

ЧЕЛЯБИНСКИЙ
ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ
УНИВЕРСИТЕТ



МИАССКИЙ ФИЛИАЛ

Е.В. Шелестюк

**ИСТОРИЯ ВЕЛИКОБРИТАНИИ
В МЕЖДУНАРОДНОЙ ПЕРСПЕКТИВЕ
(С ПРАВЛЕНИЯ ЯКОВА II СТЮАРТА
ДО ВТОРОЙ МИРОВОЙ ВОЙНЫ)**

*Учебное пособие
по лингвострановедению*

Часть 2

Миасс
2018

Министерство образования и науки Российской Федерации
Федеральное государственное бюджетное образовательное учреждение
высшего образования
«Челябинский государственный университет»
Миасский филиал

Е.В. Шелестюк

**История Великобритании в международной перспективе
(с правления Якова II Стюарта до Второй мировой
войны)**

*Учебное пособие
по лингвострановедению*

Часть 2


Миасс
2018

E.V. Shelestiuk

**A History of Britain in the International Perspective
(from James II Stuart to World War II)**

Reader

Part 2



Миасс
2018

УДК 811.13я73
ББК Ш12я73

Ш 42 **Шелестюк, Е. В.** История Великобритании в международной перспективе (со времени правления Якова II Стюарта до Второй мировой войны) = A History of Britain in the International Perspective (from James II Stuart to World War II) : Reader : учебное пособие по лингвострановедению : [в 2 ч.] : Ч. 2 / Е. В. Шелестюк ; М-во образования и науки Российской Федерации, Федеральное гос. бюджетное образовательное учреждение высш. образования «Челябинский гос. ун-т», Миасский фил.. – Миасс : Геотур, 2018. – 316 с. На англ.

ISBN 978-5-89204-278-9

Предлагаемое пособие представляет собой вторую часть курса истории Великобритании - со времени правления Якова II Стюарта до Второй мировой войны. Книга знакомит читателя с особенностями исторического развития страны, ее внешней и внутренней политики, с политическим строем и культурной жизнью Великобритании указанных эпох.

Пособие составлено в соответствии с требованиями программ МГУ по страноведению и истории стран изучаемого языка и рассчитано на студентов филологических, лингвистических факультетов, факультетов иностранных языков и перевода. Оно может быть также рекомендовано к изучению студентам-регионоведам, историкам и политологам.

Рецензенты: зав. кафедрой германской филологии Уральского Федерального университета имени Первого Президента России Б. Н. Ельцина, доктор филологических наук, профессор О. Г. Сидорова;

доцент кафедры лингводидактики и переводоведения Башкирского государственного университета, кандидат филологических наук
Э. Р. Ганеева

ББК Ш12я73

© ФГБОУ ВО «ЧелГУ», 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ПРЕДИСЛОВИЕ.....	8
1. THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR (1618-1648).....	10
The Spanish-Dutch conflict.....	11
The Czech (Bohemian) Revolt.....	11
The Danish Intervention (1625–1629).....	12
The Time of Troubles in Russia (1598-1613).....	12
General conclusion.....	15
2. JAMES II'S REIGN (1685— 1701). ENGLISH HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS IN THE 17 TH C.....	17
Domestic affairs.....	20
Foreign affairs. The Anglo-Dutch Wars.....	21
3. THE “GLORIOUS REVOLUTION” OF 1688.....	23
4. “CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT”: WILLIAM AND MARY'S RULE (1689- 1694/1702).....	28
The revolution in Scotland (1688-1692).....	29
Situation in Ireland.....	30
War with France.....	30
Home policies.....	31
Evaluating Willam III's statesmanship.....	32
The merchant elite, the Bank of England and the Royal Mint.....	32
5. PARTY RULE: ANNE (1702-1714).....	35
Scotland and the Act of Settlement.....	36
The War for the Spanish Succession (1701 - 1714).....	37
The complexion of the war.....	37
Effect of the war on parties.....	38
The end of the War for the Spanish Succession and the Peace Treaty of Utrecht (1713- 1714).....	39
Problem of Succession. Queen Ann's Death.....	40
Evaluation of Queen Anne's rule.....	41
6. THE WHIG OLIGARCHY. THE FIRST JACOBITE RISING (1715).....	42
7. THE INCREASED STRENGTH OF THE WHIGS. THE SOUTH SEA COMPANY BOOM AND BUST (1720-21), PROBLEMS WITH IRELAND.....	46
8. THE EAST INDIA COMPANY (1600-1874).....	49
Governance of India.....	49
Opium trade in China.....	52
9. ROBERT WALPOLE'S PEACE POLICY AND RETIREMENT OF WALPOLE. WAR OF THE AUSTRIAN SUCCESSION (1740–48).....	55
War of the Austrian succession.....	56
10. THE SECOND JACOBITE RISING: THE REBELLION OF 1745.....	58
11. METHODISTS. WILLIAM PITT THE ELDER. THE STAMP ACT (1765).....	62
The Methodists.....	62
William Pitt the Elder.....	63
The Stamp Act.....	65
12. THE SEVEN YEARS' WAR (1756-1763).....	66
Rivalry of Britain with France.....	66
The Seven Years' War in Europe.....	66

Theatres of the war on other continents	67
The North American theatre of the Seven Year's War.....	68
The annexation of Canada.....	69
The Indian theatre of the Seven Year's War	70
13. GEORGE III (1760-1820). INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT. HISTORY OF AMERICAN COLONIZATION AND AMERICA'S STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE	74
Industrial development.....	76
The American Colonies. White settlers and the indigenous population.....	79
The Boston Tea Party	84
14. AMERICAN REVOLUTION, OR THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR OF	87
1775- 1783.....	87
15. WILLIAM PITT THE YOUNGER AND THE SOCIO-POLITICAL SITUATION IN EARLY 19 th C. BRITAIN. FRENCH REVOLUTION (1789).....	91
Socio-political situation in early 19 th c. Britain	92
Ireland and legislative independence	93
The French Revolution.....	94
16. IRELAND AND THE WAR. THE REBELLION OF 1798. THE ACT OF UNION	96
17. BRITISH ECONOMY AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE, INDUSTRIES AND PRICES IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY	101
Economic and social development of 18 th c. Britain	101
Adam Smith. David Ricardo	106
18. BRITISH ART AND LITERATURE IN THE 18 th CENTURY	108
19. NAPOLEON BONAPARTE. ANTI-FRENCH COALITIONS. THE MURDER OF RUSSIA'S EMPEROR PAUL I (1801).....	115
The murder of Russia's Emperor Paul I	118
20. NAPOLEON AT THE HEIGHT OF POWER (1801-1805)	122
The policies in 1801-1805.....	122
Horatio Nelson	123
The Battle of Trafalgar.....	124
Talks for Peace. The Peace of Tilsit.....	126
The Berlin Decree, English Blockade	127
21. FRENCH LOUISIANA PURCHASED BY AMERICANS (1803). THE CONTINENTAL WARS.....	130
The Louisiana Purchase	130
The Peninsular War.....	131
The Russo-Swedish War	133
Arthur Wellesley	134
22. THE RUSSIAN CAMPAIGN OF 1812.....	137
The origin and causes of Napoleon's invasion of Russia.....	137
The course of the War of 1812.....	139
The War with the United States	142
23. END OF NAPOLEON (1815).....	144
The Role of Banks in the Napoleonic Wars.....	144
Waterloo.....	145
From "The Times", July 25, 1815	147
Exile and Death of Napoleon	148
24. AFTER THE WARS WITH NAPOLEON (1816-1829). LUDDITES, THE PETERLOO MASSACRE (1820).....	149
Aftermath of War	149
Luddites and Social Poetry.....	149

Surveillance and repressions	150
The Peterloo Massacre	151
Political situation.....	153
25. PARLIAMENTARY REFORM OF 1832. WORKHOUSE 1834 ACT. SITUATION OF THE WORKING PEOPLE. CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION.....	154
Catholic emancipation.....	159
26. THE BEGINNING OF THE VICTORIAN AGE (1837)	162
27. MELBOURNE. PRINCE ALBERT. DURHAM IN CANADA, LA RÉBELLION DES PATRIOTES (1837-1838).....	165
28. BRITISH ECONOMY IN THE 1820s-1840s	168
The Industrial Revolution	168
The workers and peasants' conditions	169
Representation of life of industrial workers in 19 th c. English literature	170
29. SOCIAL MOVEMENTS. CHARTISM (1836-1848).....	172
Trade union and left movements.....	172
Chartism - political reform movement in Britain from 1838 to 1848.....	173
30. ANTI-CORN LAW LEAGUE (1838). FREE TRADE CONCEPT GAINS GROUND.....	178
31. IRISH FAMINE OF 1845-1849	181
32. LORD PALMERSTON'S FOREIGN POLICY (1809-1828).....	185
The First and Second Opium Wars	188
33. THE GROWTH OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.....	191
Canada.....	192
The Cape Colony.....	192
Australia and New Zealand.....	192
India.....	195
British Policies in Asia. The Anglo-Afghan War of 1838-1842.....	196
34. THE CRIMEAN WAR (1853-1856).....	198
35. THE SEPOY MUTINY (1857-58), OR THE FIRST WAR OF INDIAN INDEPENDENCE.....	207
36. AMERICAN CIVIL WAR (1861-1865). ABRAHAM LINCOLN. RUSSIA'S ROLE IN AMERICAN CIVIL WAR.....	214
General outlay	214
Abraham Lincoln	215
Attitude to American Civil War in various strata of the British society	216
British and Russian policies in American Civil War	217
37. FENIAN MOVEMENT, UPRISING OF 1867. HOME RULE (1869).....	220
The Education Act of 1870 and Its Amendments. Education in 19 th c. Britain.....	223
38. POLITICS DURING BENJAMIN DISRAELI, 1st EARL OF BEACONSFIELD (1874-1880).....	225
The situation in England in the mid 19th century: trade unions, working class movement, political reforms	225
Foreign policies in the late 19 th c.	228
The Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878	229
British policies in Afghanistan in the 1850s-1880s	231
British policy in South Africa	232
39. POLITICS DURING GLADSTONE'S MINISTRY (1880-1885).....	234
Britain in Egypt.....	235
First Boer War (1880 - 1881).....	237
40. SALISBURY'S MINISTRY (1885-1890).....	239
41. THE LAST YEARS OF QUEEN VICTORIA. ECONOMY AND DOMESTIC AFFAIRS IN BRITAIN IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19 TH C. THE WORLD IN THE 1890s	242

Last years and death of Queen Victoria	242
Economy and domestic affairs in Britain in the late 19th c.	244
Situation in the world in the late 19 th c.	245
44. THE FAR EAST. BRITAIN IN AFRICA.....	248
45. THE SECOND BOER WAR (1899-1902)	253
46. SOCIAL LIFE IN THE LATE 19TH C. DEVELOPMENT OF PERIODICALS, TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS AND CLASS RELATIONS	257
47. BRITISH ART IN THE 19TH C.....	258
48. BRITISH LITERATURE OF THE 19TH C.	260
Romanticists.....	260
Critical realists	261
Victorian literature	262
48. SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY IN THE 17 th -19 th CC.	263
49. EDWARD VII (1901-1910). THE DOMINIONS AND COLONIES	271
50. FOREIGN AFFAIRS IN THE REIGN OF EDWARD VII. RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR (1904–05)	277
51. ECONOMY AND POLITICS IN THE REIGN OF EDWARD VII	283
52. BRITAIN AT THE TURN OF THE 20 TH C. THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND BRITAINS’ GEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE	286
53. BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR.....	296
References	311
Background Materials.....	313
1. <i>On Grammar Schools</i>	313
2. <i>On Public and Independent Schools</i>	314

ПРЕДИСЛОВИЕ

Предлагаемое пособие представляет собой вторую часть курса истории Великобритании - со времени правления Якова II Стюарта до Второй мировой войны. Книга знакомит читателя с особенностями исторического развития этой страны, ее внешней и внутренней политики, с ее политическим строем и культурной жизнью указанных эпох. Текст учебного пособия носит историографический характер, источниками для него послужили работы как зарубежных, так и отечественных специалистов.

Цель пособия - дать развернутый взгляд на историю Англии с акцентом на ее взаимоотношения с другими нациями и странами, на идеологию британского империализма, на роль Великобритании в становлении современного мирового порядка. Автор стремится представить объективный взгляд на историю Великобритании в мировом контексте, обеспечить современный глобальный подход к изучению культур. Предлагается разносторонний исторический нарратив, подкрепленный значительным количеством исторических и историографических документов. Наряду с эндоцентрическим британским ракурсом истории, обеспечиваемом использованием британской историографической литературы, предлагается взгляд извне на произошедшие события, обеспечиваемый историографией других стран. Такое описание истории представляется наиболее объективным, оно позволяет лучше понять причинно-следственные связи во временной перспективе и проблемы современности.

Новизна пособия определяется сочетанием упомянутых выше подходов, а также тем фактом, что в научный дискурс включены разнообразные энциклопедические сведения, культурологический материал, отрывки из художественных и публицистических произведений представителей британской культуры и тех культур, с которыми на протяжении своей истории сталкивалась Великобритания.

Особый акцент в пособии ставится на внешнеполитической деятельности Великобритании, включая используемые ею стратегии и методы для достижения глобальных геополитических целей. С нашей точки зрения, этот аспект требует особого освещения в связи, с одной стороны, с успехом английской геополитики, а с другой – с потерями других стран, вовлеченных в нее. Много раз инспирируя европейские и мировые войны, Великобритания оставалась вне зоны основных боевых действий. В основном избежали ужасов двух мировых войн и США, считающие себя, тем не менее, в них победителем. Акцент в пособии также ставится на колониальной политике Великобритании. Британская Империя является классической капиталистической империей, которая развивала метрополию за счет колоний - Индии, Китая, Африки, забирая их ресурсы, организуя в них работорговлю, угнетая народы. Отметим, что народы присоединявшихся к Российской Империи земель не дискриминировались, их руководящий слой включался в российскую властвующую элиту, а впоследствии в СССР экономическому и культурному «подтягиванию» окраин уделялось приоритетное внимание. Вместе с тем, именно эгоистическая и корыстная геополитика Великобритании сделала англосаксонский мир ключевым игроком на международной арене в ущерб странам, попавшим в орбиту ее влияния и игравшим по навязанным ею правилам. В этой связи мы посчитали важным отражать исторический ход взаимодействий Великобритании с другими странами, и особенно с Россией. Такое освещение истории нам представляется оправданным, поскольку история во многом повторяется, суть глобального исторического процесса неизменна.

Важной лингвострановедческой особенностью пособия является включение в исторический контекст таких реалий, понятий и символов британской жизни, как: виги и тори, акт о престолонаследии, билль о правах, союзные акты Англии и Шотландии (1707) и Великобритании и Ирландии (1801), пэрство, кабинет, гомруль, свободная торговля

(фритредерство), Народная хартия и проч. Пособие написано по-английски литературно-публицистическим языком с привлечением аутентичных английских и иностранных источников по истории, экономике, культуре и проч., текстов художественной литературы и поэзии, снабжено иллюстрациями. В большинство глав включены примечания и вставки, поясняющие или дополняющие исторические события, реалии и персоналии, отрывки из историографических источников, цитаты из оригинальных документов, из художественной, биографической и публицистической литературы. Исторические события тесно увязываются с реалиями современной Великобритании.

Пособие составлено в соответствии с требованиями программ МГУ по страноведению и истории стран изучаемого языка и рассчитано на студентов филологических, лингвистических факультетов, факультетов иностранных языков и перевода. Оно может быть также рекомендовано к изучению студентам-регионоведам, историкам и политологам. Курс может предварять курс страноведения англоязычных стран либо сопутствовать ему. Дисциплину рекомендуется вести два семестра, она рассчитана на 72 учебных часа. Отдельные материалы пособия могут использоваться при изучении специальных дисциплин (лингвокультурологии и т. п.).

В качестве методической рекомендации предлагается ряд этапов работы с пособием: 1) задание на прочтение параграфов дома, ответы на контрольные вопросы; 2) задание на пересказ параграфов или разделов параграфов дома (на каждое занятие готовится 3-5 пересказов, возможен индивидуально-адресный подход); 3) на занятии допускается чтение краткой обзорной лекции на русском языке по материалам следующих параграфов; 4) рекомендуется просмотр на занятиях или в качестве самостоятельной работы дома научно-популярных и документальных фильмов по соответствующим периодам истории.

1. THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR (1618-1648)

The Thirty Years' War was a military conflict for hegemony between the Holy Roman Empire and Protestant powers, which lasted from 1618 to 1648. This war affected virtually all European countries and provinces.



THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
|  | Country or area with a Protestant majority | ① | 1620-1623: Defeat of the Czechs and the Electoral Palatinat |
|  | Habsburg Spain | ② | 1625-1629: Intervention and defeat of Christian IV of Denmark |
|  | Habsburg Austria | ③ | 1630-1632: Intervention of Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden |
| | | ④ | 1635: Intervention of France against Spain and the Emperor
1642: Occupation of Rousillon
1643: French victory at the Battle of Rocroi |
| | | ⑤ | 1645-1648: Turenne's and Sweden's campaign in Germany |
- 0 500 km

In the political life of Europe since the beginning of the 16th century the leading role belonged to the Habsburg dynasty, which was divided into Spanish and Austrian branches. In 1581, Portugal was united with Spain, as the Portuguese king died without an heir, and his close relative Philip II of Spain gained the throne. All the overseas possessions of Portugal in the Americas also became Spanish.

The resultant Power was tremendous. In the early 17th century the Spanish branch of the Habsburgs included Spain and Portugal, the Southern Netherlands, the Duchy of Milan, Franche-Comte, the Sicilian and Neapolitan crowns, and had at its disposal the Spanish-Portuguese colonial empire. The Austrian Habsburgs possessed the crowns of the Holy Roman Empire, Bohemia, Hungary, Croatia.

Since the 17th century, some European kings wishing to have absolute power opposed the Habsburg hegemony in Europe and secularised Catholic church lands. In February 1608, at the Diet (Reichstag) of the Holy Roman Empire, the Catholic princes introduced a motion calling for

the restitution of all recently secularised church lands. When it was rejected, a group of Protestant princes submitted a formal protest and walked out of the Diet. Six of them then gathered in the secularized monastery at Auhausen, near Nördlingen in southern Germany, and on May 14 they formed a defensive union for 10 years, pledging mutual support in case of attack. Although the elector Palatine served as “director” of the Protestant Union, its leading spirit was the chairman of its military council, Prince Christian of Anhalt-Bernburg, and he immediately sought to expand the alliance. Before long, nine princes and 17 towns joined, while England, the Dutch Republic, and Sweden supported them. These developments provoked the counteralliance of the Catholic League (1609) under Duke Maximilian I of Bavaria.

In the 1620s two blocks were formed: the Spanish and the Austrian Habsburgs, the Catholic princes of Germany, supported by the Pope of Rome and the Rzeczpospolita (the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth), and the Protestant coalition - the German Protestant princes, France, Sweden, Denmark, supported by England and Holland.

The Thirty Years' War can be divided into several periods:

The Spanish-Dutch conflict

The Spanish-Dutch conflict implies the military actions between the United Provinces (the Netherlands) and Spain, which finished with the final act of independence of the Republic of the Netherlands.

Since the 16th c. England, in compliance with its perpetual strategy of subverting the power of any continental country coming to prominence, had financed the Dutch rebels, geuzen (from the French word "gueux" meaning "beggars"), who waged a guerrilla war against Spanish interests and undermined the Spanish rule. There were also watergeuzen (sea geuzen), freebooters, based in England and aided by it since the Treaty of Nonsuch (1585). To incite revolt, religion was actively used – the Calvinist faith was directed against Catholics. As a result, for example, in Flanders Protestants destroyed more than 400 Catholic churches and monasteries. All in all, 5,500 Catholic churches were destroyed in the Netherlands.² The King of Spain, as “defender of the faith”, could hardly do otherwise than restore order with very harsh means.³

On July 26, 1581 the revolt against the Spanish rule under the leadership of William I of Orange (the grandfather of the future King of England William III) took place, and the independence of the northern sovereign state - the bourgeois Republic of the United Provinces (the Dutch Republic) - was proclaimed. However, it was officially recognized only after the Thirty Years' War, in 1648. During the war for independence the "Golden Age" of the Netherlands, the period of economic prosperity, took place.⁴

The Czech (Bohemian) Revolt

In 1618-20 the Czech (Bohemian) revolt took place. The largely Protestant estates of Bohemia rebelled against their Catholic King, the Emperor Ferdinand II Habsburg, triggering the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War. Frederick was asked to assume the crown of Bohemia. He accepted the offer and was crowned on 4 November 1619. The estates chose Frederick since he was the leader of the Protestant Union, a military alliance founded by his father, and hoped for

¹World History. In 24 v. V. 10. Minsk : Harvest, 2001. P. 275.

