Britain could not go to war to help the Ottomans because of domestic disapproval. Neither could Canning aid the Greeks and risk undermining the Ottoman Empire. Neutrality also gave Britain more credence in trying to mediate a solution and keep the Russians at bay.

The rest of the European powers faced a dilemma in trying to respond to the Greek revolt. On the one hand these were revolutionaries trying to grab power from a legitimate monarch. The French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars had conditioned the rulers of Europe to abhor such acts. Yet the Ottoman Empire was not quite a European power, and the Greeks were not entirely Jacobins. Another theme running through the revolt was Christians trying to fight back the Muslim invaders in Europe. The Greek revolutionaries intermixed the two themes in their language and appeals, only causing further confusion. One finds

NOTES

speeches in the Greek National Assembly using the language of the French Revolution concerning human rights, will of the people, and nationalism. Yet the same speech could be laced with calls to drive back "barbarous Enemy of Christ." This part of the message struck a chord with Christian Europe and especially among Orthodox Russians. Alongside these themes was a sympathy among many of the elites of Europe for Greece due to its ancient past. Even though modern Greece was a very different place, this land had been the cradle of Western Civilization and was now in the hands of 'infidels'. The Greek Revolution touched upon many different issues from the political to the religious to the intellectual.

An important aspect of the Greek revolt was the support that they received from all over Europe from sympathetic supporters. Philhellenic societies sprung up across Britain and the Continent which raised money through membership fees and donations for the cause of Greek independence. They not only raised money for the rebels, but also managed to smuggle in arms as well. The more devoted Europeans traveled to Greece to take part in the conflict. The most famous of these was Lord Byron, inspired by the romantic ideal of fighting for Greece. His death in Greece raised the profile of the struggle and inspired others to follow his example. Yet more important than poets for the Greek cause were the former British and French army personnel who trained and commanded their forces. Even while European governments claimed neutrality in the conflict, their people were acting on their own accord for the Greeks. This moral and material support was invaluable for the Greeks, sustaining their war effort and holding out the hope for eventual official foreign assistance.

All of these issues were disconcerting for the Great Powers of Europe, but of much more importance were the strategic consequences of the Greek Revolt. These strategic interests had little to do with Greece itself, but revolved more around the future of the Ottoman Empire and Russia. All the Europeans powers wanted to preserve the balance of power, and the potential for Russian interference over Greece threatened the settlement at the Congress of Vienna. Only Prussia had little interest in the region being so far away with no interests beyond Europe to protect. France had commercial ties to the Levantine, but was also rather removed from the region. Both of these nations did not want to alienate themselves from Russia, and tended to support Russia in any measure short of war. Austria had a profound interest in the Balkans and the future of the Ottoman Empire. Their Hungarian border touched upon the Ottomans and the Russians.

They themselves had played a major role in driving the Ottomans back, but were much more worried about Russian expansion into the region. Metternich wanted to keep a viable Ottoman Empire intact in order to check Russian expansion. Yet the Austrian Empire had not recovered yet from the Napoleonic Wars. It was deep in debt and could not afford another war. Austria faced

NOTES

revolutionary threats from Italy and parts of its German holdings, not to mention the long-standing dissatisfaction of the Hungarians. Metternich was having difficulty maintaining Austrians position as it was, and saw the Greek revolt as yet another threat to the stability of the region.

The Russian Empire was in a very different position than Austria in many respects. While having suffered widespread devastation as well during the Napoleonic Wars, Russia had come out of the wars with the largest army in Europe by a large margin. For Russia, the declining Ottoman Empire was an opportunity for expansion. The history of Russia consisted of a long struggle to expand, quite often at the expense of its Muslim neighbors. Since the victories of Catherine the Great, the Russian had established a strong presence on the Black Sea. Istanbul controlled the vital straits into the Mediterranean, while Russian history and religion gave further impetus for the conquest of what had been Constantinople. Russia also had a keen interest in the fate of the Balkans, especially over the Slavic and Orthodox areas. Yet these longstanding interests of Russia were held in check by Tsar Alexander I. His youthful flirtation with liberalism had given way to an ardent conservatism, influenced by his friend Metternich. Both Metternich and Castlereagh worked extensively to prevent the tsar from interfering in the first year of the Greek revolt. Alexander became convinced that the Greek revolt was just another example of the pernicious influence of revolutionary ideology in Europe, and was reluctant to support the rebels despite widespread approval for them in his empire. The tsar's restraint was only a fragile reassurance to the rest of Europe though, who knew the threat Russia posed if the situation in Greece escalated or got out of hand.