²Ibid., P. 271.

³This time is reflected in the romance *The Legend of Thyl Ulenspiegel and Lamme Goedzak* (1867), written by Charles de Coster, a Belgian novelist, son of a Belgian diplomat and papal uncio. However, de Coster's touching legend about the uprising in the Netherlands carries some historical falsehood in it.

⁴The southern part of the country (the Flanders, Brabant) remained under the Spanish rule, it was called the Spanish Netherlands. As a result of the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-14), the southern part of the Netherlands passed over to Austria and became the Austrian Netherlands.

the support of Frederick's father-in-law, James VI of Scotland and I of England. However, James opposed the takeover of Bohemia from the Habsburgs and Frederick's allies in the Protestant Union failed to support him militarily by signing the Treaty of Ulm (1620). His brief reign as King of Bohemia ended with his defeat at the Battle of White Mountain in 1620, where the Czechs were defeated. Frederick's eldest son Charles I Louis, Elector Palatine returned to power in 1648 with the end of the war. His daughter Princess Sophia was eventually named heiress presumptive to the British throne and was the founder of the Protestant Hanoverian line of kings, continued in today's House of Windsor.

Even though James I of England refused support, the English participated in the Bohemian revolt, too. There were tens of thousands of volunteers to fight for Bohemian Protestants throughout the course of the Thirty Years' War. In the opening phase this saw an Anglo-Dutch regiment under Horace Vere head to the Palatinate, a Scots-Dutch Regiment under Colonel John Seton move into Bohemia, and that to be joined by a mixed "Regiment of Brittaines" (Scots and English) led by the Scottish Catholic Andrew Gray.

The Danish Intervention (1625–1629)

Christian IV of Denmark, a Lutheran, led an army against the Imperial forces in 1625. Denmark's cause was aided by France which, together with Charles I of England, had agreed to help subsidize the war, not least because Christian was a blood uncle to both the Stuart king and his sister Elizabeth of Bohemia through their mother, Anna of Denmark. Some 13,700 Scottish soldiers were sent as allies to help Christian IV under the command of General Robert Maxwell, 1st Earl of Nithsdale. Moreover, some 6,000 English troops under Charles Morgan also eventually arrived to bolster the defence of Denmark though it took longer for these to arrive than Christian hoped, not least due to the ongoing British campaigns against France and Spain. Thus Christian, as war-leader of the Lower Saxon Circle, entered the war with an army of only 20,000 mercenaries and a national army 15,000 strong.

To fight Christian, Ferdinand II Habsburg employed the military help of Albrecht von Wallenstein, who pledged his army, which numbered between 30,000 and 100,000 soldiers, to Ferdinand II.

The Treaty of Lübeck in 1629 stated that Christian IV could retain control over Denmark if he would abandon his support for the Protestant German states. So, in the following two years the Catholic powers subjugated more land.

In Germany, the former Christian's possessions, only the port of Stralsund continued to hold out against the Emperor Ferdinand and his Commander Wallenstein, having been bolstered by Scottish mercenaries who arrived from the Swedish army to support their countrymen already there in the service of Denmark. These men were led by Colonel Alexander Leslie who became governor of the city. Leslie held Stralsund until 1630, using the port as a base to capture the surrounding towns and ports in order to provide a secure beachhead for a full-scale Swedish landing under Gustavus Adolphus.

The Time of Troubles in Russia (1598–1613)

The Thirty Years' War partly overlapped with the period of 1598-1613, known as the Time of Troubles in Russia. For Russia, this war manifested itself in the form of the Polish and Swedish interventions, accompanied by a socio-political and economic crisis. After the death of Feodor, the last of the surviving Ivan the IV's sons, his brother-in-law and closest adviser, boyar Boris Godunov, who had already acted as Regent for Feodor, was elected successor by a Great National Assembly (Zemsky Sobor). Godunov's short reign (1598–1605) was not as successful as his regency. The harvests were extremely poor in 1601–1603, with night-time temperatures in all summer months sometimes below freezing, wrecking crops. Widespread hunger resulted in

mass starvation; the government distributed money and food for poor people in Moscow, but that also led to refugees' flocking to the capital and increasing the economic disorganization.

The general discontent was expressed as hostility to Godunov. Rumours circulated that Godunov was a usurper, that the late Tsar's younger brother Dmitri, thought to be dead, was still alive and in hiding. In 1603 a man calling himself Dmitri — first of the so-called False Dmitris — and professing to be the rightful heir to the throne, appeared in the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth. He had gained support in the Polish Commonwealth and the Papal States. Factions in the Polish Commonwealth saw him as a tool to extend their influence over Russia, or at least gain wealth in return for their support; the Papacy saw it as an opportunity to increase the hold of Roman Catholicism over the Eastern Orthodox Russians. Immediately after Godunov's death in 1605, False Dmitri (in reality, Gregory Otryep'ev) made his entry into Moscow.

His short rule was followed by a short rule of the Rurikid knyaz (prince) Vasily Shuisky, and then the Second Polish–Lithuanian occupation began. The Polish king decided to take the throne for himself and to convert Russia to Roman Catholicism. Meanwhile, a new false Pretender for the throne appeared. On 12 June 1607 in the town of Starodub False Dmitri II (the Tushino Thief) was solemnly proclaimed tsar.

In September 1609, the Poles began an open intervention. They besieged Smolensk. The Russian garrison defended the city gallantly for almost two years, thus drawing the main forces of the enemy and precluding the broad offensive of the Russian lands. In Vyborg, Shuisky concluded an alliance with the Swedish king to fight the Poles, on the condition of the cession of the Korelsky Uezd to Sweden. However, for Sweden this alliance was only a pretext. The only thing the allies really wanted was not less than accession of many north-western Russian lands to the Swedish crown. The King Charles IX of Sweden and later his son Gustavus Adolfus planned to cut off Russia from the access to the seas in the west and the north, take away from her the northern coast of the Baltic, and bring the country to total economic dependence on Sweden. It was extremely naïve of Shuisky to expect sincere help from the Swedes, suffice it to recall that at the height of famines in Russia Charles IX had forbidden Swedish merchants to sell bread to Russians under pain of death.

In that instance the Swedish plans for the cession of Korela failed: the citizens flatly refused to cede their town to the Swedes, even despite the Tsar's writ.

Meanwhile, the Troubles continued in Russia. Many thousand people died in wars and riots at the time. Ivan Bolotnikov's revolt was remarkable: he raised the banner of social struggle of the peasants, Cossacks and serfs against the rich and the boyars.

On June 24, 1610 in the battle at Klushino the German mercenaries of Sweden defected to the Poles right on the battlefield. The Swedish commander De la Gardie negotiated with the Poles and reached decision to stop the fighting. Then he took the treasury of the Russian army and, with a part of his soldiers - ethnical Swedes, retreated to Novgorod. The actions of the allies nearly led to a disaster, and it became clear, that only the citizens of Russia themselves could save their country.

On July 17, 1610 there was a coup d'etat in Moscow. The boyars and nobles led by Zahar Lyapunov toppled Shuisky from the throne. Tsar Vasily IV was forcibly tonsured a monk. On August 17, 1610 the Boyar "Seven", the interim government, led by Fedor Mstislavskys, entered into an agreement with the hetman Zolkiewski, which was downright national treason. False Dmitry II, who had for some time been the Polish invaders' military leader, came to grips with his former allies, and began to fight them. On 11 December 1610, he was killed by a Tatar princeling, Peter Urusov.

In January-July 1611 the national movement of the Russian people called the First Militia rose to the struggle for the expulsion of the invaders and liberation of their homeland. The Militia began to gather in the south of the country, and then in April 1611 they approached Moscow and began the siege. In the camp near Moscow the Militia formed a provisional

government (the Council of the Whole Land), which declared themselves the supreme power in the country.

They tried to negotiate with the Swedes, counting, after the example of Shuisky, to use the Swedish aid in the fight against the Poles. But the Swedes now decided to throw off all disguise. In fact, almost simultaneously with the Polish intervention, in 1610, the Swedish (Ingrian) intervention in the north-western parts of Russia began. In 1611, the Poles and the German mercenaries suppressed riots in Moscow; massacring about 7,000 Muscovites and setting the city on fire. Many other towns were devastated or weakened. For example, on 22 September 1612, the Poles and Lithuanians exterminated the population and clergy of Vologda.

In 1611, Russia was in a critical condition. The throne was vacant; the great nobles (boyars) quarrelled among themselves; the Orthodox Patriarch Hermogenes was imprisoned; Catholic Poles occupied the Moscow Kremlin and Smolensk; Protestant Swedes laid siege to Novgorod. After three months of defence, on the night of June 16, 1611, with the help of a traitor the Swedes entered the city through the unguarded gate. By mid-1612 the Swedes had been able to capture almost all Russian cities in the north-west of Russia: Nut, Koporye, Ivangorod, Yam, Porhov. Only Pskov and Gdov did not surrender to the "union" with Swedes.

Then in September 1611 the nation rose again. At the call of a Nizhny Novgorod merchant Kuzma Minin the troop of the Second National Militia was gathered in Nizhny Novgorod. Another troop was formed in Yaroslavl. A new Council of the Whole Land was called. In March 1612 the liberating campaign of the Second Militia began. In the summer of 1612, Russian troops led by Kuzma Minin and Prince Pozharsky approached Moscow and laid siege to the Polish garrison there. After the battle for Moscow on 22 October 1612, the Russian troops drove the Polish invaders to the Kremlin, and on 24–27 October O.S. (3–6 November N.S.) the whole Polish army was forced to retreat by the triumphant Second Militia. The garrison in the Kremlin surrendered to Pozharsky. The festival of National Unity Day commemorating this event on 4 November New Style used to be held in Russia annually before 1917. In the Soviet times the celebrations were moved to 7 November to mark the beginning of the 1917 Great October Socialist Revolution. Since 2005, the celebration of the National Unity Day on 4 November was revived.

To cement the people of Russia, the Zemsky Sobor (Grand National Assembly) resolved to elect a new Tsar. They decided in favour of Mikhail Fedorovich Romanov, a representative of old Muscovite boyars. He was connected by marriage with the late dynasty and, as the legend has it, had been saved from the enemies by a heroic peasant, Ivan Susanin. The ascension of Mikhail Romanov, however, was marred by a murder, when the three-year-old son of the False Dmitri II was hanged, and Dmitri's wife Maryna strangled.

The founder of the new ruling dynasty was forced to send a troop under the command of Prince Dmitry Trubetskoy to Novgorod. However, the Swedish commander De la Gardie defeated Trubetskoy and blocked his camp, in which soon famine began. On hearing this, the Tsar ordered to retreat. This failure allowed King Gustavus Adolphus to intensify military operations near Novgorod and in 1614 he stormed Gdov Fortress, which covered the north road to Pskov. After this, the treacherous allies besieged the Tikhvin Monastery, where a handful of Russian heroes stopped the onslaught of the Swedish army.

In 1615 the Swedes again tried to seize the monastery, but again failed. As a legend has it, the formidable onslaught of Swedes was warded off with the intercession of the famous Tikhvin Mother of God, an icon, which was then in the monastery. In 1615, trying to grab the last Russian stronghold, Gustavus Adolphus personally led troops in his march on Pskov. Its defenders heroically repelled all attacks, causing considerable damage to the attacker.

The Ingrian Wars with Sweden lasted until the Treaty of Stolbovo in 1617. The Dymitriad Wars against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth would last until the Peace of Deulino in 1619. While gaining peace through the treaties, Russia was forced to make territorial

concessions, though her enemies lost most of them over the coming centuries. After the Time of Troubles Russia was considerably weakened. Only in 1670-1700 did the economic situation begin to improve. The Time of Troubles was instrumental in unifying all classes of the Russian society around the Romanov Tsars and established foundations for the powerful Russian Empire.

The period of the Time of Troubles inspired many artists and playwrights in Russia and beyond. The three most popular topics are the Pozharsky/Minin liberation of Moscow, the struggle between Boris Godunov and False Dmitry and the story of Ivan Susanin, a peasant who sacrificed himself to lead Poles away from Mikhail Romanov.

General conclusion

The Thirty Years' War had a strong religious and ideological element, with the bourgeois Protestant ideology of economic freedom and moral independence from the tenets and rites of Catholic Christianity, on the one hand, and the desire to preserve the Old European overlordship with the pre-eminence of the Pope of Rome – on the other. The conflict between Protestants (Lutherans, in the first place) and Catholics was made yet more complex by the spread of Calvinism throughout Germany and Europe in general.

It was also the struggle of Protestant European monarchies with the Habsburgs' Holy Roman Empire for the accumulation of power in their hands, as well as for the geopolitical domination in Europe.

The conflict ended with the Peace of Westphalia (1648). This peace treaty spawned the Westphalian system of international relations, based on the doctrine of national sovereignty, that is the inviolability of sovereignty of each national state. On the other hand, the internal affairs and institutions of a state could not enter the sphere of influence of other states.

A huge human toll was paid by Germany in the Thirty Years' War, with about half of her population extirpated between 1618 and 1648. The Habsburgs lost all their possessions in Alsace. After Peace of Westphalia Germany was divided into many states. And so, it was until the second half of the 19th century, when Bismarck put an end to it creating united Germany. In 1659 the French King Louis XIV Bourbon struck another blow to the Habsburgs – the Treaty of the Pyrenees left the Western part of the Spanish Netherlands, including the county of Artois, in the hands of the French.

Comprehension questions:

1. Speak about the Thirty Years' War in general.
2. Describe the Spanish-Dutch conflict.
3. Dwell on the Czech (Bohemian) revolt.
4. Speak on the Danish intervention (1625–1629).
5. Expand on Russia's Time of Troubles.
6. Make a general conclusion about the Thirty Years' War.

Names and expressions:

affected virtually all European countries and provinces - повлияли практически на все европейские страны и провинции

the resultant Power was tremendous - образовавшаяся держава была огромной

the Diet (Reichstag) of the Holy Roman Empire - Сейм (Рейхстаг) Священной Римской империи

formed a defensive union for 10 years, pledging mutual support in case of attack - сформировали оборонительный союз на 10 лет, пообещав взаимную поддержку в случае нападения

the elector Palatine - пфальцграф

geuzen, watergeuzen (sea geuzen), freebooters, based in England - гёзы, морские гёзы -

флибустьеры, базирующиеся в Англии

Treaty of Nonsuch (1585) - Договор в Несравненном замке Генриха VIII (1585)

to incite revolt - подстрекать к бунту

triggering the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War - вызвав начало Тридцатилетней войны

heiress presumptive to the British throne the founder of the Protestant Hanoverian line of kings, continued in today's House of Windsor - основатель протестантской ганноверской династии, продолжившейся в современном доме Виндзоров

tens of thousands of volunteers to fight for Bohemian Protestants - десятки тысяч добровольцев, прибывших, чтобы бороться за Богемских протестантов

Horace Vere head to the Palatinate - Гораций Вер направился в Пфальц

and that to be joined by a mixed "Regiment of Brittaines" (Scots and English) led by the Scottish Catholic Andrew Gray - и что к ним присоединится смешанный "полк британцев" (шотландцев и англичан) во главе с шотландским католиком Эндрю Греем

arrived to bolster the defence of Denmark - прибыли, чтобы предоставить подкрепление для защиты Дании

pledged his army - пообещал предоставить свою армию

retain control over Denmark – (чтобы) сохранить контроль над Данией

bolstered by Scottish mercenaries who arrived from the Swedish army to support their countrymen already there in the service of Denmark - подкреплён шотландскими наемниками, прибывшими из шведской армии, чтобы поддержать своих соотечественников уже на службе Дании

secure beach-head for a full scale Swedish landing - безопасный плацдарм для полномасштабной высадки шведов

Widespread crop failure resulted in mass starvation - Недород зерновых привел к массовому голоду

general discontent - общее недовольство

professing to be the rightful heir to the throne - объявив себя законным наследником престола

Factions in the Polish Commonwealth - властные группировки в Речи Посполитой

on the condition of the cession of the Korelsky Uezd to Sweden - на условии уступки Корельского уезда Швеции

not less than accession of many north-western Russian lands to the Swedish crown - (желали) ни более ни менее как присоединить многие северозападные русские земли к шведской короне

to cut off Russia from the access to the seas - чтобы отрезать Россию от доступа к морям

to take away from her the northern coast of the Baltic - отнять у нее (России) северное побережье Балтийского моря

suffice it to recall that at the height of famines in Russia Charles IX had forbidden Swedish merchants to sell bread to Russians under pain of death - достаточно вспомнить, что в разгар голода в России Карл IX запретил шведским купцам продавать хлеб россиянам под страхом смерти

defected to the Poles - перебежал к полякам

a coup d'etat in Moscow - государственный переворот в Москве

forcibly tonsured a monk - насильно пострижен в монахи

the Boyar "Seven" - «Семибоярщина» - временное правительство во главе с Федором Мстиславским

the Council of the Whole Land - Совет всей земли (Земский собор)

Pskov and Gdov did not surrender to the "union" with Swedes. - Псков и Гдов не поддалось на «союз» с шведами.

approached Moscow and laid siege to the Polish garrison there - подошли к Москве и

осадили польский гарнизон

warded off with the intercession of the famous Tikhvin Mother of God - отразили при заступничестве знаменитой Тихвинской Божьей Матери

economic freedom and moral independence from the tenets and rites of Catholic Christianity - экономическая свобода и моральная независимость от догматов и обрядов католического христианства

the Peace of Westphalia (1648) treaty spawned the Westphalian system of international relations - Вестфальский (1648) мирный договор породил Вестфальскую систему международных отношений

A huge human toll was paid - огромное количество человеческих жертв понесла

2. JAMES II'S REIGN (1685— 1701). ENGLISH HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS IN THE 17TH C.



When Charles II died in 1685 the Tory influence was still strong, and the late King's brother James, Duke of York, succeeded him without the least sign of opposition; on the contrary, Parliament voted him, and he ascended the throne on the 16th of February, 1685.

James II (1633-1701) was the second survived son of Charles I and Henrietta Maria, he was born at St. James's on the 15th of October 1633, and created Duke of York in January 1643. During the Civil War James was taken prisoner by Fairfax (1646), being only a boy of thirteen, but it happened so that he managed to escape to Holland in 1648. After his escape he served in the French army, and then in the Spanish and his commanders praised him for his brilliant personal courage. Returning to England with his brother Charles II in 1660, he was appointed Lord High Admiral. His victory over the Dutch in 1665, and his battle with De Ruyter in 1672, showed that he was a good naval commander and an excellent administrator as well. This gave him a reputation for high courage. But his private reputation was not as good as his public one. In December 1660 James, under discreditable circumstances, secretly married Anne Hyde (1637-1671), daughter of Clarendon. Both before and after the marriage he seems to have been a libertine as unblushing as Charles himself. In 1672 James made a public avowal of his conversion to Roman Catholicism. Charles II had opposed this project, but in 1673 allowed his brother to marry the Catholic Mary of Modena as his second wife.

Both Houses of Parliament who looked at this union with abhorrence, now passed the Test Acts (1672-1673, 1678), by which no Catholic could hold public office in the England. In consequence of this act James was forced to resign his posts. It was in vain that he married his daughter Mary to the Protestant Prince of Orange in 1677. Anti-Catholic feeling ran so high, that James found it wiser to retire to Brussels (1670), while Shaftsbury and the Whigs planned to exclude him from the succession. Then James was Lord High Commissioner of Scotland (1680-1682), where he severely persecuted the Covenanters. In 1684 Charles restored James to the office of High Admiral by use of his power.

Charles Dickens says in his "Child's History of England": "King James the Second was a man so very disagreeable, that even the best of historians has favoured his brother Charles, as becoming, by comparison, quite a pleasant character. The only object of his short reign was to re-establish the Catholic religion in England; and this he doggedly pursued with such a stupid obstinacy, that his career very soon came to a close."

The first thing the new king did was to assure his council that he would make his main

purpose the preservation of the Government, both in Church and State, as it was by law established; and that he would always take care to defend and support the Church. Great public acclamations were raised over this fair speech, and a great deal was said from the pulpits and elsewhere about the word of a King which was never broken by credulous people who never supposed that he had formed the secret council for Catholic affairs, one of the chief members of which was a mischievous Jesuit, called Father Petre. It was all unknown, and the Parliament granted to the new King a large sum of money, — and so James the Second began his reign with a belief that he could always do what he liked, and with a determination to do it.

Now, the Parliament and the King decided to punish Titus Oates (1649-1705), contriver of the sham "Popish plot". Oates was tried for forgery a fortnight after James's coronation and besides they fined him very heavily. He was sentenced to stand twice in the pillory to be whipped from Oldgate to Newgate one day, and from Newgate to Tyburn two days afterwards, and to stand in the pillory five times a year as long as he lived. Oates was quite unable to stand on his feet after his first flogging, and he was dragged on a sledge from Newgate to Tyburn and flogged there again. He was so strong a man that he did not die under the torture, but lived, and was afterwards pardoned and rewarded, though nobody ever believed in him anymore.

Very soon after Oates received his punishment the government had to deal with two rebellions in favour of the Protestants: the one, in Scotland, was headed by the Earl of Argyle, and the other, in the south of England, by the Duke of Monmouth, an illegitimate son of Charles II. Even during his father's reign Monmouth had been suggested as a possible heir by Shaftsbury and the Whigs, and an attempt had been made to persuade people that he was legitimate. The Duke was convinced that Charles II had been married to his mother and claimed that he, and not Charles' brother James, should be the next king. Parliament did not agree with Monmouth's claim and allowed James, Charles II's Catholic brother, to be crowned as King James II.

Because Monmouth was a Protestant, as well as being handsome and popular, he thought the English people would support him in a rebellion against his uncle. Monmouth and Argyle were both in retirement in Holland, they both went from Brussels to Rotterdam, and attended a meeting of Scottish exiles held there, to discuss measures for an uprising in England. It was agreed that two Englishmen should be sent with Argyle to be in his confidence, and two Scotchmen with the Duke of Monmouth. They both agreed to head simultaneous risings in England and Scotland against James.

Argyle was the first to act upon this contract. But two of his men were taken prisoners at the Orkney Islands, and so the Government became aware of his intention, and was able to act against him with such vigour that to prevent his raising more than two or three thousands Highlanders; although he sent a fiery cross by trusty messengers from clan to clan and from glen to glen, as the custom then was when Scots were called by their chiefs.

As Argyle was moving towards Glasgow with his small force, he was betrayed by some of his followers, taken, and carried with his hands tied behind his back, to his old prison in Edinburgh Castle. So, he had even no possibility to give a single battle. James ordered to execute him, on his old shamefully unjust sentence, in three days; and he was anxious that his legs should be pounded with his old favourite, the boot. However, the boot was not applied; Argyle was simply beheaded, and his head was set upon the top of Edinburgh Jail. One of those Englishmen who had been assigned to him was that old soldier Rumbold, the master of the Rye House. He was heavily sorely and within a week after Argyle had suffered his punishment with great courage, was brought up for trial — as the King did not want him to die and disappoint everybody. Rumbold, too, was executed, after he had defended himself with great spirit, saying that he did not believe that God had made the greater part of mankind to carry saddles on their backs, and bridles in their mouths, and the others to ride them, booted and spurred for the purpose — and, of course, it is impossible not to agree with Rumbold. The execution took place in 1685.

Meanwhile the Duke of Monmouth had been welcomed by the West country peasantry and

had advanced by way of Tauton and Bridgwater to Bristol. He was five or six weeks behind his friend when he landed at Lime, in Dorset; he had at his right hand an unlucky nobleman called Lord Grey of Werke. The Duke immediately set up his standard in the market-place, and proclaimed the King a tyrant, and a Popish usurper, charging James not only with what he had done, which was bad enough, but with what neither he nor anybody else had done, such as setting fire on London, and poisoning the late King. In Tauton there were many Protestant dissenters who were strongly opposed to the Catholics. Here, both the rich and the poor turned out to receive him, ladies waved a welcome to him from all the windows as he passed along the streets, flowers were thrown in his way, and every compliment and honour that could be devised were showered upon him. Among the rest twenty young ladies came forward, in their best clothes, and in their brightest beauty, and gave him a Bible ornamented with their own hands, together with other presents.

Encouraged by this homage, the Duke Monmouth proclaimed himself King, and went on to Bridgwater. In the meantime, a reward of £5000 was offered for Monmouth, dead or alive. James was so dispirited at finding that he made but few powerful friends after all, that it was a question whether he should disband his army and try to escape.

The rebels resolved to make a night attack on the King's army, as it lay encamped on the edge of a morass called Sedgemoor in Somerset. The horsemen of Monmouth were commanded by the same unlucky Lord Grey, who was not a brave man. He gave up the battle almost at the first obstacle — which was a deep drain; and although the poor countrymen fought bravely with scythes, poles, pitchforks, and such poor weapon as they had, they were soon dispersed by the trained soldiers, and fled in all directions. The king's army shot down Monmouth's peasant followers by the hundreds. Those left alive were captured.

Then the Duke of Monmouth himself fled, unknown in the confusion; but the unlucky Lord Grey was taken early next day, and then another of his party was taken, who had confessed that he had parted from the Duke only four hours before. They searched for him very strictly, and he was found disguised as a peasant, hidden in a ditch under fern and nettles, with a few peas in his pocket which he had gathered in the fields to eat. The only other articles he had over him were a few papers and little books; one of the books was very strange: there were some charms, songs, recipes and prayers written with his own hand. The Duke was completely broken. He wrote a miserable letter to the King, pleading to be allowed to see His Majesty. When Monmouth was taken to London, and conveyed bound into the King's presence, he crawled to James on his knees, and made a most degrading exhibition. As James never forgave or relented anybody, he was not likely to soften towards issuer of the Lime proclamation, so he at once told the traitor to prepare for death.

On the fifteenth of July, one thousand six hundred and eighty-five, this unfortunate favourite of the people was brought out to die on Tower Hill. The crowd was immense, and the tops of all houses were covered with spectators. The Duke had seen his wife, the daughter of the Duke of Buccleuch, in the Tower, and had talked much of a lady whom he loved much better — the Lady Harriet Wentworth — who was one of the last persons he remembered in this life. Before laying down his head upon the block he felt the edge of the axe and told the executioner that he feared it was not sharp enough, and that the axe was not heavy enough. When the executioner replied that it was of the proper kind, the Duke said, "I pray you have a care, and do not use me so awkwardly as you used my Lord Russell." The executioner made nervous by this, and trembling, struck once and merely gashed him in the neck. Upon this, the Duke of Monmouth raised his head and looked the man reproachfully in the face. Then he struck twice, and then thrice, and then threw down the axe, and cried out in a voice of horror that he could not finish his work. The sheriffs, however, threatened the executioner with what should be done to himself if he did not, then he took up the axe again and struck a fourth time and a fifth time. Then the wretched head at last fell off, and James, Duke of Monmouth, was dead, in the thirty-sixth year of his age.

And such were the circumstances in which James II ascended the English throne.

In the aftermath of the Battle of Sedgemoor, which ended the Monmouth Rebellion in England, the "Bloody Assizes" - a series of trials - were started in 1685. Judge George Jeffreys was presiding over the "Bloody Assizes". Over 1,000 rebels were in prison awaiting the trials. From Winchester the court proceeded through the West Country to Salisbury, Dorchester and on to Taunton, before finishing up at Wells. More than 1,400 prisoners were dealt with and although most were sentenced to death, fewer than 300 were hanged or hanged, drawn and quartered. The Taunton Assize took place in the Great Hall of Taunton Castle (now the home of the Museum of Somerset). Of more than 500 prisoners brought before the court on the 18/19 September 1685, 144 were hanged and their remains displayed around the county to ensure people understood the fate of those who rebelled against the king. Some 800–850 men were transported to the West Indies where they were worth more alive than dead as a source of cheap labour (indentured slavery). (Rafael Sabatini's *Captain Blood* novel, and the later movies based on it, graphically portray this punishment.) Others were imprisoned to await further trial, although many did not live long enough, succumbing to 'Gaol Fever' (Typhus), which was rife in the unsanitary conditions common to most English gaols at that time.

Domestic affairs

You have already read about two great destructions in London in 1665 - the Great Plague, when people fell ill so suddenly and died so quickly, that no one felt safe, and the Great Fire (the Fire of London). The Great Plague was a terrible disease, and it was a wonderful thing that scarcely a year passed after that plague smote London there broke out the Great Fire, destroying any traces of the plague left behind. But it was, of course, the second great trouble, and the town of London suffered from it as well as from the preceding one. Four hundred streets were destroyed. The King Charles II and his brother James tried to stop the progress of the flames, they ordered to blow up houses with gunpowder, so making a gap which the fire could not cross. It was quite dreadful for the town, but it really was better for London that its unhealthy streets should disappear.

But all through the times of the Stuarts trade was growing. The Flemish weavers in wool helped to establish this trade in England; and more than once religious persecutions in their own country sent away numbers of industrious men with their looms to set up in England, to the great profit of this country. French silk weavers, too, sought refuge in England and started their beautiful work chiefly in the East End of London. Queen Elizabeth, for example, was delighted with a great novelty brought to her as a present — a pair of woven silk stockings.

In Stuart times, frames for knitting were set up in the towns of Leicester and Nottingham, where woollen goods were produced. The linen and calico trades, too, began to employ workers, though in a very small way, and most of the cotton brought from abroad was used to make candlewicks.

In the same 17th century coal began to be used in houses, chiefly in London, as it could easily come by water from Newcastle. People also began to use it to obtain heat for smelting iron instead of wood. They feared that before long all the forests would be end down, for it took two loads of wood to make one load of charcoal to make one ton of iron.

Birmingham became a manufacturing town in the same century, ships were built there, and at the end of the century England possessed twice the number of vessels that she had when her little "sea hawks" made ruthless forays on foreign shores and ships and later poured out of the harbours to tackle the Armada. Dockyards sprang up, such as those at Deptford and Woolwich, where the saw and the hammer were busily used in making the wooden walls of old England.

Foreign affairs. The Anglo-Dutch Wars

As the contemporary English saw it, in the late 16th - early 17th cc. England was brought very low because of the plague and the fire. "All that Elizabeth and Cromwell had tried to do to make the country one of the most powerful countries in Europe seemed to be undone by Charles II, because of his dealings with foreign countries. He received a great deal of money from the powerful King of France, Louis XIV (the French king considered it cheaper to pay Charles rather than risk fighting England), Charles promised to help him to obtain part of the Netherlands; he even sold to Louis XIV the town of Dunkirk, near Calais, which Cromwell took because it commanded the Channel."

"Can you imagine the feelings of the country about all these events? – Dickens asks." When the war happened and turned unfortunately, the Dutch sailed up the Thames itself and burnt the English ships. After this, for a time, it was the turn of the Dutch to sail proudly up and down the Channel, "monarchs of all they saw around them."

But to get an objective story, let us also consider the events from the broad geopolitical perspective. In the late 16th - early 17th cc. the Netherlands emerged as a major maritime power and immediately became a new competitor of Britain. To protect its position in North America, in October 1651 the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England passed the first of the Navigation Acts, which mandated that all goods imported into England must be carried by English ships or vessels from the exporting countries, thus excluding (mostly Dutch) middlemen. This typical mercantilist measure as such did not hurt the Dutch much as the English trade was relatively unimportant to them, but it was used by the many pirates operating from British territory as an ideal pretext to legally take any Dutch ship they encountered. The Dutch responded to the growing intimidation by enlisting large numbers of armed merchantmen into their navy.

The English, trying to revive an ancient right they perceived they had to be recognised as the "lords of the seas", demanded that other ships strike their flags in salute to their ships, even in foreign ports. On 29 May 1652, Lieutenant-Admiral Maarten Tromp refused to show the respectful haste expected in lowering his flag to salute an encountered English fleet. This resulted in a skirmish, the Battle of Goodwin Sands, after which the Commonwealth declared war. So, the First Anglo-Dutch War (1652–1654) began.

On 10 of July 1652, the Council of State of England ordered Admiral Blake returning from India to capture the Dutch fleet, brimful of spices. The British captured about 1,700 ships. The goods sold amounted to six million pounds. The annual state budget of England at that time was six times less. The crazy money and the relative ease of its acquisition would lead to the second (1665–1667), third (1672–1674) and fourth (1780–1784) war⁵ with Holland.

Holland did not stay idle and occasionally won important victories. Thus in 1677 the Dutch fleet under the Dutch commander Michiel de Ruyter entered the mouth of the Thames, burned a lot of British ships, and brought terror on the whole of England (not in vain did the writer Rafael Sabatini attribute to his favourite hero, Peter Blood, the training of the sea art under de Ruyter).

After the Venetian banking aristocracy moved from Holland in Britain, the Dutch economic growth slowed down and from about 1720 ceased to grow and fell, while in Britain an economic boom began. Round 1780 the per capita gross national product of the British surpassed that of the Dutch. Whereas in the 17th century the commercial success of the Dutch had inspired English jealousy and admiration, in the late 18th century the growth of British power, and the concurrent loss of Amsterdam's pre-eminence, led to Dutch resentment. When the Dutch Republic began to support the American "rebels", this led to the fourth Anglo-Dutch War, and,

⁵The fourth Anglo-Dutch War was also unleashed by Britain because of the Dutch support of the rebellious United States of America.

as the English historians put it, “the loss of the alliance made the Dutch Republic fatally vulnerable to the French.” Soon it would be subject to regime change itself. The Dutch navy was by now only a shadow of its former self, having only about twenty ships of the line, so there were no large fleet battles. The British tried to reduce the Republic to the status of a British protectorate, using Prussian military pressure and gaining factual control over the Dutch colonies. In the long run, Holland, one of the most powerful nations of its time, was defeated and became the familiar kind of second-class supplier of coffee, vegetables and flowers.

Since the late 17th c. a new rival for Britain emerged: it appeared that France was gaining supremacy in Europe. But her supremacy was not to last either. Skilfully intriguing, knocking up alliances and military blocs and pitting them up against their rival, promoting and aiding convenient political figures, neutralizing and even eliminating inconvenient ones, the British exhausted France by wars and revolutions. The French colonial power was weakened and after the defeat of Napoleon France succumbed to the British control.

In the heat of battles for wealth and power iron rules were forged that have continued to determine the British policy for ages: preventing the strengthening and elevation of any power that could challenge Britain, setting other countries against a British rival of the time, waging wars by proxy through knocking together alliances, “divide and rule” principle, building the world strongest fleet that would ensure supremacy on the sea.

Comprehension questions:

1. Domestic policy of the 17th c. Describe the industries that flourished in England.
2. Dwell on the Anglo-Dutch Wars.
3. James II's reign. What faith did James II profess? What kind of ruler was he? How can he be evaluated as a ruler today?
4. What revolts and uprisings happened during James' reign?

Names and expressions

so, making a gap which the fire could not cross — создавая таким образом пространство через которое не мог пробраться огонь

that its unhealthy streets should disappear — чтобы его нездоровые улицы исчезли

England was brought very low — Англия потерпела большое поражение

Dunkirk — Дункерк

Calais — Кале

it commanded the Channel — он управлял всем Каналом

it was the turn of the Dutch — настала очередь голландцев

monarchs of all they saw around them — точно господа всего, что они видят вокруг

Flemish — фламандские

more than once — не раз

as a present — и в качестве подарка

Leicester ['lestə]

before long all the forests would be end down — скоро все леса будут изведены на корню.

Fairfax ['feafaks] **Thomas (1612-1671)** — English Parliamentary general

De Ruyter ['roitə:] (1607-1679) — Dutch admiral

both before and after — и до, и после

Anti-Catholic feeling ran so high — антикатолические настроения так усилились...

to exclude him from the succession — лишить его престолонаследия

has favoured his brother — предпочитали его брата

Titus Oates ['taitəs 'əuts] (1649-1705)

they fined him very heavily — его оштрафовали на большую сумму

as long as he lived — пока он жив
Argyle [a:'gail] (1620-1685) — Аргайл (Аргил)
the Duke of Monmouth, James Scott (1649-1685) — герцог Монмутский
a fiery cross — огненный крест
trusty messengers — надежные посланные
the boot — орудие пытки (здесь)
Taunton ['to:nt(ə)n] - Тонтен
ladies waved a welcome to him — дамы приветственно махали ему
made a most disgraceful exhibition — представлял собой весьма жалкое зрелище
Buckleuch— Баклю
Wentworth— Уэнтворт
It was of the proper kind — он (топор) устроен как следует
What should be done with himself— что с ним самим сделают
Ecclesiastical Commission — Церковная комиссия
Lord Lieutenant — лорд-наместник— почетный титул номинально главы судебной исполнительной власти в графстве
One Mr. Anthony Farmer — некий мистер Фармер
A Mr. Hough [hou] — некий мистер Хоу
in opposing it tooth and nail — сопротивлялись изо всех сил
to have this read on a certain Sunday — чтобы это прочесть в определенное воскресенье
King's Bench — Суд Королевской Скамьи
Temple Bar — лондонские ворота, ворота перед зданием Темпла

3. THE “GLORIOUS REVOLUTION” OF 1688



In 1688 James II issued the second Declaration of Indulgence, which granted broad religious freedoms in England by suspending penal laws enforcing conformity to the Church of England and allowing persons to worship in their homes or chapels as they saw fit. It also ended the requirement of affirming religious oaths before gaining employment in government office (the Test). The King and his council ordered the bishops that the declaration should be read in all the (Anglican) churches - those of London on 20 May and outside London on 27 May and the two following Sundays. This was the only way, in those days, of making the document swiftly and generally known, which was James's straightforward object.

The Anglican clergy, however, felt it a challenge to themselves, for many of them were opposed to the toleration of Roman Catholics and Nonconformists. And it should be said that by the time people supported them. There was another important, if hidden from the public eye, group discontented with James II's policies. They were the financial oligarchy of the City, who largely determined the state policies at the time, and the aristocracy and bourgeoisie connected with them. The Stuarts did not favour usurers' capital, therefore the English and Dutch lenders at first supported Cromwell against Charles I, and then William of Orange against James Stuart. They used a financial weapon – arranged two defaults in England - in 1671 and in 1686, which led to the "Glorious Revolution." The principal figure behind it was a founder of the Whig movement, Anthony Ashley Cooper, first Earl of Shaftesbury, who wished that the English king

were reduced to the position of a Venetian doge.⁶

The word “whig” itself probably came from the dialectal “whigamore” - “a horse drover,” also used in the meaning “opponent of Crown policies”, compare the original meaning of “tory” (from Old Irish “toirighim” “I pursue”) – “an Irish Catholic dispossessed of his land”, and also “an outlaw”.

However, on the surface of it, it was a purely religious confessional conflict. Seven Bishops of the Church of England resolved to defy James's order to read the Declaration of Indulgence. They were imprisoned and tried for seditious libel. However, they were found not guilty – the protestants opposed to toleration had gained their victory!

On the day of the bishops' acquittal a letter signed by Lords Shrewsbury, Devonshire, Dandy, and Lumley, Bishop Compton, Edward Russell, and Henry Sidney, brother of Algernon, was sent to William of Orange inviting him “to restore English liberties in arms.” “We have great satisfaction,” — they wrote, — “to find that your highness is so ready and willing to give us such assistance as they have related to us. We have great reason to believe we shall be every day in a worse condition than we are, and less able to defend ourselves, and therefore we do earnestly wish we might be so happy as to find a remedy before it be too late for us to contribute to our own deliverance.

The people are so generally dissatisfied with the present conduct of the Government in relation to their religion, liberties and properties (all of which have been greatly invaded), and they are in such expectation of their prospects being daily worse, that your Highness may be assured there are nineteen parts out of twenty in the people throughout the kingdom who are desirous of a change; and who, we believe, would willingly contribute to it if they had such a protection to countenance their rising, as could secure them from being destroyed; it is no less certain that the Greatest part of the nobility and gentry are as much dissatisfied, although it is not safe to speak to many of them beforehand; and there is no doubt that some of the most considerable of them will venture themselves with your Highness at your first landing, whose interest would be able to draw great numbers to them; and if such a strength could be landed and defend themselves till they could be got into some order, we make no question that strength would quickly be increased to a number double to the army here, although their army should remain firm to them. Many of the officers were so discontented that they continue in their service only for a subsistence (besides that, some of their minds are known already), and very many of the common soldiers do daily show such an aversion to the Popish religion that there is the greatest probability imaginable of great numbers of deserters from them; and amongst the seamen it is almost certain there is not one in ten who would do them any service in such a war. Besides all this, we do much doubt whether this present state of things will not yet be much changed to the worse before another year by a great alteration which will probably be made both in the officers and soldiers of the army, and by such other changes as are not only to be expected from a Parliament, but what the meeting of any Parliament (in our present circumstances) may produce against those, who will be looked upon as principal obstructers of their proceedings there. If things cannot then be carried to their wishes in a Parliamentary way, other measures will be put in execution by more violent means.” (This letter was signed by Shrewsbury, Devonshire, Dandy, Lumley, Bishop of London, Russell, and Sidney).