It is important to understand all of these issues and positions in order to comprehend the British policy over the Greek Revolution. The British also shared the other Powers' concern over the expansion of Russia and the threat to the balance of power. The British position in the Mediterranean made things a little different. At this time the British were the major naval power of that sea, with major naval bases at Gibraltar and Malta. During the Napoleonic Wars they had acquired a protectorate over the Ionian Islands, off the west coast of Greece, putting them in very close proximity to the conflict. Russian control of Istanbul, or even military access through the Straits posed a threat to British control of the Mediterranean. The British government was therefore keen to maintain the Ottoman Empire as a buffer zone between the Mediterranean and the Russians. Moreover the British had to protect important trading routes to India, and a cooperative Ottoman trading policy was critical. Although not as critical as later in the century when Britain moved into Egypt and began work on the Suez Canal, the region nonetheless was an important artery to the richest colony for

Britain. All said, Britain had key interests at stake in the contest, and played a vital role in how events would unfold in the Greek Revolt.

NOTES

When the insurrection in Greece began in 1821, Castlereagh and the British government had decided that the best policy was one of strict neutrality. The Russians had protested the Ottomans treatment of Greece and the Danubian principalities. On Easter 1821, the Ottomans had the Patriarch of the Greek Orthodox Church murdered, followed by seven bishops and thousands of other Greeks in Istanbul. The Russians recalled their ambassador from Istanbul as a consequence, raising the fear that war was imminent. The rest of the Alliance took no official action, and treated the Greeks as other revolutionaries in Europe. The Greek representative was even denied entrance to the Congress of Verona at Metternich's insistence.

When Canning took the post of foreign minister in 1822, he followed the policy of Castlereagh in respect to Greece. Canning compared British neutrality to the position taken in respect to Latin America: "the like neutrality has been observed by Great Britain in the contest now raging in Greece. The Belligerent Rights of the Greeks have been uniformly respected." The British did not interfere with the uprising, but they blocked arms shipments, tried to prevent British military advisors, and provided no aid. Early on during Canning's ministry, he wrote that "I have not uttered a wish for the Greeks, because they, right or wrong, are the assailants." This opinion held true for Canning through much of his time in office. He did not really concern himself with the ideological or religious issues surrounding the conflict, so much as the fact that it was a rebellion that threatened a state friendly and strategically important to Britain. While not exactly supporting the Ottomans in the conflict, the British refused Greek requests for aid in their struggle.

Canning was much more worried about Russian entrance into the conflict than any other aspect of the Revolution. Strangford, the British envoy to Istanbul, was serving double duty as a conduit for the Russians. He considered the possibility of war as high: "I have no doubt that at this moment the danger of war is greater than ever." Canning agreed with these sentiments. Although he tried to mediate a normalization of relations between the Russians and the Ottomans, he doubted the intentions of the Russians. In 1824 Canning wrote "That Russia means force I have little doubt, but she had cautiously avoided saying so." All his efforts at diplomacy over this matter were focused on preventing the Russians from going to war. Yet until 1826 no resolution was achieved, The Porte was unwilling to compromise over Greece or the Danubian Principalities. Russia refused to drop its requests, but was unwilling to go to war either with the rest of the Alliance advising constraint. Meanwhile the Greek insurgents were slowly being pushed back by Ibrahim Pasha.

NOTES

Great Britain in this early phase of the crisis, was almost alone in trying to mediate a solution. France and Prussia did not want to see Russia go to war, but at the same time did not want to ruin relations with Russia by trying restrain it. Austria privately told Britain that they supported British efforts, but publicly could not break with Russia especially given the close relationship of Metternich and Alexander. Canning understood the Austrians were in a difficult situation. He wrote that "Metternich is very angry, and threatens Russian hostilities against Turkey - threatens us, that is, but is much more alive to the danger for himself." Austria knew that war between Russia and the Ottomans was not in its interests, but was unwilling to risk the Holy Alliance and the influence he had with the tsar over the matter. Great Britain was alone in really trying to deter the Russians. Canning vented to Liverpool that the Greek question "is full of peril and plague; and the more so as the whole brunt of the business is laid on our shoulders."

It must be remembered that these events were contemporaneous to the French intervention in Spain, and Great Britain was being isolated within the Quintuple Alliance. As events unfolded in Greece, Canning was able to change this situation and create one much more favorable to British interests.