The letter was sent on the very day of the bishops' acquittal. The preparations of the Prince of Orange were extraordinary vigorous, and his mind was resolved. For a fortnight after the Prince was ready to sail for England, a great wind from the west prevented the departure of his fleet. Even when the wind lulled, and it did sail, it was dispersed by a storm, and had to return. At last,

⁶By the way, philosopher John Locke was in Cooper's retinue as his personal physician. Under the Whig influence, Locke spoke against absolute monarchy, for individual consent as the basis of political legitimacy, for individual “natural rights” etc. (see the chapter “Science and philosophy development in the 17th-19th cc.”).

on the first of November 1688, the Protestant east wind, as it was long called, began to blow; and on the 3rd, the people of Dover and the people of Calais saw the Prince's 14,000 strong army accompanied by the fleet of fifty warships twenty miles long sailing gallantly by between the two places.

On Monday the fifth, they anchored at Torbay in Devonshire, and the Prince, with a splendid retinue of officers and men, marched into Exeter. But the people in that western part of the country did not support him. Few people joined William, and he began to think of returning, and publishing the invitation he had received from those lords, as his justification for having come at all. At this crisis, some of the gentry joined him; the Royal army began to falter; an engagement was signed, by which all who set their hand to it declared that they would support one another in defence of their laws and liberties of the Three Kingdoms, of the Protestant religion, and of the Prince of Orange. From that time, the cause received no check; the greatest towns in England began, one after another, to declare for the Prince; and he knew that it was all safe with him when the University of Oxford offered to melt down its plate, if he wanted any money.

William marched towards London, while the King, after encamping at Salisbury, gradually retreated before him. This hesitation proved fatal, for it made the royal cause seem hopeless. Desertion and treason became "fashionable." James' Commander-in-Chief John Churchill committed high treason and went over to William. Even the Princess Anne betrayed her father and fled to William. The Bishop of London, who had once been a soldier, rode before King's daughter Anne with a drawn sword in his hand, and pistols at his saddle. The little Prince was sent to Portsmouth, Father Petre went off like a shot to France, and there was a general and swift dispersal of all the priests and friars.

"God help me, — cried the miserable King, — my very children have forsaken me!" In his wildness, after debating with such lords as were in London, whether he should or should not call a Parliament, and after naming three of them to negotiate with the Prince, he resolved to fly for France. At the same time, he tried to appoint commissioners to treat with his son-in-law. He ordered his little Prince of Wales to be brought back from Portsmouth; and the Queen with the child crossed the river to Lambeth in an open boat, on a miserable wet night, and got safely away on the 9th of December 1688.

At one o'clock in the morning of the 11th, the King, who had in the meantime, received a letter from the Prince of Orange, out of bed, told Northumberland who lay in his room no open the door until the usual hour in the morning, and went down the back stairs and crossed the river in a small boat, sinking the great seal of England by the way. Horses were provided for the King, and he rode, accompanied by Sir Edward Hales, to Faversham, where he embarked in a Custom House Hoy. The master of this Hoy, wanting more ballast, ran into the Isle of Sheppy to get it, and there the fishermen and smugglers crowded about the boat, and informed the King of their suspicious that he was a "hatchet-faced Jesuit." As they took his money and would not let him go, he told them who he was, and that the Prince of Orange wanted to take his life and he began to scream for a boat — and then to cry, because he had lost a piece of wood on his ride which he called a fragment of Our Saviour's cross. He put himself into the hands of the Lord Lieutenant of the county, and everything was known by the Prince of Orange, who was then at Windsor — and the Prince, only wanting to get rid of James, and not caring where he went, so that he went away, was very much displeased that they did not let James go. However, there was nothing to do in such circumstances but to bring him back to Whitehall. And as soon as James got there, he heard mass, and a Jesuit said a grace at his public dinner.

The people had been thrown into the strangest state of confusion. By the King's flight and had taken it into their heads that the Irish part of the army were going to murder the Protestants. Therefore, all the bells began to ring and the people lighted watch-fires, and burned Catholic Chapels, and looked about in all directions for Father Petre and the Jesuits, while the Pope's ambassador was running away in the dress of a footman. Nobody found any Jesuits, but a man,

who had once been a frightened witness before Judge Jeffreys at court, saw a swollen drunken face looking through a window, which he well remembered. The owner of that face was in a sailor's dress, but that man knew him to be the Judge Jeffreys, and he seized him. The people, after knocking him about, took him to the Lord Mayor, who sent him, at his own petition, to the Tower, for safety. There, the man died.

The London people continued to be at a loss, and now they in their great bewilderment lighted bonfires and made rejoicing, as if they were glad to have King James back again. But, his stay in the English capital was very short, for the English guards removed from Whitehall, Dutch guards were marched up to that palace, and James was told by one of his late ministers that the Prince of Orange would enter London next day, so James had better go to Ham. He said, Ham was a cold damp place, and he would rather go to Rochester. He thought himself very cunning, for he meant to escape from Rochester to France, but the Prince of Orange and his friends knew that perfectly well and desired nothing more. So, James went to Gravesend, in his royal barge, attended by some lords, and watched by Dutch troops, and pitied by the generous people, who were far more forgiving than the King had ever been, when they saw him in this humiliation. On the night of the twenty-third of December, not even then understanding that everybody wanted to get rid of him, he went out, absurdly, through his Rochester garden, down to the Medway, and got away to France, where he re-joined the Queen.

At the end of 1688 James seemed to have lost his old courage. After his defeat at the Boyne (July 1, 1690) he speedily departed from Ireland, where he had so conducted himself that his English followers had been ashamed of his incapacity and had laughed at him. His proclamations and policy towards England during these years show unmistakable traces of the same incompetence. On the 17th of May 1692 James saw the French fleet destroyed before his very eyes off Cape La Hogue. He was aware of the "Assassination Plot", which was directed against William, though was not an open advocate of it. By its revelation and failure (February 10, 1696) the third and last serious attempt of James for his restoration failed. In the same year he refused to accept the French influence in favour of his candidature to the Polish throne, in the ground that it would exclude him from the English. Since then he neglected politics on this reason, and Louis of France ceased to consider him as a political factor.



A mysterious conversion had been effected to him by austere Cistercian abbots. The world saw with astonishment this vicious, rough man of the world transformed into an austere penitent, who worked miracles of healing. Surrounded by the odour of sanctuary, which greatly edified the faithful, James lived in St. Germain until his death on the seventeenth of September 1701. Up until 1696 there was conspiring around him for the invasion of England with the support of the French and the Jacobites (English and Scottish adherents of the Stuarts).

We can well assume that the "Glorious Revolution" was the first case of the so-called "colour revolutions", or "orange revolutions", - regime changes carried out using mainly methods of non-violent political struggle (usually massive street protests). As for James II's general appraisal, Charles Dickens characterises him as follows: the political ineptitude of James II is clear; he often showed firmness when conciliation was needed, and weakness, when resolution alone could have saved the day. Moreover, though he mismanaged almost every political problem with which he personally dealt, he was singularly tactless and impatient on advice. But in general, political morality, he was not below his age. He was more honest and sincere than Charles II, more patriotic in his foreign policy, and more consistent in his religious attitude. That his brother retained the throne while James lost it is an ironical demonstration that a more pitiless fate awaits the ruler whose faults are of the intellect,

than one whose faults are of the heart.

As soon as James II fled, just on the day of the King's departure, the Prince came and summoned the Lords to meet him, and soon afterwards, all those who had served in any of the Parliaments of King Charles the Second. It was finally resolved by these authorities that the throne was vacant “by the conduct of James the Second”; that it was inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant kingdom, to be governed by a “Popish prince”; that the Prince and Princess of Orange should be King and Queen during their lives and the life of the survivor of them; and that their children should succeed them, if they have any. That if they have none, the Princess Anne and her children should succeed; that if she had none, the heirs of the Prince of Orange should succeed.

On the thirteenth of January, one thousand six hundred and eighty-nine (1689), the Prince and Princess, sitting on a throne in Whitehall, bound themselves to these conditions. The Protestant religion was established in England, the Catholic Church was de facto banned in England and in her colonies. William III placed the fate of the country in the hands of the Whigs. It seemed at first that as if the two conflicting principles of an elective and hereditary monarchy held by the two Houses would result in a deadlock. The Lords even suggested that James should still keep the title of king; but that William should act as one. Then it was proposed that Mary should be queen, and that he should act for her. Both proposals were disposed of by William's declaration that he would not accept either of them. And the throne was offered to William and Mary both, while the elective principle was established by a Declaration of Rights which declared the recent acts of James the Second illegal, and thus became new standard of government.

As a result of the “Glorious Revolution” a new political subject epitomized by the British elites finally took shape. It appeared through the merger of financial capital, royal and aristocrat representatives, landowning nobility and secret services and determined the development of Britain in the 18th c. and beyond. Britain became a trade and financial state, pursuing aggressive colonialist policy, having the global expansion as its economic and political strategy, focused on the world market, consumption of the world resources and, which has become its shibboleth - behind the scenes geopolitical manipulations.

Comprehension questions:

1. What was the essence of James II's religious reform? Was it progressive? Why was it resented by the Anglican clergy?
2. What were the main forces behind James II's downfall?
3. What did the letter of the Bishops say?
4. How did William of Orange arrive in Britain?
5. The anti-Catholic acts and general confusion among the population.
6. What were James's steps after he was dethroned?
7. What transformation occurred to James in exile?
8. The coronation of William and Anne. What was specific about these crowned heads?
9. What political subject was formed as a result of the “Glorious Revolution”?
10. Compare the “Glorious Revolution” of 1688–1689 and the English Bourgeois Revolution of the 1640s— 1650s. Why is the former considered by many historians as even more radical than the latter?

Names and expressions

Till they could be got into some order — пока их можно будет привести в относительный порядок

will be put in execution — будет приведено в исполнение

his mind was resolved — он был настроен решительно

For Reference

There has never been Constitution as a single document in Britain. The British Constitution is in fact a number of acts and bills that regulate the governance and dispensation of power. In 2004, a Joint Committee of the House of Commons and the House of Lords discussed that "the fundamental parts of constitutional law could be taken to include the following statutes":

Magna Carta 1215 — clauses 1, 9, and 29, as enumerated in 1297, remain in statute

Bill of Rights 1689 — secures parliamentary supremacy over the monarch, the result of the Glorious Revolution

Crown and Parliament Recognition Act 1689 — confirms the succession to the throne and the validity of the laws passed by the Convention Parliament

Act of Settlement 1701 — settles the succession of the Crown

Acts of Union 1707 — union of England and Scotland

Act of Union 1800 — union of Great Britain and Ireland

Parliament Acts 1911 and 1949 — asserts the supremacy of the House of Commons by limiting the legislation-blocking powers of the House of Lords

Life Peerages Act 1958 — establishes standards for the creation of life peers which gives the Prime Minister the ability to change the composition of the House of Lords

Emergency Powers Act 1964 — provides power to employ members of the armed forces in work of national importance

European Communities Act 1972 — incorporates European law into UK law

House of Commons Disqualification Act 1975 — prohibits certain categories of people, such as judges, from becoming members of the House of Commons

Ministerial and Other Salaries Act 1975 — governs ministerial salaries

British Nationality Act 1981 — revises the basis of British nationality law

Supreme Court Act 1981 — defines the structure of the Supreme Court of England and Wales

Representation of the People Act 1983 — updates the British electoral process

Scotland Act 1998 — devolves certain powers to the Scottish Parliament

Government of Wales Act 1998 — devolves certain powers to the Welsh Assembly

Northern Ireland Act 1998 — devolves certain powers to the Northern Irish Assembly

Human Rights Act 1998 — incorporates the European Convention on Human Rights into UK law

House of Lords Act 1999 — reforms the House of Lords removing most hereditary peers

Civil Contingencies Act 2004 — establishes a framework for national and local emergency planning and response

Since then, the following statutes of a constitutional nature have become law:

Constitutional Reform Act 2005 — creates the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom and guarantees judicial independence

Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010 — reforms the Royal Prerogative and makes other significant changes

Fixed-term Parliaments Act 2011 — introduced fixed-term parliaments of 5 years

Succession to the Crown Act 2013

the cause received no cheek — дело не встречало сопротивления

it was all safe with him — все с ним в порядке (благополучно)

to melt down its plate — расплавить столовое серебро (или золото)

Churchill, John (1650-1722) — Первый герцог Мальборо

like a shot — моментально, мгновенно

Boyne [boin]

La Hogue [la:hog]

it would exclude him from the English — это исключило бы его из числа англичан

Cistercian — цистерцианский монах

St. Germain — монастырь Святого Жермена

to save the day — чтобы спасти положение

impatient on advice — нетерпим к советам

not below his age — на уровне своего времени

4. "CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT": WILLIAM AND MARY'S RULE (1689-1694/1702)

William III (1650-1702), as he began to be called in England, was born on the 4th of November 1650, eight days after his father's death. His father was William II, also Prince of Orange, stadtholder of the Dutch republic; his mother was Mary, daughter of Charles I of England. He married Mary, eldest daughter of James, then Duke of York, in November 1677. From 1672, he governed as Stadtholder William III of Orange over Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht, Gelderland, and Overijssel of the Dutch Republic. In what became known as the "Glorious Revolution", on 5 November 1688, William invaded

England in an action that ultimately deposed King James II and won him the crowns of England, Scotland and Ireland. In the British Isles, William ruled jointly with his wife, Mary II, from 1689 until her death on 28 December 1694. The period of their joint reign is often referred to as "William and Mary".

The revolution in Scotland (1688–1692)

The Glorious Revolution in Scotland was part of a wider change of regime, known as the Glorious Revolution or Revolution of 1688, in the British kingdoms of the Stuart monarchy in 1688–89. It began in England and saw the removal of the Catholic James VII of Scotland and II of England from the thrones of England, Scotland and Ireland and his replacement with his Protestant daughter Mary and her husband William of Orange.

In Scotland, under the last two Stuarts, Presbyterianism had become as prescribed a religion as Roman Catholicism, and it seemed for a moment as if the Royalists and Episcopalians there would capture the government for James. But conditions in Scotland were very unlike those in England; especially different was the division of parties and classes, for while in England Anglicans and Presbyterians had on occasion been able to unite against the Crown, in Scotland the dominating feature in public life was the power and dissensions of the nobility. As soon as James retired to France the Presbyterians found that owing to the absence of the royal troops in England, they were strong enough to abolish Episcopacy, and to make this a condition of their offer of the Scottish crown to William and Mary.

But there were really two “races” in Scotland, Lowlanders and Highlanders; the latter, though they had no particular affection for the Stuarts and had little interest in constitutional or ecclesiastical problems, were unwilling to accept a Dutchman for their king, or to submit to the ascendancy of an earl of Argyle. Under an energetic leader like Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, the Highland clans could harass the government till James was able to send a real army. But when the reinforcements sent by James were seen, and it occurred that they were disappointingly small, Dundee had to fight or to see the clansmen melt away to their homes. His opponent general Mackay had tried to protect the Lowlands by erecting on a number of strong positions, but in July 1689 had marched the Atholl country to recapture the Castle of Blairs. With a small army of four thousand men he had just emerged from the pass Killiecrankie, when the Highlanders swept down upon them annihilated the whole army.

Even if Dundee had not been badly wounded in the action, this victory could not have determined the war; but as it was, with their best leader killed, the Highlanders could no longer hold out against the government, and within a year and a half the whole country was in William's hands. The massacre of Glencoe (1692) which resulted in the extirpation of the MacDonalds of that glen by the influence of their enemies, the Campbells, was the unfortunate finishing-touch of the subjugation. The massacre of Glencoe, or in Scottish Gaelic *Mort Ghlinne Comhann* (murder of Glen Coe). The massacre began simultaneously in three settlements along the glen—Invercoe, Inverrigan, and Achnacon— although the killing took place all over the glen as fleeing MacDonalds were pursued. Thirty-eight MacDonalds from the Clan MacDonald of Glencoe were killed by the guests who had accepted their hospitality, on the grounds that the MacDonalds had not been prompt in pledging allegiance to the new monarchs, William and Mary. Another forty women and children died of exposure after their homes were burned. The famous poet Sir Walter Scott wrote in his poem *On the Massacre of Glencoe*:

"Then woman's shriek was heard in vain,
Nor infancy's inputed plain,
More than the warrior's groan, could gain
Respite from ruthless butchery!
The winter wind that whistled shrill,
The snows that night that cloaked the hill,

Far more than southern clemency.
Were each grey hair a minstrel string,
Each chord should imprecations fling,
Till startled Scotland loud should ring,
Revenge for blood and treachery!"

Situation in Ireland

Meanwhile James had landed in Ireland, and after persuading the Irish Parliament to repeal the Act of Settlement had besieged Londonderry. The Protestant garrison, under George Walker, a clergyman, and Major Henry Baker, held out bravely till relieved by William's ships, which succeeded at last in breaking the boom across the Foyle. On the very day of the relief of Londonderry the besieged garrison of Enniskillen went out to meet the Irish army at Newton Butler and completely defeated it. In the following year William went over to Ireland himself and defeated James, now reinforced by French troops under Lauzan, at the battle of the Boyne (July 1, 1690). Abandoned by their king, who fled to Dublin and thence to France, the Irish, under the gallant Sarsfield, made a last stand at Limerick. William, after failing to capture the town, first by siege and then by assault, returned to England, leaving the command to Ginkel and Churchill. The latter captured Cork and Kinsale, while the former defeated St. Ruth, the new French commander of the Irish forces, at Aughrim. The surrender of Limerick on terms which enabled the Irish to take service in France left the whole country in English hands.

Unfortunately for the future relations of England and Ireland, that part of the Treaty of Limerick which assured the Irish Roman Catholics the same liberty as they had enjoyed in the reign of Charles the Second, was immediately violated. The Parliament at Westminster not only insisted on introduction of a Test in Ireland which excluded all Roman Catholics from office and from the Parliament at Dublin, but also soon afterwards subjected them to the most severe social and commercial restrictions.

War with France

William of Orange knew very well what he was doing when he repeated Henry VIII's trick of giving the growing bourgeoisie a vested interest in his undertakings. The Reformation movement of the 16th c. took root because the monastery lands had been sold to the "new nobles" and speculators whose loyalty is where their money is invested. The reigning-but-not-quite-ruling Dutchman who began the "War of the League of Augsburg" (1689-1697) as soon as he came to the throne using England to defend Holland from France, gave the City businessmen a vested interest in his regime forming the Bank of England which began with lending its money to the Government at eight per cent; at the same time it was empowered by colonies with slaves. So, the very institution of monarchy in Britain became but the function of the City.

The great interest of William's life was challenging the power of France. This has been one of his chief reasons for accepting the crown of England, and one of his earliest acts as king was to declare war against Louis XIV. The newly created Bank of England (1694) greatly helped William, printing banknotes "out of thin air", not secured by any gold. Owing to this "assistance," England was able to enlist other countries (Denmark, Germany and Austria) in this war on the British side, and eventually win it.

The Irish campaign (see above) had been part of the general hostilities; naval battles were fought in the Channel, and a European confederation against France was made up with the English money on the Continent. In the Channel the first victory was gained by the French, as in 1690 the English and Dutch fleets were defeated off Beachy Head; but Russell's success at La Hogue in 1692 put an end to all fears of a French victory. Now the French fleet was definitely destroyed.

On land William himself was in command, but, though an able general, he was usually defeated in the fields. In 1692 he lost Namur and was badly defeated at Steinkirk (August 4th), and in 1693 he was disastrously beaten at Neerwinden or Landen (July 16th). In 1695, however, he was able to resume the offensive and to retake Namur in a brilliant and, what was more unusual, a successful campaign. William had assumed the duties of commander-in-chief too young to learn the dull duties of a professional soldier himself, and his imperious will did not suffer others to direct him. Hence though often fertile in resource and ingenious in plan, he was always a brilliant amateur, though sometimes unlucky.

In diplomacy William was as uniformly successful as in war he was the reverse. His unity of aim and constancy of purpose made him one of the greatest diplomats of his time. He held together his ill-assorted coalition, and finally concluded peace at Ryswick in September 1697. Louis restored all his acquisitions since 1678, except Strassburg, and recognized William as king of England. During the subsequent years William tried to arrange a partition treaty with France, by which the domains of the childless Charles II of Spain were to be divided at his death. But after the death of Charles in 1700 the whole heritage was left to France. William certainly opposed this.

Home policies

While all these fightings had been going on in Scotland, Ireland and Flanders, home politics in England itself had been full of interests. At the beginning of his reign William had done his best to gratify all parties, and although the Whigs had been chiefly instrumental in making him king and in amending the constitution (the Act of Settlement), he chose some of his chief advisers from among the Tories. But this impartiality did not prevent some of the bishops and about three hundred of the clergy, known as non-jurors from refusing to take the path of allegiance. When war was declared against France and brought with it heavy taxation and a National Debt, the Tories gradually formed a regular opposition to the government, and the king was rather embarrassed than helped by the advice of their leaders. It was therefore suggested to William by Sunderland in 1693 that he should choose his ministers only from the party strongest in the House of Commons; but it was not before 1696, and then only after several conspiracies against the king had strengthened the Whig influence, that William fully carried out the suggestion by choosing his chief ministers entirely from the Whigs. Two years previously (1694) a Triennial Act was passed, limiting the duration of Parliament to three years.

The Whig "Junto" formed in 1696, is memorable as setting a precedent which eventually came to be recognized as the origin of government by party. But as at this time and for long afterwards the king did not feel bound to act upon the advice offered by his ministers, the Cabinet system as we now understand it was not yet fully developed. As a matter of fact, the Tories were strong enough to drive the members of the Junto gradually from office.

Queen Mary had died in 1694, and William, who was never very popular himself, had alienated English good-will by his marked preference for Dutchmen. It was this feeling of jealousy which made Parliament in 1698 insist upon the reduction of the standing army, legalized by the Mutiny Act of 1693, to 7,000 men, and the dismissal of William's Dutch Guards.

In 1694 "The Protestant King" signed a charter, establishing the Bank of England, and all the banking system was centralised under a corporate and monarchical rule, the arrangement which is preserved until now.

Not long before his death in 1702 he approved of the merger of the Dutch East India Company and the English East India Company, which challenged the monopoly of its rival in the late 17th century. The two companies were merged in 1708 to form the United Company of Merchants of England Trading to the East Indies, commonly styled the Honourable East India Company.

Evaluating William III's statesmanship

In viewing William's character, one is struck by its entire absence of ostentation — and this circumstance reveals his mind and policy more clearly than anything else. No one can doubt his real belief in religion despite many moral failings or weaknesses. He was an unfaithful husband; he was too fond of Dutch favourites or worthless women like Lady Orkney. When it suited his interests, he sanctioned the systematic corruption of members of Parliament and he condoned massacres like those of at the Hague or in Glencoe. On the other hand, he did not hesitate to inflict considerable injury on his own people, the Dutch, by the terms of the treaty with England (1689), when it became clear that only in this way could England's co-operation be secured. Military historians point out that William III sometimes sacrificed great advantages to impetuosity; naval experts think that he sometimes threw away great opportunities by indifference. They are mostly right, but they did not see his essential greatness, which lay in another sphere.

The best proofs of William's real power of statesmanship are that the peace of Utrecht was subsequently made — and it was William who had prepared it as the only security for European peace nearly a dozen years before its conclusion. While he could not oppose Louis XIV's diplomacy, or the graces of a Marlborough, he grasped the central problem of his time with more clearness, or advanced solution with more success, than any other statesman of his age. William fought on to the end, and the ideas and the spirit of his policy continued to triumph long after the death of their author.

William III's rule was an important landmark in the history of England. The royal dynasty of Windsor ruling in today's Britain descend from his family (he himself died childless) and the House of Hanover. Many important European royal dynasties are connected by ties of kinship with this family.

William's main concern had been getting the English on the same side as the Dutch in their competition against France. After becoming King of England, he granted many privileges to the English navy in order to ensure their loyalty and cooperation. William ordered that any Anglo-Dutch fleet be under English command, with the Dutch navy having 60% of the strength of the English.

In William's times the basis for mass colonization of North America was prepared. The memory of this is the name of the capital of the Bahamas - Nassau (1695).

The merchant elite, the Bank of England and the Royal Mint

During William III's reign, the merchant elite (former Venetian and Amsterdam financiers) abandoned the Netherlands and began to use London as a new operational base. As a result, the Dutch economy deflated, while in Britain economic boom began. An important part in these processes was played by the banks. Below we will try to explain their part.

The City of London Corporation, which had emerged much earlier than the Bank of England, had already acquired special privileges stemming from the power of financial capital. Britain's rulers needed the City's money and gave the City what it wanted in exchange. "The right of the City to run its own affairs was gradually won as concessions were gained from the Crown. London's importance as a centre of trade, population and wealth secured it rights and liberties earlier than other towns and cities. From medieval to Stuart times the City was the major source of financial loans to monarchs, who sought funds to support their policies at home and abroad."⁷ The City was closely linked with the crown and parliament, but not subordinate to them. When a powerful adviser to Henry VIII, Cardinal Wolsey, attempted in the late 1520s to put the City

⁷Shaxson N., 2011, p. 255.

under progressive taxation and organized a symbolic export of arms and utensils of the City livery companies, the riposte was quick. In 1529, the City helped to discredit Wolsey and, for the monarchs not to forget about the grievance (and revenge), established in 1571 the position of "the Remembrancer", which was supposed to remind the monarch of his duty to the city.⁸ The City had close contacts with Venice, Lombardy and Prague. In 1613 the family of Baruch established the Standard Chartered Bank, which is now called the "bank of banks."

However, neither the Tudors, nor particularly the Stuarts favoured usurers' capital in general and Jewish in particular. Thus, the English and Dutch moneylenders supported first Cromwell against Charles I, and then William of Orange against James Stuart.

Charles I, who, in need of money, ordered to capture 130 thousand pounds in bullion stored in the Tower and returned it only after the depositors of the City signed a loan of 40 thousand pounds, was not forgiven and met his doom.⁹ When Oliver Cromwell became Lord Protector, he aimed to compete with the Netherlands, so he sought to attract the capital of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews settled in Amsterdam. During Cromwell's time the Jews returned to England.

When William of Orange became the king of England, he made further concessions to the moneylenders and allowed them to create the Bank of England in 1694. The Bank of England significantly differed from the banks, which were established in the 15-17th cc. in Portugal and Spain. The former banks were used as storage and savings institutions, but no financial capital investment and crediting were made by them. Holland and then England revealed the first shoots of financial capitalism, and created the first European global banking centre, whose chief business was investments. Notably, the main revenue of Holland was not raked up from industrial production, but from lending money to kings and intermediary trade. When William moved to England, the Venetian and Amsterdam financiers moved there, too, and aided in establishing the Bank of England - in particular, in order to raise money for William III's war against France and to provide credit for building the navy.

Almost immediately the Bank started to issue notes in return for deposits. It was the first issue of paper money, i.e. paper receipts, equivalent to gold. These notes (primarily government promissory notes), rather than "real" money, were the key assets of the bank. Thus, instead of bargaining-deposit operations, the Bank of England began to perform primarily the credit function. Remarkably, in the same period (1695) the previously purely mercantile Exchange of London launched securities transactions, both national and foreign, which in a certain way affected the economies of other countries.

The inscription on modern banknotes of pounds sterling issued by the Bank of England still reads: "I promise to pay the bearer on demand the sum of ... pounds." It is due to the conservatism of the English, that we can see the whole history of the transformation of money as a means of payment into a means of enslaving the world.

As the first money was made of precious metals, the possibility of mint was limited by the presence of these same metals. To circumvent this obstacle, bankers began to issue paper receipts with a promise to pay some amount of money (the specified worth of pounds of high-grade gold). This stage is reflected in the inscription on pounds, which was obviously made to ensure people's trust. Then everyone got used to paper money. Why exchange paper for gold, if paper is more convenient to carry? Finally, the cunning bankers realized that no one would check and verify the total amount of available paper receipts and the available gold. The main thing was that everyone *believed* that the bankers had enough of it, that paper notes were secured by gold.

Everything changed overnight. Previously ships carried gold from the colonies to Britain, and according to the amount of gold brought, paper money was issued. This scheme was instantly

⁸Ibid., p. 257.

⁹ Coston, Henry. Les Financiers qui mènent le monde. Paris: La librairie française, 1955. P. 31.

made obsolete. Bankers could now produce as much paper money as needed and then pretend that the ships brought exactly that amount of gold.

The Bank of England, lodged in the heart of the City of London, together with the East India Company, the West India Company and the Venetian-Amsterdam system, has become the core of what we now call the "financial International."¹⁰ The emergence of the bank and the creation of the national debt ushered in a financial revolution that led quite quickly to the emergence of mortgage markets, Lloyds insurance, a stock exchange, a financial press and the rapid expansion of overseas trade. The financial sector constituted what P.J. Cain and A. G. Hopkins called the "governor of the Imperial engine."¹¹

Also, in the 16th century the Royal Mint achieved a monopoly on the production of coins of the realm. Curiously, no other than Isaac Newton was Master of the Royal Mint. Newton firmly exercised and expanded administrative and legal authority, including the creation the Mint's own prisons and police involved in the investigation of various financial crimes and violations across the country. In fact, the Royal Mint under Newton, along with its branches in several other cities, became a kind of empire characterized by such a degree of centralization and control that was not achieved by Britain until the mid-19th c.¹²

Comprehension questions

1. Is there a Constitution as such in Britain? What documents are acknowledged as Constitution?
2. William of Orange's biography in brief.
3. The Scottish resistance. The massacre of Glencoe.
4. The situation in Ireland and the Treaty of Limerick.
5. Speak about William's war with France. What forces supported it? What tactics permitted England to win a victory? William as a soldier and diplomat. How did the hostilities with France end?
6. William's home politics.
7. Evaluate William III's statesmanship.
8. The merchant elite. The brief historic outlook of the City of London (money lending, Cardinal Wolsey's fate, the "Remembrancer", Charles I, Oliver Cromwell).
9. What was the difference of the Bank of England from Spanish and Portuguese banks?
10. The history of banknotes.
11. Why did the economic law of gold equivalent of the cost of goods "change overnight"?
12. The Royal Mint.

Names and expressions

Lowlanders— жители Нижней Шотландии

Highlanders— горцы

Dundee — Данди, город и графство в Шотландии

Mackay — Мак Кей

Atholl — город в Шотландии, Пертшир

Blairs [ble:r] — Блэр

Killiecrankie — Ирландия

¹⁰The short history of the Bank of England is at <http://www.bankofengland.co.uk/banknotes/Pages/about/history.aspx> (03.14.2015)

¹¹Shaxson N., 2011, p. 261.

¹²Craig I. Isaac Newton - Crime Investigator // Nature. 1958. V. 182. № 4629. P. 149-152, quoted in Менцин Ю.Л. Монетный двор и вселенная (Ньютон у истоков английского «экономического чуда»). Вопросы истории, естествознания, техники. № 4, 1997. Сс. 3-25.

Walker ['wo:kə] — Уокер
Baker [beikə]
Act of Settlement — Акт о престолонаследии в Англии
Foyle [foil] — Фойл
Enniskillen — Эннискиллен (Ирландия)
Lauzan [lo:zən]
Sarsfield [,sa:sfi:ld] — **Le Sars** — Ле Сарс, в районе Па-де-Кале
Limerick — Лимерик, городок в Ирландии
after failing to capture the town — после того, как ему не удалось захватить город
Ginkel ['ginkəl]
Kinsale [kinsəl]
Aughrim — Окрим, город в Ирландии
Dublin ['dablin]
Namur ['nə'mu:ə] — Намюр, город и провинция в Бельгии
Steinkirk ['sti:n kɜ:k-, 'stain-]
Neerwinden [neə'wində] — город в Бельгии
his imperious will did not suffer others to direct him — его властность не желала страдать из-за того, что им командуют другие
Ryswick ['risvik] — Рисвик (в Южной Голландии)
it was not before 1696 — только в 1696
Triennial Act — акт о том, что Парламент избирается только на три года
Junto — хунта, клика, сообщество
the origin of government by party — происхождение правления по принципу партии
as a matter of fact — вообще говоря; на самом деле
Archduke — эрцгерцог
Elector — курфюрст
Electress — женщина-курфюрст
Hesse [hess] — Гесс, область Германии
Flanders ['flɑ:ndəz]
One is struck — можно поражаться
Utrecht ['ju:trekt] — Утрехт

5. PARTY RULE: ANNE (1702–1714)



Anne (1665— 1714), second daughter of James, Duke of York, afterwards James II, and Anne Hyde, daughter of the first earl of Clarendon, was born on the 6th of February 1665. As a child she suffered from an eye illness and was sent to France for medical treatment; she lived there with her grandmother, Henrietta Maria, and on the latter's death with her aunt, duchess of Orleans; she returned to England only in 1670. She was brought up with her sister Mary, by the direction of Charles II, as a strict Protestant; and as a child she made friendship of Sarah Jennings (afterwards Duchess of Marlborough), thus beginning life under the two influences — and the two influences meant very much for her future career.

On the 28th of July 1683, she married Prince George of Denmark — the union was unpopular, but one of great domestic happiness, the prince and the princess were comfortable in temper and both preferred retirement and quiet to life in the great world. Anne refused to show any sympathy with the king after William had landed in November.

When James returned to London on the 26th, he found that Anne and her lady-in-waiting

Sarah Jennings (now Sarah Churchill) escaped from Whitehall by a back staircase, and after that they put themselves under the care of the bishop of London, spent one night in his house, and on the 1st of December arrived at Nottingham. From there she came to Oxford, and on the 19th of December the princess returned to London.

But Anne's life was soon troubled with quarrels with the king and queen. The two sisters had lived hitherto apart on extremely affectionate terms, but now they found no enjoyment in each other's society. Anne wanted to be independent, and it greatly displeased William and Mary, who regarded it as a plot.

At the close of 1691 Anne had declared her approval of the naval expedition in favour of her father and expressed grief at its failure. The same year the quarrel between the two sisters was ended by the dismissal of Marlborough, justly suspected of Jacobite intrigues. Anne took the part of her favourites with great zeal against the court, though she probably knew nothing of Marlborough's treason; and on the dismissal of her friend the countess from her household by the king and queen she refused to part with Sarah, and retired with Lady Marlborough to the duke of Somerset's residence. Anne was now in disgrace; she was deprived of her guard of honour. In May Marlborough was arrested for treason, and Anne regarded his disgrace as a personal injury to herself. In August 1693, however, the two sisters were reconciled.

The death of Mary weakened William's position and made it necessary to cultivate good relations with the princess. She was now treated with every honour and civility, and finally established with her court at St. James's Palace. At the same time William kept her in the background. In 1696 Anne wrote to her father asking for his leave to wear the crown at William's death, and promising his restoration at some opportunity. It is said that before his death James wrote to his daughter asking for her protection for his family, but Anne could do nothing for them because of the recognition James's son as king of England by Louis XIV. She wore mourning for her father in 1701, and in the same year there was a new Act of Settlement, and the substitution of the Hanoverian branch.

On the 8th of March 1702, Anne became, by King William's death, queen of Great Britain, she was crowned on the 23rd of April.

It is said that on the whole Anne was a weak-minded woman was entirely guided by her friend Lady Marlborough. Her chief ministers were Marlborough himself and Godolphin. In her first speech to parliament, like George HI afterwards, Anne declared her "heart to be entirely English." A ministry, mostly Tory, with Godolphin at its head, was established. The Queen showed from the first a strong interest in church matters and declared her intention to keep church appointments in her own hands. She detested equally Roman Catholics and dissenters.

Though the Tories came into the power in Anne's days, the Whig war policy was not abandoned; on the other hand, Marlborough, one of the greatest generals in history, became the Captain-General of the Allies and undertook the defence of the Dutch frontier.

Scotland and the Act of Settlement

In 1703 it seemed possible that a war would break out at home between England and Scotland. While England was glad enough to conclude the Methuen treaty with Portugal, and thus, in return for allowing the importation of Portuguese wines on specially favourable terms, secure an opening of English woollens in Portugal, it still regarded Scotland, for trade purposes, as a foreign country, and forbade her to trade with the English colonies. It had developed into national enmity.

The Scots had an absurd scheme to colonise Darien, and the failure of that plan in 1699 had been more bitter by active hostility from England. In 1703 the Scottish Parliament passed an Act of Security, providing for the separation of the two thrones and governments on Anne's death. England replied by further trade restrictions, and the two nations seemed to be on a brink of war. But commissioners had been sitting since 1702 to arrange for a closer union of the two countries,

and after all Scotland had more to lose from isolation and more to gain from union than England. At last, after long negotiations, an Act of Union was passed in 1707, of which the chief points were that the two countries should form one United Kingdom of Great Britain, with succession to the Throne according to the English Act of Settlement; that the Scottish Church and law should remain untouched; that equal trade privileges should be enjoyed by both countries; and that forty-five Scottish members and sixteen Scottish representative peers should attend a United Parliament.

The War for the Spanish Succession (1701 - 1714)

The War for the Spanish Succession was started by the British in 1701 to prevent the connection of its great rivals - Spain and France. The hostilities began in 1698. The nearest heir of the Spanish throne was the Dauphin of France; but the Dauphine's mother had renounced her claim to the succession, and the throne had to be occupied by Leopold of Austria. As Leopold's succession would completely upset the balance of power in Europe, William III persuaded Louis XIV to agree that the succession should pass to Leopold's grandson, the Electoral Prince of Bavaria.¹³ This first Partition Treaty was upset by the Electoral Prince's death, and in 1700 a second treaty was drawn up by which Leopold's second son, the Archduke Charles, was to succeed to Spain and the Spanish Netherlands, while the Spanish dominions in Italy were to fall to France. When, however, the King of Spain died in the same year and left his undivided possessions to the Dauphin's younger son Philip, Louis XIV declined the Partition Treaty at all. In all the arrangements so far no account had been taken of the wishes of the Spaniards themselves.

William's policy in resisting France was approved by many Englishmen when, on the death of James II, Louis immediately recognized James's son as King of England. As a result, the Whigs came back to power and passed the Act of Settlement, by which the crown was to pass on William's death first to Mary's sister Anne and then to the Electress Sophia of Hanover and her Protestant descendants (1701). By this Act Catholics, or those married to Catholics, were excluded from the ascension to the English throne. By the same Act it was decided that the consent of Parliament was necessary for wars on behalf of the sovereign's foreign possessions and for his absence from the British Isles; and a clause which could hardly be expected in such an Act, judges were no longer to hold office during the king's pleasure, but for life— unless a vote in Parliament would remove such a judge. In a later session a resolution was passed to maintain an army and a fleet each of 40,000 men, thus providing William with the troops he required for the Grand Alliance he had already formed with the Empire, Holland, Prussia, and Hesse against France. Churchill, now Earl of Marlborough, was sent to command in Flanders till the king's arrival. But William was not to fight again; he was thrown from his horse at the beginning of 1702 and died shortly afterwards. It was really that his doom should have come at the moment when he had once drawn together a great alliance in Europe, and when he possessed a popularity in England such as he had never before enjoyed.

The complexion of the war

The war of the Spanish succession was raging by land and sea: in Austria, Spain and Netherlands. Britain was demonstrating geopolitical success in that war. As we have mentioned above, the Lisbon Treaty and then the Methuen Treaty were signed 1703, as a result, Portugal, which had been part of the Spanish kingdom and participated in the war for the Spanish inheritance, was “emancipated” from the Spanish rule and became a separate country. In fact,

¹³Keatinge, Maurice Walter. A History of England for Schools; With Documents, Problems, and Exercises. London : Adam and Charles Black, 1911.

however, Portugal became fully economically and politically dependent on Britain.

In 1704 Marlborough won a victory over the French and Bavarians at Blenheim, on the Upper Danube, and in the same year Gibraltar was captured by Rooke and Cloudesley Shovel.¹⁴ In the following year Peterborough took Barcelona, and in 1706 Marlborough's defeat at Ramilles led to the conquest of the greatest part of the Spanish Netherlands. When at the same time the Allies entered Madrid it seemed that the object of the war had been gained; but in 1707 the Spaniards rose in favour of Philip, whom their late king had named as his successor, and under the Duke of Berwick, the illegitimate son of King James II and Arabella Churchill, living in exile in France, defeated the Allies at Almanza. However, it was more than repaired in 1708 by Marlborough's victory over the Duke of Vendome in the Netherlands.

But the greatest were the blows inflicted on France. As Alfred Thayer Mahan, the naval historian, strategist, and geopolitical theorist wrote: "Of all the great powers [France] alone had a free choice [between land and sea]. In 1672 she definitively chose expansion of land. Why [in 1715] was France miserable and exhausted while England was smiling and prosperous? Why did England dictate, and France accept, terms of peace? The reason apparently was the difference in wealth and credit." France fought alone against several enemies risen and supported by English subsidies and lost the war.