Shifting Alliances and Intervention

On December 1, 1825, Tsar Alexander I of Russia unexpectedly died of typhus. Nicholas I, Alexander's brother, ended up succeeding him on the throne, but he had a very different personality then his late brother. He lacked the Western polish of his brother, and ruled in much more autocratic Muscovite manner. He did not like Metternich, who had been somewhat successful at restraining the former tsar. Nicholas I did not have as much of an attachment to Greece as his brother had, but was more aggressive in general. Ideologically, he was even more conservative than Alexander, even gaining the nickname 'gendarme of Europe'. Yet in the early years of his reign, he emphasized Russian interests over ideological concerns. The ascension of Nicholas I to the throne of Russia changed the entire equation for Greece and the Ottoman Empire.

The second event that changed the situation for the Great Powers was probably only a rumor, but one with dire enough consequences to provoke action. The Greek Revolution had been a bloody affair from the beginning, pitting religious and ethnic groups against one another. The Ottomans and their Egyptian allies had used scorched earth tactics in order to weaken support for the insurgents. Both sides had committed atrocities in the war, but the Europeans powers were more sensitive to acts done by the infidel Ottoman Empire. Since the entry of the Egyptians into the conflict, Ibrahim Pasha had successfully reduced most of the Greek fortresses and had a free rein in the Peloponnese. Yet he had failed to

subdue the insurrection, which lent credence to idea that he might change his strategy.

NOTES

Canning heard of a new plan from the Russians, alleging that Ibrahim Pasha was going to begin a new policy of what amounted to ethnic cleansing. The Greek inhabitants were to be enslaved or relocated, replaced by Arab Muslims. Somehow this plan was leaked and publicized widely, horrifying the British people and invigorating campaigns to aid the Greeks. If this plan were true, the European Powers could not sit idly by while the Ottoman Empire butchered its Christian subjects. Yet it is extremely doubtful that this plan was true. There is no evidence on the Ottomans side that they really intended to carry out such a bloody program, especially considering the effect it would have on the rest of their Christian subjects. As the rumor seems to have started in Russia, more likely it was a ploy by the Russians to gather support for intervention. Despite the truth of the matter, it weighed heavily on policymakers and helped to push Britain and France closer to intervention.

Faced with a changing Russian policy and the possibility of Ottoman outrages, Canning changed the direction of his own policy. The fundamental interests of Great Britain had not altered, Canning still wanted a viable Ottoman Empire and a halt to Russian expansion southwards. Yet given the new circumstances, Canning was forced to change his approach. Given the popularity of the Greeks in Britain, Canning could not side with the Ottomans as Britain would thirty years later in the Crimean War. The Power with perhaps the most common interests concerning Greece was Austria. Metternich had proven unwilling to break with Russia over the issue or countenance the creation of Greek state, which seemed increasingly like the only way to resolve the war. Yet Canning needed some way to influence Russia and convince the Ottomans to end their war in Greece.

Canning decided that the best way to deal with the crisis was closer cooperation with Russia. In 1826, Wellington visited St. Petersburg for the coronation of Nicholas, beginning discussions over Greece. These talks led to the St. Petersburg protocol, in which the British and Russians demanded the Porte recognize an autonomous Greece under the suzerainty of the Ottomans. Canning had changed policy quite dramatically on making these demands, from a position of neutrality to one of advocating the Greek cause. Unlike Latin America, where Canning was recognizing a fait accompli, in Greece Canning was supported the side losing the conflict. In effect, the Russians and British were taking the Greek side and trying to impose a settlement on the Ottomans. Giving Ottomans nominal control would prevent foreign powers from exerting influence but was clearly not to the benefit of The Porte. Canning hoped working with the Russian would prevent a war from breaking out, and created a united front would convince the

NOTES

Ottomans to give in to their demands. Unfortunately the Ottomans refused to grant Greece autonomy, but were willing to concede to some Russian demands, in the Convention of Akkerman, involving Orthodox subjects in the Danubian Principalities and Serbia.

The St. Petersburg Protocol had much wider significance for British diplomacy and the Quintuple Alliance, for it marked an end to British isolation within the Alliance and a Russian break with the Holy Alliance. Once the protocol was leaked, Metternich was furious. Yet part of the failure was due to Metternich's policy, which had relied on his personal relationship with Alexander to restrain Russia. The Russians now intended to pressure the Ottomans, with or without British support. Canning was hoping that British co-operation would moderate Russian demands and give him some leverage over Russian actions. Nonetheless, the structure of the balance of power in Europe had changed dramatically with the ascension of Nicholas. For the rest of Canning's ministry it would be Austria that found itself increasingly isolated.