But where did the English find such money and such opportunities to enlist practically all of Europe (Denmark, Germany and Austria) to start a war against Louis XIV? The money just appeared out of nothing. The same writer says that despite being burdened with a debt which was far too considerable to pay back within a short period of time after a most excruciating war in 1697, already in 1706 instead of seeing the French fleet next to the British shores, they were already sending the strongest ships on annual offensive missions against the enemy. The money for bankrupt England was provided by the Bank of England. France, on the other hand, did not have the money to buy the loyalty of other countries. That is why Savoy, who fought with the French at the beginning of the war, finished it on the side of London.¹⁵ It was simply overbought.

Closer to the end of the War for the Spanish succession, a chain of deaths happened in the family of Louis the XIV, the Sun King, who was at the time 73 years old. Nothing seemed to spell trouble. The first to die, in 1711, was the King's son and the heir to the throne, Louis, Le Grand Dauphin, allegedly of smallpox (though he had had it in childhood). In 1712, Louis' grandson Duke of Burgundy also died of the same disease. Then his great-grandsons got ill with allegedly scarlet fever and one of them, the young heir, died.¹⁶ In 1715, a year after the Treaty of Utrecht was signed, which marked the end of French ambitions of hegemony, the distraught Sun King passed away himself.

Effect of the war on parties

The course of the war had not been without effect on parties in England. When the campaign of 1703 ended without any important success, the hostile attitude of the extreme Tories compelled the moderate members of the party, who, like Godolphin and Marlborough, were heartily in favour of the policy of William III, to draw closer to the Whigs. This was the easier for them because they were able to replace Nottingham by Robert Harley, Speaker of the House of Commons. The victory of Blenheim was a great blow to the high Tories, and in 1705, after the elections had returned a large Whig majority, the Queen herself seemed to change sides.

¹⁴Gibraltar, an area in Spain (on the southern end of the Iberian Peninsula), a British territory since 1713 known to its 30,000 residents as "the Rock", was a very valuable seizure for the British, a strategic "chokepoint" in the Mediterranean Sea, which blocks ships passage. Today, the peninsula on Spain's south coast is a major point of contention in Anglo-Spanish relations. Spain has long claimed sovereignty over the enclave.

¹⁵<http://www.megabook.ru/Article.asp?AID=635974>

¹⁶His brother was probably saved thanks to an antidote, found by the King.

And yet in all this time the ministry was a Tory ministry, although it depended for its existence on Whig support; and the queen, in spite of appearances, was as much a Tory as ever. But the Whigs were too strong to be resisted, and in 1706 were able to demand the admission into the ministry of several of their leaders, and especially of Sunderland, who, as well as being an ardent Whig, was Marlborough's son-in-law. Harley now began to intrigue against his colleagues. The ministry was more than ever dependent on the Whigs, and there was now no middle party. An attempted invasion of Scotland by the son of James II, so called the Old Pretender, prevented by admiral Byng, still further discredited the Tories.

The end of the War for the Spanish Succession and the Peace Treaty of Utrecht (1713-1714)

At last the French offered terms for peace, but when the Allies refused to accept anything, and wanted to get French support to drive Philip out of Spain, but the negotiations fell through. In spite of her exhaustion France put another army in the field and was almost able to claim its defeat at Malplaquet (1709) as a victory, so many of the allies were killed. The Allies seemed most fortunate when the Archduke Charles entered Madrid; but Spanish national feeling was entirely with Philip, and the Archduke was very soon obliged to withdraw.

Now the danger for the war to be indefinitely prolonged was clear and Englishmen were becoming weary of victories which increased taxation. The Tories began to lose ground as the queen and the Duchess of Marlborough had a big quarrel. First Sunderland and then Godolphin were dismissed.

When Marlborough returned home in 1710, he not only found it impossible to reconcile the Queen and his wife, but also discovered that his own influence was gone. The Tories were intent upon concluding peace and were already secretly negotiating with the French. To disgrace Marlborough was the best means to their end, and he was dismissed from all his offices. In 1713 the War of the Spanish Succession was closed by the Treaty of Utrecht. As M.W. Keatinge writes, the peace was popular [in England], and on the whole not unfavourable to England. Philip was recognized as King of Spain and the Indies; Charles of Austria was given the Spanish Netherlands, Milan, Naples, and Sardinia; England got Gibraltar, Minorca, Newfoundland, and Nova Scotia, and was given a monopoly of the slave trade. Louis XIV recognized the Protestant succession in England and dismissed the Pretender. The French and Spanish thrones, it was agreed, should never be united.¹⁷

We shall add that Gibraltar, belonging to Spain and captured by the Anglo-Dutch force during the War of the Spanish Succession in 1704, was a very valuable acquisition for the British. This fortress city (the Rock of Gibraltar) closed the entrance to the Mediterranean Sea and had a very important geostrategic position. Britain always realised that in order to dominate the world it had to control its strategic "chokepoints," narrow sea passages, which Gibraltar was. Gibraltar was ceded to Britain "in perpetuity" under the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713, then this decision was confirmed under the Treaty of Versailles in 1783. It became an important base for the Royal Navy and contributed to Britain's command of the seas. Annexing Gibraltar, the British also bargained for themselves Asiento – the monopoly on the supply of slaves from Africa. The British government passed the rights to control of the slave trade to the South Sea Company. Now the slave trade on a global scale could only be conducted with the permission of Britain.¹⁸

¹⁷https://archive.org/stream/historyofengland00keatuoft/historyofengland00keatuoft_djvu.txt

¹⁸Gibraltar, occupied by Britain in 1704, is still its overseas territory, and Spain still challenges it. In 1963, the vote was held on the initiative of the United Nations whether Gibraltar should be Spanish or British, on the results of which the majority of local residents voted for the preservation of British rule. This resulted in the complication of relations of Britain with Spain. Therefore, the land border of Spain and Gibraltar was opened only in 1985. In 2002, at the insistence of Spain, negotiations on the joint British-Spanish management of Gibraltar took place. Knowing the British strategy, their futility could be predicted - the United Kingdom will concede its key points no one.

By the way, such “chokepoints” as Gibraltar were not only important for military control, they were and still are extremely profitable trading posts. A country, controlling them, at negligible cost and with a small military garrison, could automatically collect some 3% of all money from each merchant ship that was forced to swim through the trading post. Profits derived

The Act of Settlement («Акт о престолонаследии») was passed in 1701 to settle the succession to the English and Irish crowns and thrones on the Electress Sophia of Hanover (a granddaughter of James VI of Scotland and I of England) and her Protestant (non-Roman Catholic) heirs. The Act of Settlement is still in force and it excludes Roman Catholics, or those married to Catholics, from succession to the English throne. This act and its further amendments, limiting the absolute royal power, nevertheless have provided for the Monarch Prerogatives, which are vast and confer great power on the English Monarch to this day.

- One of the prerogatives is to summon and prorogue Parliament. Each parliamentary session begins with the monarch's summons.
- Before a bill passed by the legislative Houses can become law, the Royal Assent (the monarch's approval) is required.
- In accordance with unwritten constitutional conventions, the Sovereign must appoint an individual who commands the support of the House of Commons, usually the leader of the party or coalition that has a majority in that House. The Prime Minister takes office by attending the Monarch in private audience, and after Kissing Hands that appointment is immediately effective without any other formality or instrument. The monarch can unilaterally dismiss a Prime Minister.
- The Royal Prerogative includes the powers to appoint and dismiss ministers, regulate the civil service, issue passports, declare war, make peace, direct the actions of the military, negotiate and ratify treaties, alliances, and international agreements. (However, a treaty cannot alter the domestic laws of the United Kingdom; an Act of Parliament is necessary in such cases.)
- The monarch is commander in chief of the Armed Forces (the Royal Navy, the British Army, and the Royal Air Force), accredits British High Commissioners and ambassadors, and receives diplomats from foreign states.
- The Sovereign is deemed the "fount of justice"; although the Sovereign does not personally rule in judicial cases, judicial functions are performed in his or her name. The common law holds that the Sovereign "can do no wrong"; the monarch cannot be prosecuted for criminal offences. The Sovereign exercises the "prerogative of mercy", which is used to pardon convicted offenders or reduce sentences.

The Act of Settlement was later extended to Scotland, as a result of the Treaty of Union (Article II), enacted in the Acts of Union 1707 before it was ever needed. Along with the Bill of Rights 1689, it remains today one of the main constitutional laws governing the succession to not only the throne of the United Kingdom, but, following British colonialism, the resultant doctrine of reception, and independence, also to those of the other Commonwealth realms (fifteen members of the Commonwealth, including Canada, Australia, New Zealand and others, which recognise the Queen as their head of state), whether by willing deference to the act as a British statute or as a patriated part of the particular realm's constitution. Since the implementation of the Statute of Westminster 1931 in each of the Commonwealth realms (on successive dates from 1931 onwards), the Act of Settlement cannot be altered in any realm except by that realm's own parliament and, by convention, only with the consent of all the other realms, as it touches on the succession to the shared throne.

Tory leadership by introducing the special Bill, the object of which was to insist that the children of Dissenters should be educated only by teachers licensed by the bishops. Oxford, whose wife

in this way were comparable with the profits from a military campaign during a colonial war. There are a few trading posts of global importance in the world, they are Suez, Panama, Cape Town, Singapore, Gibraltar and a couple of others. And, importantly, the British owned most of them at some time, winning them from the countries in which territories these posts are, or from rival colonialists. Some key trading posts are zealously retained by Britain under its control to this day.

As regards Russia, during the War for the Spanish Succession the Tsar Peter I was carrying out his reforms. At the time Russia's army and navy were still not strong enough, so Russia could be “taken with bare hands.” After some time, Russia would become so strong that Peter the Great would collide with the strongest army of Europe, the Swedes headed by Charles XII, fight for two decades (1700-1721) and return to Russia its Baltic possessions. The country would become the Russian Empire. A few decades later it would triumphantly beat Frederick II of Prussia in the Seven Years War (cf. Battle of Kunersdorf, 1759).

Problem of Succession. Queen Ann's Death

In the middle of their triumph the Tory leaders, the Earl of Oxford (Harley) and Viscount Bolingbroke (St. John), quarrelled. Both began to intrigue with the Pretender, for they knew that the Elector of Hannover was inclined to the Whigs. The queen herself had no affection for the House of Hannover, and if the Pretender would have sacrificed his religion, she would have gladly worked for his succession to the throne. But as this was beyond hope, Oxford did his best to reconcile the Queen to the Hanoverian succession. When he had the evident success, his jealous colleagues captured the object of which was to insist that the children of Dissenters should be educated only by teachers licensed by the bishops. Oxford, whose wife

and children were Presbyterians, was embarrassed; he neither opposed nor supported the Bill. The queen, who was above all things devoted to the church party, was persuaded to dismiss him.

Bolingbroke's complete triumph was only prevented by the Queen's sudden illness. The Dukes of Somerset and Argyle, heads of two of the most powerful Whig families, managed to take their places as privy councillors, and Bolingbroke even found himself obliged to ask the dying queen to appoint the Duke of Shrewsbury, one of the leaders of the Revolution of 1688, as Lord High Treasurer in succession to Harley. The supporters of the Protestant succession were thus able to proclaim George of Hannover king in accordance with the Act of Settlement, while Bolingbroke saw all hopes of a Stuart restoration destroyed and his own political career ruined.

Evaluation of Queen Anne's rule

The ordinary English people became so tired of the wars that the age of Queen Anne seemed to them as a brilliant time of great victories and the age of flourishing English culture and literature, and that was not so untrue. During her reign, as in the reign of Elizabeth I, there were a number of outstanding English writers, such as Joseph Addison (1672-1719), an essayist, poet and man of letters; Alexander Pope (1688-1744), a famous poet, and the satirical writer Jonathan Swift (1667-1745) — by the way, if you remember, he laughed at both Tories and Whigs. There were so many men of letters in the age of Anne that this time was called the "Augustan Age" in England.

Comprehension questions

1. Speak about Anne's ancestry, her marriage and escape from her father. Anne's dissension with William and Mary. Suspicions over a Jacobite plot.
2. Anne as the Queen.
3. Scotland and the Act of Settlement.
4. What were the provisions of the Act of Union passed in 1707? What new state was formed under this act?
5. The War for the Spanish Succession (1701 - 1714). The complexion of the war. What was the British tactics during that war? How can France's defeat in this war be explained? Louis the XIV's death.
6. The balance of political parties in England during Anne's rule.
7. The end of the War for the Spanish Succession and the Peace Treaty of Utrecht (1713-1714). Prove that the terms of the Peace were quite favourable to Britain.
8. Why was Gibraltar an important acquisition for Britain?
9. Problem of Succession. Queen Anne's Death.
10. Evaluation of Anne's rule.
11. The Act of Settlement. The prerogatives of the British Monarch.

Names and expressions

Orleans [o:liənz]

the union was unpopular but one... — "one" is used instead of "union"

comfortable in temper — с уравновешенным характером

life in the great world — жизнь в высшем свете

lady-in-waiting — камеристка

put themselves under the care of — вручили себя заботе

Godolphin, Sydney (1645-1712) — Годольфин

Methuen [mijju's]

Darien ['deəriən] — Дарьен (залив)

Blenheim ['blenim] — Бленим

the Danube ['daenju:b] — Дунай

Ramilles ['reimils] — деревня в Брабанте, провинции Бельгии

Almanza [o:lmənzə] — Альманса (Испания)
Vendome [vaen'do:m] — Вендом (Франция)
this was the easier for them — им тем легче было
In spite of appearances — несмотря на внешнее проявление (вид)
The Old Pretender — Старый Претендент
fell through — полностью провалилась
Malplaquet [maɛplə'ke] — деревня в Сев. Франции
Utrecht [ju:trekt] — Утрехт
to lose ground — потерять основание, почву под ногами
Milan [mi'laen] — Милан
Naples ['neɪp(ə)lz] — Неаполь
Sardinia [sar'diniə] — Сардиния
Sicily ['sɪsɪli] — Сицилия
Savoy [sa'voɪ] — Савойя
Minorca [mi'no:kə] — Минорка
Bolingbroke [,bəʊlɪn'brɒk] (1678-1751) — Болингброк
Hanover; the House of Hanover — Ганновер (Германия), Ганноверская династия

6. THE WHIG OLIGARCHY. THE FIRST JACOBITE RISING (1715)



Robert Walpole (1676-1745), first earl of Oxford, British statesman, Britain's first prime minister, who kept Britain in peace while in office.

Queen Anne left no children after her — she had given birth to several, but they all died as infants. So, the crown passed away from the Stuart family to a distant cousin, who ruled Hannover and was a protestant. He became George I (lived 1660-1727, king of Britain from 1714), the first representative of the Hanoverian dynasty on the British throne. This king spoke no English, cared little about the country he was called to rule over, so matters were left chiefly in the hands of the very clever ministers. The accession of George I meant more than the triumph of the Whigs, although it certainly so discredited the Tories that their party came to be regarded as Jacobite and disloyal to the government. The most important result was that the king who had never taken the trouble to learn English and whose real interests lay in Hannover and in foreign affairs left English matters more and more to his ministers; the power of the crown fell into the hands of the Cabinet¹⁹, whose

¹⁹ The Cabinet of the United Kingdom is the decision-making body of a British monarch, composed of the Prime Minister and some 21 Cabinet ministers, the most senior of the government ministers. Ministers of the Crown, and especially Cabinet ministers, are selected primarily from the elected members of House of Commons, and also from the House of Lords, by the Prime Minister. Cabinet ministers are heads of government departments, mostly with the office of "Secretary of State for [function, e.g. Defence] ". The collective coordinating function of the Cabinet is reinforced by the statutory position that all the Secretaries of State jointly hold the same office, and can exercise the same powers. The Cabinet is the executive committee of the monarch's Privy Council, a body which has legislative, judicial and executive functions, and whose large membership includes members of the Opposition. Its decisions are generally implemented either under the existing powers of individual government departments, or by Orders in Council.

In England, phrases such as "cabinet counsel", meaning advice given in private, in a cabinet in the sense of a small room, to the monarch, occur from the late 16th century. Francis Bacon in his *Essays* (1605) with the first use of "Cabinet council", where it is described as a foreign habit, of which he disapproves: "For which inconveniences, the doctrine of Italy, and practice of France, in some kings' times, hath introduced cabinet counsels; a remedy worse than the disease". Charles I began a formal "Cabinet Council" from his accession in 1625, as his Privy Council, or "private council", and the first recorded use of "cabinet" by itself for such a body comes from 1644, and is again hostile and associates the term with dubious foreign practices. Since the reign of King George I the Cabinet has been the principal executive group of British government. Both he and George II made use of the

president, now that the king seldom attended its meetings, was able to get far greater control over his followers and to initiate far more measures in the state than had ever been possible before.

At first, let us give Walpole's biography outline. Walpole was born on August 26, 1676, in Norfolk, England, and educated at the University of Cambridge. He entered Parliament in 1701 and became known as a spokesman for Whig policy. In 1708 he was appointed secretary at war, and in 1710 he became treasurer of the navy, a position he lost when the Whig government was defeated in an election the same year. On the accession of the first Hanoverian king of England, George I, in 1714, Walpole, who had been a supporter of the German-born monarch, was restored to the cabinet, becoming first lord of the treasury and chancellor of the Exchequer in October 1715. Because of a conflict among the king's advisers, Walpole resigned in 1717, but he continued to exercise considerable influence as an opponent of government policy. He returned to the cabinet in 1720, a year of financial crisis caused by heavy speculation in the stock of the South Sea Company, a corporation founded in 1711 for the purpose of assuming the national debt (South Sea Bubble). Members of the government were accused of manipulating the value of the stock, but Walpole was never proven to have abetted the scheme. He skilfully protected the court and the Whig leadership from political disaster. From 1721 to 1742 Walpole served as leader of the House of Commons, first lord of the treasury, and chancellor of the Exchequer, and he consolidated Whig power through a system of royal patronage. He secured large legislative majorities because his policies of continued peace and low taxation reflected the desires of Parliament, and he displayed an unsurpassed ability to unite the members on political issues. Because of his extensive political power and influence on the domestic and foreign policies of Britain during this period, Walpole is considered to have been the nation's first prime minister, although the title itself did not come into common use until much later in the century and became official only in 1905.

So, one of the main merits of Walpole's rule was lasting peace. The Whigs realized that rest was sorely needed, for England was "worn out with Marlborough's great wars." So, the first business of the new Parliament was to inquire into the negotiations to end the War for the Spanish Succession, which had resulted in the Treaty of Utrecht. Meanwhile a person whom the Jacobites called James III, and the Hanoverian party — the Old Pretender, and who was also called Chevalier James Edward Francis Stuart (1688— 1766) made attempts to dismiss the Hannover party and to return the Stuarts. The son and heir of James II of England was born in Saint James's Palace, London. The scandalous story that he was a supposititious child started and spread abroad by interested politicians at the time of his birth, has been completely disproved, and most contemporary writers allude to his striking family likeness to the Royal Stuarts. As we remember, his mother had fled with him as a little child to France, and after his father's death the French king Louis XIV tried to proclaim him king but failed.

At the peace of Utrecht following the War for the Spanish Succession James withdrew from French territory. A rebellion in the Highlands of Scotland began in September 1715 by the raising of the standard on the hills of Mar, and by the solemn proclamation of James Stuart, the Chevalier of Saint George, in the midst of the assembled clans, but its progress was arrested in November by the indecisive battle of Sheriffmuir and by the surrender at Preston. Knowing nothing of the gloomy nature of his prospects, the chevalier landed in December 1715 in Peterland, and advanced as far south as Scone, accompanied by a small force under the Earl of Mar, but he soon learned of the approach of the Duke of Argyle, and retreated to Montrose, where the Highlanders dispersed to the mountains, and he embarked again to France. Unfortunately for the Jacobites, Louis XIV died, leaving an heir his grandson a boy of five. The regency of France fell to hands of the Duke of Orleans, himself the next heir to the throne after

system, as both were non-native English speakers, unfamiliar with British politics, and thus relied heavily on selected groups of advisers. The term "minister" came into being since the royal officers "ministered" to the sovereign.

the young king. So, the Jacobites now had no help of France.

When the disappointed Pretender, seeing the hopelessness of his adventure, returned to France by ship, Argyle humanly refrained from harrying the clansmen, and they returned to their homes, but the Dutch Guards who arrived later did their best to follow them up and stamp out the rebellion. The government was singularly moderate: Lords Kenmure and Derwentwater were the only leaders who were executed; less than thirty of the less distinguished prisoners were hanged, and some hundreds were transported to the American colonies.

Still there were some people among the Jacobites who were ready to serve the Old Pretender hoping for the best in their country after returning the Stuarts. Robert Burns said in one of his poems written as a song of an old man who lost seven sons in the rebellion for Stuarts:

"The church is in ruins, the state is in jars,
Delusions, oppressions, and murderous wars;
We dare na weel say't, but we ken wha's to blame —
There'll never be peace till Jamie comes hame.
Now life is a burden that bows me down,
Sin' I tint my bairns, and he tint his crown;
But till my last moment my words are the same —
There'll never be peace till Jamie comes hame."

The same poet wrote in his poem "On the Battle of Sheriffmuir":

"They've lost some gallant gentlemen
Among the Highland clans, man;
I fear my lord Panmure is slain,
Or fallen in Whiggish hands, man:
Now wad ye sing this double fight,
Some fell for wrang, and some for right."

But on the whole Burns understood that the hopes of the people for the Stuart House were vain, and he wrote in another poem:

"Then let your schemes alone, in the state, in the state,
Then let your schemes alone in the state;
Then let your schemes alone,
Adore the rising sun,
And leave a man undone
To his fate."

So, the rising failed, and some of the Jacobites were punished. In 1719 James the Old Pretender married Maria Clementina Sobeski, granddaughter of the warrior king of Poland, John Sobeski. They were now invited to reside in Rome at the special request of Pope Clement XI, who openly acknowledged their titles of British King and Queen, gave them a papal guard of troops, presented them with a villa and a palace, and also gave them an annual allowance of 12,000 crowns out of the papal treasury. At the Palazzo Muti, where there was the chief centre of Jacobite intriguing, were born two James's sons, Charles Edward (the future Young Pretender) and Henry Benedict Stuart. His wife died at the early age of 32 in February 1735. His wife's death seemed to have affected James's health and spirit, and he began to grow feeble and indifferent, so that the political adherents of the Stuarts were gradually led to fix their hopes upon the two young princes rather than upon their father. James now appeared seldom in public, and much of his time was given to religious exercises. It was with great reluctance that James allowed his elder son to leave Italy for France in 1744, nevertheless, in the following year, he

permitted Henry to follow his brother's example, but with the news that the Jacobites were completely won at Culloden, he evidently came to regard cause as definitely lost. The estrangement of his elder and favourite son of an ecclesiastical career, so embittered his last years that he sank into a moping invalid and rarely left his chamber. With the crushing failure of the "Forty-five" and quarrel with his heir, the once-dreaded James soon became a mere cipher in British politics, and his death at Rome on the 2nd of January 1766 passed almost unnoticed in London. He was buried with regal pomp in St. Peter's.

As to James's personal character, it is known that he was grave, high-principled, industrious and dignified. Although a fervent Roman Catholic, he was far more reasonable and liberal in his religious views than his father, as many letters testify.

Comprehension questions

1. What royal family took over from the Stuarts after Queen Anne?
2. Can we say that it still diminished the royal absolute power? Which party came to the fore? Did George I know the British life? Who was he advised by?
3. What is the Cabinet?
4. Which personality tried to dismiss the Hannover party and return the Stuarts in 1715 (and later his son - in 1745)?
5. Speak about the Jacobite rebellion headed by James Stuart, the Chevalier of Saint George, the "Old Pretender."
6. Charles Edward (the future "Young Pretender").
7. James II's last years.

Names and expressions

- Waterloo** [ˌwo:tə'lu:] — городок и местность на территории Бельгии
- Australia** [o:'streiliə]
- New Zealand** ['nju:'zi:lənd]
- the age of Queen Anne** — эпоха королевы Анны
- Joseph Addison** ['ædis(ə)n] — Джозеф Аддисон
- Alexander Pope** [pəʊp] — Александр Поп
- Augustan Age** — относящийся к эпохе римского императора Августа; после Августа — век неоклассической литературы
- who had never taken the trouble** — который так и не взял на себя труд
- Cabinet** — Cabinet of Ministers
- Sheriffmuir** — Шерифмур
- Peterhead** ['pi:təhed] — горная вершина в Шотландии
- Scone** [skəʊn] - камень, на котором короновали шотландских королей (в окрестностях Перта)
- Montrose** [ˌmont' rəʊz] — находится в Шотландии
- Kenmure** [ken'muə]
- Derwentwater** ['dæ:vent wo:tə]
- We dare na weel say't** = we dare not say about it
- ken** = know
- wha's** = who is
- Sin'** = since
- tint** = lost (Scot.)
- bairns** = children (Scot)
- amang** = among (Scot.)
- ye** = you (Scot.)
- wrang** = wrong (Scot.)

then let your schemes alone — бросьте строить планы
Culloden [ku:lodən]

7. THE INCREASED STRENGTH OF THE WHIGS. THE SOUTH SEA COMPANY BOOM AND BUST (1720–21), PROBLEMS WITH IRELAND

The suppression of the Old Pretender's rebellion gave increased strength to the Whig government, and it was not unnatural that after an armed rebellion the government should be unwilling to relinquish powers. The Triennial Act of 1694 therefore was repealed, and a Septennial Act passed, which enabled the sitting and all subsequent Parliaments to last for seven years. The immediate consequences of the Act were perhaps not so important (it was passed in 1716) as its ultimate effect, which was to strengthen the power of Parliament and to lessen the influence of the House of Lords, whose members, as great landowners, held many of the seats in the Commons as their private property.

The difficulties of the Hanoverian connection were seen in 1716, when Townshend and Walpole left the Whig ministry rather than support George in a war with Sweden, whose king, Charles XII, objected to the annexation of Bremen and Verdun by Hannover. Once out of office, Walpole opposed the government now led by Stanhope and Sunderland, in home as well as foreign policy.

The Act of Occasional Conformity was passed in 1711 to prevent Dissenters from avoiding their political disabilities by taking a Sacrament once a year. But when the government, fearing that the Prince of Wales would reverse his father's policy and bring back the Tories to power by strengthening them in the House of Lords, proposed a Peerage Bill to restrict the creation of peers²⁰, Walpole was influential enough to secure its rejection. The result was that he and Stanhope were again admitted to the ministry. The object of the Peerage Bill was to limit the Royal power of creating peers. It was proposed, partly from a desire to guard the Lords against such a sudden increase of their numbers as had been forced on them when the Treaty of Utrecht was under discussion, and partly to secure the Whigs in office against any change in the royal councils in a succeeding reign. It was in fact proposed by men who valued the immediate victory of their principles more than they trusted to the general good sense of the nation. The Lords were at that time, as a matter of fact, not merely wealthier, but wiser than the Commons, and by this Bill the Commons should show their distrust to the Peers. Nevertheless, the remedy was worse than the disease, for it would have established a close oligarchy, bound sooner or later to come into conflict with the will of the nation. So, the Bill was not popular.

While, as we have seen, the connection with Hannover — a Central European province hard

²⁰ The Peerage of the United Kingdom and British Empire comprises most peerages created in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland after the Act of Union in 1801, when it replaced the Peerage of Great Britain. New peers continued to be created in the Peerage of Ireland until 1898 (the last creation being Baron Curzon). The ranks of the peerage are duke, marquess, earl, viscount, and baron. The last non-royal dukedom was created in 1900, and the last marquessate in 1936. Creation of the remaining ranks mostly ceased once Harold Wilson's Labour government took office in 1964, and only four non-royal hereditary peerages have been created since then. Until the House of Lords Act 1999 was passed, all peers of the United Kingdom were automatically members of the House of Lords. However, from that date, most of the hereditary peers ceased to be members as part of Parliamentary reform, whereas the life peers retained their seats. All hereditary peers of the first creation (i.e., those for whom a peerage was originally created, as opposed to those who inherited a peerage from an ancestor), and all surviving hereditary peers who had served as Leader of the House of Lords were offered a life peerage in order to allow them to sit in the House should they so choose. Marquesses, earls, viscounts and barons are all addressed as 'Lord X', where 'X' represents either their territory or surname pertaining to their title. Marchionesses, countesses, viscountesses and baronesses are all addressed as 'Lady X'. Dukes and duchesses are addressed just as 'Duke' or 'Duchess' or, in a non-social context, 'Your Grace'.

to defend — was likely to entangle England in Continental politics and wars, the new impulse given to her colonial commerce by the Treaty of Utrecht was bound, sooner or later, to bring her into conflict with Holland, France, and Spain, whose future depended as much as England's on expansion and trade. But we have also seen that the precarious position of the French regent drove him into the arms of England, while Charles XII of Sweden was furious at the annexation of Bremen and Verdun by Hannover. Sweden found an ally in Spain, where Alberoni, Philip V's chief adviser, was anxious for any turn of fortune which would retrieve the fortunes of his country. The best way to attack England was to help the Pretender, and therefore Alberoni supported the insurrection in Scotland, which was crushed at Glenshiel without an effort; in the preceding year (1718) the Spanish fleet, fresh from the seizure of Sardinia, had been defeated off Cape Passaro by Admiral Byng. The English and French had meanwhile secured first the adhesion of Holland to form a triple, and then that of Austria to form a quadruple, alliance.

In 1720 England experienced her first commercial crisis. The rapid growth of trade and wealth had created a spirit of speculation, which had been fostered by the exceptional privileges of the South Sea Company. Created by a charter in 1711, the Company had a monopoly of trading in the South Seas, and after the Treaty of Utrecht had transferred to it the carrying of the limited English trade with the Spanish colonies.

The Treaty of Utrecht of 1713 granted Britain an *Asiento*²¹ lasting 30 years to supply the Spanish colonies with 4,800 slaves per year. Britain was permitted to open offices in Buenos Aires, Caracas, Cartagena, Havana, Panama, Portobello and Vera Cruz to arrange the Atlantic slave trade. One ship of no more than 500 tons could be sent to one of these places each year (the *Navío de Permiso*) with general trade goods. One quarter of the profits were to be reserved for the King of Spain. There was provision for two extra sailings at the start of the contract. The *Asiento* was granted in the name of Queen Anne and then contracted to the company. By July the company had arranged contracts with the Royal African Company to supply the necessary African slaves to Jamaica. Ten pounds was paid for a slave aged over 16, £8 for one under 16 but over 10. Two-thirds were to be male, and 90% adult. The company trans-shipped 1,230 slaves from Jamaica to America in the first year, plus any that might have been added (against standing instructions) by the ship's captains on their own behalf.

By 1720, the Company had enlarged its capital — but not its operations — by taking over part the National Debt, now amounting to 52 million. The government's creditors had to exchange their stock for South Sea scrip. This connection with the government had the immediate effect of sending up the value of the Company's shares, so that in 1720 100 stock sold for 1,000. The effect was to encourage the floating of rival unchartered companies and a general spread of the most absurd speculation and gambling in shares.

The South Sea Company, seeing capital diverted from itself in this way, attacked the other concerns, and in doing so only succeeded in creating suspicion of all such undertakings. A general panic set in, the Company's own shares dropped to £175 — still an excellent investment for the original purchasers, but sheer ruin for those who had come in when the stock stood at £1000. Investors in the other companies lost everything. To the general panic succeeded general clamour against the government, which had given an altogether fictitious value to the Company's shares. Stanhope and Sunderland had to resign, and their fall and his own skilful management in restoring credit — largely, however, by confiscating the Company's property and dividing it among the shareholders brought Robert Walpole to the head of the administration (in 1721).

As a man of business when men of business were few in the House of Commons, he was eminently fit to manage the affairs of the country. But he owed his long continuance in office especially to his sagacity. He clearly saw, that Stanhope had failed to see, that the mass of the

²¹ The *Asiento* was the permission given by the Spanish government to other countries to sell slaves to the Spanish colonies, between the years 1543 and 1834.

nation was not fitted as yet to interest itself wisely in affairs of government, and therefore the rule must be kept in the hands of the upper classes. But he was too sensible to adopt the coarse expedient which had commended itself to Stanhope, and he preferred humouring the masses to contradicting them. The struggle of the preceding country had left its mark in every direction on the national development.

Out of the reaction against Puritanism had come a widely spread relaxation of morals, and also, as far as the educated class was concerned, an eagerness for the discussion of all social and religious problems. The fierce excitement of the political life had quickened thought, and the most anciently received doctrines began to mean less and less until they were brought to the test of reason. It was a time when a pen was more powerful than the sword, when a Secretary of State would treat with condescension a witty pamphleteer, and when such a pamphleteer might hope, not in vain, to become a Secretary of State.

It was in this world of reason and literature that the Whigs of the Peerage Bill moved. With a great cynical insight Walpole discovered that a great government cannot rest on a clique, however distinguished. If the mass of the nation was not conscious of political wants, it could understand the material want. The merchant needed protection for his trade; the voters gladly welcomed election days as bringing guineas to their pockets. By and by the idea would dawn on the nation that anarchy is as productive of evil as tyranny, and that a government which is not able to regulate or control allows the strong to oppress the weak, and the rich to oppress the poor.

English policy had by that time practically killed Irish manufactures and trade on the one hand, while on the other the landlords who did not live on their lands made the country poor of money and the English government refused to export coin to Ireland.

In 1722, however, William Wood of Wolverhampton was granted of a patent for fourteen years to coin copper halfpence and farthings for Ireland to the value of £100,800. Wood really bought the patent for £ 10,000 from the Duchess of Kendal, one of the king's favourites, and therefore had to get his profit by making the coins of less weight than it was necessary. The Irish government protested; but little was done till Dean Swift roused the whole nation, irrespective of party or religion, by letters which he signed M.B. Drapier. In these the draper ridiculed Wood's halfpence so unmercifully that the government had to withdraw the patent.

The growing force of journalism in politics is further illustrated by the career of the British statesman Henry Bolingbroke (1678-1751). He became a member of the House of Commons in 1701, joining the Tories in opposition to the War of the Spanish Succession, and gained immediate distinction by his eloquence. He began to intrigue for the succession of James Edward Stuart, the Old Pretender, but his plans were forestalled by the sudden death of Queen Anne. When George I ascended the throne, Bolingbroke fled to France. He was impeached by Parliament in 1715 and his name removed from the roll of peers. While in France, he acted as secretary of state to the Old Pretender. In 1723 he had been allowed to return to England, but although his estates were restored to him, he was still excluded from Parliament. He thus had to fall back upon pamphleting or journalism if he wished to influence politics at all. He attacked in his pamphlets Walpole every week and did his best to organise opposition to the government.

George I died on a visit to Hannover in 1727, and as George II had long been a variance with his father, it seemed probable that the ministry, and Walpole with them, would be dismissed.

Comprehension questions

1. What was essentially the Septennian Act? What ultimate effect did it have?
2. In what context is the "Hanoverian connection" mentioned disapprovingly? What were the outlooks of the Whigs (financial / commercial / landed oligarchy, liberals) and the Tories (peers (lords), old nobility, royalists, conservatives) on the policy of Britain? Which are called "wiser" and why? Why was the Peerage Act not popular?
3. What circumstances brought England into conflict with Spain, Holland and France?

4. The South Sea Company and the crisis.
5. What did Robert Walpole clearly see that Stanhope had failed to see?
6. What was Puritanism of the previous age replaced by?
7. Explain the phrase: "The merchant needed protection for his trade; the voters gladly welcomed election days as bringing guineas to their pockets. By and by the idea would dawn on the nation that anarchy is as productive of evil as tyranny, and that a government which is not able to regulate or control allows the strong to oppress the weak, and the rich to oppress the poor." This phrase appears to criticize liberalism of the Whigs. What is the demarcation line between liberalism and anarchy? In what way does it remind us of the "neoliberal" doctrine tried out in Russia in the 1990s?
8. What did Jonathan Swift (Dean Swift) criticize in his letters? Did he achieve his goal?
9. Henry Bolingbroke (1678-1751).

Names and expressions

- held many of the seats** — занимали много мест
- Townshend and Walpole left the Whig ministry rather than support George in a war with Sweden** — Таунсенд и Уолпол предпочли уйти из министерства, чем поддержать Георга в борьбе со Швецией
- once out of office** — оказавшись вне службы; не занимая официального места в правительстве
- the Art of Occasional Conformity** — Акт о частичном подчинении (имеется и виду частичное согласие с католическими догматами)
- to take a Sacrament** — давать торжественную клятву, присягу
- a Peerage Bill** — Билль о производстве в пэры
- in office** — занимать место по службе
- as a matter of fact** — фактически; на самом деле
- hard to defend** — которое трудно защищать
- Cape Passaro ['keɪp 'pɑːsɑːro]** — Мыс Пассаро (оконечность Сицилии)
- £100** = 100 pounds
- a clique, however distinguished** — клика, однако, какой бы значительной она не была
- political wants — политические нужды
- Wolverhampton** — находится в Страдфоршире, Англия
- to coin** — чеканить монеты
- farthing** — фартинг, т. е. 1/4 пенса
- Dean Swift** — Декан — официальная, церковная должность Джонатана Свифта
- draper ['dreɪpə]** — суконщик

8. THE EAST INDIA COMPANY (1600–1874)

Governance of India

The lucrative trade with the East had attracted the Europeans for a long time. The colonial era in India began in 1502, when the Portuguese Empire established the first European trading colony there. It was later called Goa, following Dom Afonso de Albuquerque's conquest of the city of Goa, which had been controlled by Muslims, in 1510. The Portuguese evangelised Indians and promoted Catholicism among them. In this, Jesuits played a fundamental role, and to this day the Jesuit missionary Saint Francis Xavier is revered among the Catholics of India. Portuguese soldiers and sailors used to marry local Indian girls.

At the end of the 16th century, the United Netherlands and England challenged Portugal's monopoly of trade with Asia, forming private joint-stock companies to finance the voyages. The

English (later British) East India Company, and the Dutch East India Company were chartered in 1600 and 1602 respectively. Making their inroads into the ancient Eastern lands, the Dutch and the British edged out their competitors, Portuguese, by economic and non-economic methods. Soon they captured the leading positions in maritime trade between Europe and Asia. In 1613, the Muslim Emperor of India granted the British East India Company the right to establish trading stations in the Bengal region of northeast India. By making treaties with local Indian princes and warlords, the East India Company rapidly controlled more and more Indian territory. The British and the Dutch East India Companies merged in 1708, when the power of the Netherlands declined.

Since the death of the Muslim Emperor Aurungzeb (1618-1707), the power of the Great Mogul had gradually fallen into the hands of provincial viceroys who frequently rivalled with each other. France and Britain took advantage of that situation to conquer India, and Britain succeeded, gaining the coveted prize. British historians claim that “to the dash of the soldier” she “added the skill of the administrator”, but bribery, instigation of feudal strife and installing loyal native personalities also played their role in this victory. As for the governance of India, Britain, if anything, exercised it with an iron fist.

The English began to govern most of India after the Battle of Plassey (1757, see the paragraph *The Indian Theatre of the Seven Years' War* in this book), when they won a decisive victory over the Nawab of Bengal and his French allies. At first, the East India Company directly ruled British-controlled areas of India. In 1784, however, the British Parliament put the company under its authority, but the day-to-day administration of law in British India remained in the hands of the company. So, it governed large areas of India, exercising military power and assuming administrative functions. By 1840, Britain ruled most of India. By 1849, it had subdued all of India, allowing some Indian kings to govern in their areas. The East India Company governed in India for 190 years (1668-1858). Following the events of the Sepoy Mutiny (Indian Uprising) of 1857, the British Crown assumed direct administration of India as a British Raj (1858-1947). The Company was dissolved on 1 January 1874. Britain only withdrew from India in the mid-20th century.

The East India Company had long held a privileged position in relation to the English, and later the British, government. As a result, it was granted special rights and privileges, including trade monopolies and exemptions. In many ways, the East India Company may be called the predecessor of modern multinational corporations, with its combining economic and political forms of activity, centralized distribution system, standardization of products.²²

The Company employed several ways to enrich themselves and the metropolis. First, it appropriated the values of the Bengali treasury and the entire fiscal apparatus of Bengal. Secondly, it sharply increased taxes, for example, it twice increased the land tax. Thirdly, local merchants were forbidden to engage in foreign trade due to the policy of protectionism. Fourthly, the British introduced internal customs. Fifthly, they monopolized the most important internal trades, introducing very low prices to purchase products of local producers for resale. Hundreds of thousands of Bengali artisans were forcibly attached to the factories of the Company, which took their products at low prices, or even no pay at all.