The Ottoman concessions appeased Russia for the time being, but the Greek war still raged on. In fact the situation was growing more desperate for the Greeks, as Ibrahim Pasha's forces were driving them deeper into the countryside. Canning was busy trying to gain further support for his new position on Greece, and managed to find a friendly ear in France. As had been seen, France had been on the opposite side Britain of almost every issue during Canning's ministry, from Spain to Latin America. Yet he was still more than willing to work with them. During an 1826 visit to Paris, Canning managed to bring the French successfully into the fold over Greece. The result was the Treaty of London, signed by France, Russia, and Britain in 1827. These were the last few months of Canning's life, and he had taken over as prime minister while appointing Dudley as foreign minister.

The Treaty of London was a classical example of Great Power politics. The three signatory powers virtually decided among themselves a solution to the problems in Greece and threatened force to achieve it. The treaty called "for the object of reestablishing peace among the Contending Parties, by means of an arrangement called for, no less by sentiments of humanity, than by interests for the tranquility of Europe." Right in the introduction, the treaty recognized that the Greek situation was a threat to general peace in Europe and alludes to humanitarian motives, perhaps referring to the rumors of repopulation. The Powers called for a mainly autonomous Greece, where the leaders would be nominated by the Porte and then selected by the Greeks. Greece would pay tribute to the Ottomans and be forced to return property dispossessed during the war. The proposed solution was almost identical to the St. Peterburg Protocol, but an additional article added teeth the Treaty. It called upon both the Greeks and

Ottomans to accept the terms of the treaty, and threatened restrained intervention in the case of either party refusing to agree:

> "the said High Powers intend to exert all the means which circumstances may suggest to their prudence, for the purpose of obtaining the immediate effects of the Armistice of which they desire, by preventing as far as possible, all Collision between the Contending Parties ... without, however, taking part in the hostilities between the Two Contending Parties.

NOTES

The three powers agreed that they were willing to take action in order to impose their settlement upon Greece and the Ottomans. This stance was especially provocative towards the Ottomans, as it gave Greeks much of what they wanted at a time when their forces were doing poorly. Also the Ottomans, particularly the Egyptians in the south of Greece, relied more heavily upon naval supply lines. It would be upon the sea that the issue between the powers and the Ottomans came to a head in open hostilities.

The Treaty of London also signified a major shift within the Quintuple Alliance. The great powers that had been aligned against Britain since the Congress of Verona, now realigned. France, Russia, and Britain were working together closely while Austria, who had been invited to London but declined, was now left on the sidelines. While Prussia still supported Austria, it had little influence outside of central Europe. What made Russia and France ideal partners for Britain was that these were the only powers with significant navies. France and Russia also began to show more respect for other areas of British policy, for the French and Russians accepted the new Portuguese Constitution. This cooperation was tentative though, for an overly aggressive Russia could easily upset everything or a change in policy or government in any power. In fact the alignment did not survive the 1830 Revolution in France. Yet overall the change meant the end of the Holy Alliance and greatly reduced the importance of the Quintuple Alliance altogether. Increasingly diplomacy became more like typical Great Power behavior, with shifting alliances more than overarching ideological fronts.

George Canning died a month after the Treaty of London was signed, but the fight over Greek Independence would continue for five more years. His change in policy and diplomatic efforts to enact a peace ensured that Ottoman rule did not continue in Greece. The allied Powers sent orders to their commanders in the Mediterranean to enforce the Treaty of London, which resulted in the 1827 Battle of Navarino. The Greeks had accepted the Treaty of London, but the Ottomans still rejected it and sought to win the war militarily. The French, Russian, and British squadrons in the Mediterranean converged outside Navarino, a major port for incoming Ottoman and Egyptian supplies.

NOTES

The allied fleet sent communications to Ibrahim Pasha hoping to convince him to accept the "propositions which were to the advantage of the Grand Signor himself." Codrington, the British admiral, was under orders not to engage the Ottoman fleet unless attacked. Yet the allied fleet took a provocative position blocking the harbor. On October 20, 1827 the combined Ottoman and Egyptian fleets attacked the allied fleet positioned in the bay. Even though the allied fleets were outnumbered four to one, their ships were larger and better built. Their crews were also much better trained and experienced from the Napoleonic Wars. The result of the battle was the almost complete annihilation of the Ottoman and Egyptian Mediterranean fleets.

The battle did not end the war immediately either, but the Ottomans were now in a desperate situation. Their forces in the Peloponnese were cut off from supply lines, and there was a danger that Russia could enter the war at any time. The Greeks enjoyed a moral victory on the backs of the Allied powers, and realized that they needed to advance rapidly in order to hold as much territory as possible when a peace would be imposed. The Ottomans still refused to negotiate though, despite British and French entreaties. Russia, still dissatisfied over the Ottomans, declared war with them in 1828 and marched almost to Istanbul by 1829. The Russians were restrained by the other European Powers, and only gained small territory along the border of the Crimea and the Caucasus. The Ottomans also agreed to an autonomous Greece. So despite Canning's attempts to prevent a war between Russia and the Ottoman Empire, one finally broke out only a year after his death. Fortunately it was a limited war and Russia did not try to dismantle the Empire, but it served to further exacerbate the festering Eastern Question. The Greeks too were not entirely happy with their lot from the Treaty of London, and continued resisting the Ottomans resulting in their complete independence in 1832. The Powers relented only when they convinced the Greeks to establish a monarchy.

Canning's policy in terms of the Greeks and the Ottoman Empire yielded mixed results, but had important consequences for the region. The Greeks gained eventual independence, but that had not been a goal of Canning. In fact it only served to further undermine the crumbling Ottoman Empire. Russia in the end went to war with the Ottomans, so Canning's policy of working with the Russians to restrain them was not successfully either. Both the British and French realized they had no leverage to restrain the Russians. The Battle of Navarino had garnered prestige for the British navy, but it had been one Canning had hoped to avoid by putting pressure on the Ottoman Empire until it relented. Yet the Ottomans had proved more intractable than anyone had imagined. On the face of it, Canning's policy in this area was unsuccessful, but if one looks at the larger strategic concerns he had achieved some results.

The greatest concern over a general war sparked by Russian aggression had been avoided and the hottest points of crisis resolved even though it had been to the detriment of the Ottoman Empire. The greatest gain of Canning was the realignment of the alliance system. No longer was Britain in the minority concerning major issues affecting the Great Powers. While the death of Alexander had played a pivotal role in changing the relations among the powers, Canning was adept enough to see an opportunity and take advantage of it. By the end of his life Canning had become celebrated among liberals for his policies, including supporting Greek independence, which were not in actuality his real intentions. He was given credit for helping checkmate Metternich and the Holy Alliance, but his aims were far from ideological. Canning had established a close working relationship with the most autocratic of all European states. They had then imposed a settlement on a friendly state, and had even crushed the Ottoman fleet. He had acted on what he saw as the national interests of Britain. So while he had helped achieve Greek independence, his real goal was to end the conflict and prevent Russian intervention. While his diplomatic maneuvering had divided the formerly close relationship between Austria and Russia, it was motivated by Great Power politics more than any ideological commitment to liberalism. Nonetheless Canning enjoyed widespread popularity for his achievements by the end of his life within Britain and throughout certain groups in Europe.

3.8 SUMMARY

- George Canning (April 11, 1770 – August 8, 1827) was a British statesman and politician who served as Foreign Secretary and, briefly, Prime Minister. Canning rose quickly in British politics as an effective orator and writer. His speeches in Parliament as well as his essays gave the followers of William Pitt the Younger a rhetorical power they had previously lacked. Canning's skills saw him gain leverage within the Pittite faction that allowed him influence over its policies along with repeated promotions in the Cabinet. Over time, Canning became a prominent public speaker as well, and was one of the first politicians to campaign heavily in the country.
- Upon entering office in 1822, Canning was immediately faced with the problem of Revolution in Spain. The Congress of Verona was assembling, and Canning did not even have time to draw up new instructions for the Duke of Wellington, attending on behalf of Great Britain. This hardly mattered because Canning would not have differed from Castlereagh's directive not to get involved in any escapades in Spain, or make any real commitment to the Allies. Canning's policy on Spain, and later Portugal, was essentially to allow each nation to work out its own internal constitution, while being extremely wary of any outside interference.

- From the Battle of Vienna in 1683 until the collapse of the Ottoman Empire in 1918, the problem persisted in Central Europe and the Balkans over what exactly was to be done with the territory the Ottomans were no longer capable of holding. Closely linked to this question were issues over the expansion of Russia southwards and the growing nationalism of various ethnic groups across the region. These questions over nationality, religion, and politics were never really successfully resolved even to this day. During the 1820s the major problem facing European policymakers was over a revolt in Greece against the Ottomans that threatened to embroil Russia in yet another in a long series of wars against the Ottoman Empire.

3.9 REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Descibe the early life of Canning.
2. Discuss the revolution of Spain.
3. State the foreign policy of Canning towards Portugal.
4. What was the foreign policy of Canning towards Latin America?

3.10 FURTHER READINGS

- Andrew Marr, ***A History of Modern***, Publisher: Macmillan (17 May 2007).
- Padmaja Ashok, ***The Social History of England***, Publisher: Orient Blackswan, 2011.
- Thomas Babington Macaulay and Hugh Trevor-Roper, ***The History of England***, Publisher: Penguin Classics (April 26, 1979).