In 1762, Robert Clive and other top officials of the Company formed a society for the monopoly of trade of salt, betel-nut and tobacco in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. Zamindars (aristocrats, typically hereditary, who held tracts of land and controlled peasants, from whom they collected taxes) and producers were obliged to hand over the goods to this society at forced low prices. This led to the ruin of Indian landowners as well as peasants and artisans.

As a witness testified: "A commercial resident (Factory Head) assigns them all (artisans,

²²Фурсов К.А. Европейские Ост-Индские Компании: двигатель и тормоз капитализма // X Международная конференция по проблемам развития экономики и общества, 2009. Сс. 165-172.

weavers) some work and for a small advance appropriates their work, depriving them of the right to use their skills for their own benefit." "Markets, quays, wholesale markets and granaries are completely destroyed. As a result of violence, these merchants and their men, artisans and raiata (peasants) and others fled," reads a message of the Birbhum district governor Nawab who preserved nominal power.²³

The low purchasing prices and unreasonable taxation caused degradation of agriculture. After passing under the colonial rule of Britain, India repeatedly faced mass famines, sweeping over vast territories. So, the famine years of 1769-1773 killed about 10 million Bengalis — one-third of Bengal's population at the time.²⁴

Now let's turn to the textile industry, owing to which India for hundreds of years had been renowned as the workshop of the world, combining great skill with phenomenally low labour costs in textile production.²⁵ Within half a century of the British rule (since the 17th c.) the Indian textile industry fell into decline. Some British historians claim, that Indian textile workers were poor detached individuals, and a typical Indian weaver's workshop was a hut with a loom "so inconveniently large that it cannot be contained within the hut of the manufacturer, who is therefore compelled to ply his trade in the open air, where it is interrupted by every vicissitude of the weather".²⁶ But in fact, the Indian textile manufacturing technology was rather developed for its time. For example, at the end of the 18th century a weaver's family near Dhaka used up to 120 different specialized tools.²⁷ Technically, Indian weaving was at least in three positions ahead of European: in large-figured weaving, dyeing and printed cloth.²⁸ The Indian loom, invented independently of the European one, was no worse, but at the same time much simpler in design.²⁹ The standard of living of Indian textile workers was even higher than that of the British ones, who could hardly feed themselves, and, even less so, their spouses, relatives and children.³⁰ In Bengal, while the overall cost of living of an adult was 1 rupee a month, a spinner earned from 3- 5.5 rupees (up to 8 rupees) a month^{31,32}, a weaver - 5-6 rupees a month.³³ The earnings of tissue bleacher generally ranged from 7.5 to 9 rupees a month.³⁴ The price of a loom in Bengal in the early 19th century was only 5 rupees.³⁵ That is, the machines were readily available for an ordinary weaver, and he did not have to get into debt in order to acquire the means of production.

The colonial mechanism that caused the decline of weaving, alongside many other traditional Indian crafts was that, having acquired the local know-how and turning to machine mass production, the British banned the Indian goods on local Indian markets and in Europe and began to export their own goods in India. The British government talked of the "laissez-faire policy", of

²³ World history. The period of the British conquest. Moscow-Minsk, 2000.

²⁴ Other notable famines include the Great Famine of 1876–78, in which up to 10.3 million people died, and the Indian famine of 1899–1900, in which up to 10 million people died. In the 20th c., the Bengal Famine of 1943–44 killed up to 3 million Bengalis. Overall estimates of deaths by starvation come up to more than 40 million Indians.

²⁵ Gopal, Priyamvada. The story peddled by imperial apologists is a poisonous fairytale. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2006/jun/28/comment.britishidentity>

²⁶ Murray, Hugh et al. Historical and Descriptive Account of British India. New York, 1836. V. II. P. 327.

²⁷ Bhattaharaya, S. The East India Company and the Economy of Bengal from 1704–1740. L., 1954. P. 184; Taylor, J.A. A Sketch of the Topography and Statistics of Dacca. Calcutta, 1840. P. 174.

²⁸ Vestnik MGU (Moscow State University Courier). Series 13. Oriental Studies. 1984. № 1. P. 20.

²⁹ Ward, W. A View of the History, Literature and Religion of the Hindoos. L., 1817. V. I. P. 93.

³⁰ P. A. Brown, French Revolution in English History, 1918, p. 62— 63, quoted in Morton, Arthur Leslie. A People's History of England. Russian Edition. P. 39.

³¹ Bhattaharaya, S. Ibid. P. 184; Taylor, J.A. Ibid. P. 72.

³² Ward, W. Ibid. V. I. P. 93; v. II. P. 126.

³³ Sinha, N.K. The Economic History of Bengal: from Plassey to the Permanent Settlement. Calcutta, 1956. V. I. P. 173–175.

³⁴ Bhattaharaya. Ibid. P. 358.

³⁵ Bhattaharaya. Ibid. P. 184; Taylor J.A. Ibid. P. 78.

“allowing matters to take their own course”, of not interfering with private initiative. But it did interfere with Indian trade in England, pursuing the policy of protectionism for the British producers and ruining Indian producers with severe duties and prohibitions.

The British government held back the economic development of India, even though it was detrimental to the interests of the British industrialists who owned businesses in India. It discouraged Indian industries, especially the growing cotton industry of Bombay and Ahmedabad. An excise duty was imposed on the products of Indians, particularly, on cotton goods, the object of which was to help British cotton goods from Lancashire to compete with Indian textiles. As Jawaharlal Nehru wrote: “Almost every country puts duties on some foreign goods, either to protect its own industries or to raise money. But the British in India did a very unusual and remarkable thing. They put the duty on Indian goods themselves!”³⁶

For almost a century (since circa 1760), Britain had conducted this policy of harsh taxation, protectionism and direct appropriation of goods. As calculated by the British themselves, the East India Company took out of India and imported to the metropolis 12 million pounds worth of free goods.³⁷ After the conquest of India's independence, Indian economists re-examined this question and found that gratuitous export of goods and coins in 1757-1780 reached 38 million pounds.³⁸ There are also estimations with much bigger figures: William Digby, a British author and journalist, estimated the riches exported from India at 500 million to 1 billion pounds, and according to the American historian B. Adams, during the first 15 years of the British colonization, only jewellery exported from Indian Bengal was worth about 1 billion pounds.^{39, 40}

The Company officials in India made fabulous fortunes, living in huge houses attended by scores of Indian servants. The historian P. J. Marshall estimated some “East Indian Fortunes” in pounds: Robert Clive's net worth in 1767 was 401,102, John Johnston had 300,000, Richard Smith amassed in 1764-1770 a fortune of 250,000 pounds. While the average salary in the Company was between 1,000 and 5,000 a year, Marshall estimates a total of 18,000,000 pounds worth of “private fortunes” amassed by its officers in the period of 1757-1784. Those fortunes were made through the extraction of money and goods from the Indian population, in addition to the official East India Company taxes and duties imposed on Indians. Thus it may well be concluded that the growth of British wealth was at the cost of the massive impoverishment of India.

Opium trade in China

Before the end of the 18th century, i.e. before the first results of the industrial revolution, Europe had little to offer Asia. At the same time, over the 17th century, there was a growing demand in Europe and America for Chinese goods. Tea had become fashionable in Europe and there was a great demand for Chinese silk and porcelain; other products in demand included grain, spices, fabrics, cotton, wool, silk, indigo dye, saltpetre. However, China had little interest in trading for what it considered inferior foreign goods, it only agreed to accept silver for its products. From the mid-17th century around 28 million kilograms of silver was received by China in exchange for Chinese goods. The East India Company had to pay for the Chinese goods in silver and tariffs were very high. Britain's problem was further complicated by the fact that it had been using the gold standard from the mid-18th c. and therefore had to purchase silver from other European countries, incurring an additional transaction cost.

³⁶Nehru, Jawaharlal. *Glimpses of World History*, vii. New Delhi: Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund, Teen Murti House, 2003. P. 432.

³⁷ *Great Soviet Encyclopaedia*. V. 18. Moscow, 1953. P. 60.

³⁸ Antonova K.A., Bongard-Levin G.M., Kotovsky G.G. *History of India*. M., 1973, p 258.

³⁹ "Prosperous" British India, a Revelation from Official Records, first published in 1901.

⁴⁰ Adams B. *The Laws of Civilizations and Decay. An Essay on History*. N.Y., p. 305. 1898.

The great trade deficit with China and the gradual depletion of the British reserves of silver caused panic in the British ruling circles and the desire to maintain their silver reserves. Eager to find a product that would provide revenue through export sales to China, the British turned to the opium poppy. Because of its strong appeal and addictive nature, opium was an effective solution to the trade problem. So, in China Britain created a vast market for opium. The East India Company began to grow opium in Indian Bengal and smuggle this opium in China. As many Indians had been brought to ruin by the British governance, there was a great supply of labour available for collecting the sap from the incised poppy pods [Spence 1990: 130]. Later the East India Company gained a monopoly for the purchase of Indian opium and then sold licenses to trade in opium to choose Western merchants who would be specifically involved in the transferring of the narcotic the company sold. After selling their opium in China, the Western merchants deposited the silver they collected in payment with company representatives in Canton for letters of credit. Then the company used the silver to buy tea, porcelain and other Chinese goods for sale in Britain. Thus, a "triangular trade of goods from Britain to India, India to China, and China to Britain was initiated, at each step of which a high return of profit could be made". The East India Company and Western merchants thrived on the Chinese misery. The flow of silver was reversed and now Britain was able to tap China of its riches.

Karl Marx wrote: "We cannot leave without singling one flagrant self-contradiction of the Christianity-canting and civilization-mongering British Government. In its imperial capacity it affects to be a thorough stranger to the contraband opium trade, and even to enter into treaties proscribing it. Yet, in its Indian capacity, it forces the opium cultivation upon Bengal, to the great damage of the productive resources of that country; compels one part of the Indian ryats (peasants) to engage in the poppy culture; entices another part into the same by dint of money advances; keeps the wholesale manufacture of the deleterious drug a close monopoly in its hands; watches by a whole army of official spies its growth, its delivery at appointed places, its inspissation and preparation for the taste of the Chinese consumers, its formation into packages especially adapted to the conveniency of smuggling, and finally its conveyance to Calcutta, where it is put up at auction at the Government sales, and made over by the State officers to the speculators, thence to pass into the hands of the contrabandists who land it in China."

The opium smuggling immensely undermined China's economy and human resources, it reduced its population severely. In 1820, the number of chests of opium smuggled into China had increased to 5,147; in 1821 to 7,000, in 1824 to 12,639, in 1834 to 21,785 chests. In 1834 the East India Company lost its privilege of trading and was transformed from a mercantile into a government establishment. The opium smuggle to China became completely thrown open to English private enterprise which pushed on with such vigour that, in 1837, \$25,000,000 worth of opium were smuggled into China, despite the desperate resistance of the Celestial Government.

The Chinese Qing Empire attempted to ban opium imports, but Britain persisted. The conflict resulted in two Opium Wars, waged by the British and allied countries against China (1839 to 1842 and 1856 to 1860) for the possibility to continue the opium trade and thus drain China of its silver stock. China lost those wars and was turned into a weak dependent state with many millions of its population addicted, which it remained until the 20th c. The Chinese population began to fall rapidly. While in 1842 the population of the empire was 416,118,200 people, of whom 2 million were addicts, in 1881 there were 369,183,000 people in China, of whom 120 million were drug addicts.

Montgomery Martin, a British civil servant who served as Colonial Treasurer of Hong Kong from 1844 to 1845, wrote: "Why, the 'slave trade' was merciful compared with the 'opium trade'. We did not destroy the bodies of the Africans, for it was our immediate interest to keep them alive; we did not debase their natures, corrupt their minds, nor destroy their souls. But the opium seller slays the body after he has corrupted, degraded and annihilated the moral being of unhappy

sinner, while, every hour is bringing new victims to a Moloch which knows no satiety, and where the English murderer and Chinese suicide vie with each other in offerings at his shrine." The opium trade progresses steadily. The increased consumption of teas and silk in Great Britain and the United States resulted in the increase of the opium trade.

In 1865, the East India Company supported the China Inland Mission, a society of Christian missionaries, who turned a blind eye on or even welcomed the proliferation of opium use among the Chinese. Therefore, in Chinese eyes the Western patronage, including Christian missions, became associated with opium, millions of dead, imperialism, and the special privileges granted foreigners under unequal treaties. A Chinese nobleman said of the European and American presence in China: "Take away your missionaries and your opium and you will be welcome."

Comprehension questions

1. Which countries tried to colonize India?
2. Speak about the Dutch and the British East India companies and their merger.
3. How did the Europeans enrich themselves?
4. The Battle of Plassey (1757) and its meaning. The "East India Fortunes".
5. In what way did the British destroy Indian agriculture?
6. What was the level of the development of textile production in India at the time? Compare the life conditions of Indian and British weavers.
7. What was the hypocrisy of laissez faire principal declaration? Did the British in fact use laissez faire or protectionism in India? Prove it.
8. Mass famines in India caused during the British governance.
9. When did India assume the British Raj status?
10. What ploy did the British resort to secure trade with China?

Names and expressions

lucrative - прибыльный

began to challenge the Iberian powers - начали оспаривать владения Пиренейских держав

made their own inroads – стали совершать собственные набеги

edging out its competitors, Portuguese - вытеснив конкурентов, португальцев

the East India Company - Ост-Индская компания

Company officials in India made fabulous fortunes, living in huge houses attended by

scores of Indian servants - представители компании в Индии нажили баснословные состояния, жили в огромных домах, им прислуживали десятки индийских служащих.

exercising military power and assuming administrative functions осуществляющих военную мощь и предполагая, административные функции

compelled to ply his trade in the open air - были вынуждены заниматься своим ремеслом на открытом воздухе

loom - ткацкий станок

the machines were readily available for an ordinary weaver, and he did not have to get

into debt in order to acquire the means of production - машины были легко доступны для обычного ткача, и у него не было нужды влезать в долги, чтобы приобрести средства производства

detrimental - вредный

an excise duty was imposed on the products of Indians - на товары индийцев был наложен акциз

having acquired the local know-how and turning to machine mass production, the British

banned the Indian goods in Europe and on local markets - приобретя местные знания и начав на их основе массовое машинное производство, британцы запретили индийские товары в Европе и на местных рынках

dissolved - упразднена

it only agreed to accept silver for its products - он (Китай) соглашался брать за свою продукцию только серебро

who turned a blind eye on or even welcomed the proliferation of opium use among the Chinese - которые закрывали глаза или даже приветствовали распространение употребления опиума среди китайцев

9. ROBERT WALPOLE'S PEACE POLICY AND RETIREMENT OF WALPOLE. WAR OF THE AUSTRIAN SUCCESSION (1740-48)

Walpole's administration lasted long enough. In 1727, when George I was succeeded by George II (George Augustin, 1683-1760) Walpole remained in power. His eagerness for the possession of that power which he desired to use for his country's good, together with the incapacity of two kings, born and bred in a foreign country, to take a leading part in English affairs, completed the change which had been effected when William first entrusted the conduct of government to a united cabinet, there was now for the first time a Prime Minister in England, a person who was himself a subject imposing harmonious action on the cabinet. It was difficult to realize the full importance of such a change.

In Walpole's time the forms of the English so called constitution had become, in all essential particulars, what they are now, the main constituent documents of which are the Bill of Rights (1689) and the Act of Settlement (1701). In the first few weeks of his reign the new king preferred Spencer Compton; but when the details of the Civil List had to be arranged, Walpole's knowledge of finance proved to be indispensable, especially as he undertook to obtain a far larger sum than Compton. His power over George II, who resembled his father in his loyalty to the constitution, was gained through the Queen, Caroline of Anspach — she with more ability than her husband had the good sense to conceal her superiority, and gained her point by persuading George that her ideas had originated with him.

Walpole's policy was to maintain peace, and he was almost successful in doing it. In Parliament itself, if not outside, he secured for a long time freedom from opposition by a most lavish system of bribery; the chief opponents of his policy were the members of his own party and of his own ministry whom he had estranged, for he could not tolerate the smallest amount of power in the hands of anyone of respectable persons, and quarrelled successively with Townshend, Carteret, and Chesterfields.

Walpole's experience in finance led him to put the taxation of the country upon more scientific grounds. He had already done much to encourage the free import of raw materials for manufacture, and in 1733 he proposed an Excise scheme for tobacco and wine which would largely increase the revenue. Hitherto these articles had paid Customs duties at the port of the entry, and in order to avoid this payment smuggling had become a common and lucrative business; for the inland duty to the government was to be paid by the dealers when they took the goods from warehouses. It may be noted in passing that Walpole hoped by the increase of revenue thus gained to be able to remit the land tax: a comfortable boon to country squires, and a still more comfortable one to the great Whig landowners. But the idea of an Excise was traditionally unpopular, and the opposition had an easy task, aided by the mob and interested tradesmen, to represent it as a universal tax upon all articles of food. Even in his own ministry there was a section, led by Chesterfield, which voted against Walpole's measures. The clause allowing goods to be re-exported without paying duty at all, which, Walpole said, "would have made London a free port and by the consequence the market of the world," did not affect the opposition. In the end the measure was dropped, to the great delight of the nation.

Walpole was not slow to throw his indignation upon those of his followers who had opposed him. Chesterfield was dismissed and several army officers were cashiered. From this time indeed

is to be dated the establishment of the principle that the members of the ministry are responsible to its head, and that the head is responsible to the Crown.

The opposition, forced by the dismissed and discontented Whigs, soon found a useful supporter in Frederick, Prince of Wales. The "Patriots", as they called themselves, had only one sentiment in common, hatred of Walpole; among them there were a number of ambitious young politicians, like William Pitt, and the minister showed his contempt for them: he nicknamed them "the Boys."

The long period of peace had brought great prosperity to England, and this prosperity only made trade obstacle seem the more irritating and intolerable. By the Treaty of Utrecht one English ship a year had been allowed to trade with the Spanish colonies; but in course of time many merchants were engaged in this commerce overseas, and that in spite of the vigorous action of the Spanish coastguards, who insisted on regarding them as smugglers and brutally carried out their rights of search. As early as 1733 the Spanish king had formed "a family compact" with his fellow-Bourbon, Louis XV, King of France, to check England. This fact and the growing complaints of the merchants raised a clamour for war in England, which Walpole found it more and more impossible to resist. The final impulse to the popular agitation was given when a sea-captain named Jenkins returned home and reported that the Spanish coastguards had torn off one of his ears. Walpole had to yield the national wish or to resign; he yielded, and England plunged into the "War of Jenkins' Ears" against Spain (1739). It is chiefly memorable for Anson's voyage around the world, in the course of which he had captured a Spanish galleon laden with treasure and brought home a great booty. Admiral Vernon too captured Porto Bello but failed in an attack on Cartagena. On the whole the war brought little credit to England, and though Walpole returned to power in 1741, his influence was at an end. He retired in 1742 and was created Earl of Oxford.

War of the Austrian succession

The previous wars – the War of William of Orange, Queen Anne's War (1703-1713), and even King George II's War (1744-1748) did not help Britain to achieve a decisive advantage over France. Then the British took a different approach, they "enlisted" Prussia to unleash a military conflict in Europe. The British plan for the Prussian army was simple: to hold down the main forces of the French army in Europe and permit the British to wrestle away the colonies from France. To solve this problem, Frederick II of Prussia was given cash and 20,000 British soldiers to fight the French. We have discussed the ensuing war above - it went down in history as the War of the Austrian Succession (1740–48). It involved most of the powers of Europe over the question of Maria Theresa's succession to the realms of the House of Habsburg. The military actions included several war theatres: the King George's War in North America, the War of Jenkins' Ear (which formally began on 23 October 1739), the First Carnatic War in India, the First and Second Silesian Wars.

The context of this war was as follows. The Austrian Emperor Charles VI had only one child, Maria Theresa. He was eager to secure for her all his possessions in Austria, and he tried to persuade of law arranging of her succession all the governments in Europe. But no sooner was he dead than Frederic II of Prussia seized Silesia.⁴¹ He had taken the precaution of allying himself with France, so that when England sent help to Maria Theresa, Horace Walpole might have well exclaimed: "We have the name of war with Spain without the thing, and war with France without the name." England very soon really found herself at war with France. George II commanded the English and Hanoverian troops in person, and at the battle of Dettingen (1743) defeated the

⁴¹Later this monarch was called Frederic the Great, despite the fact that he was far from invincible, thus more than once he lost battles to Russia.

French.

Carteret, the foreign minister, who had succeeded in forming a European coalition in defence of Austria, was unable to retain the loyalty of his own colleagues and was replaced by the Duke of Newcastle and his more able brother, Henry Pelham. On their advice the "Broad Bottom" administration was forced, and thus several of the "Patriots" or "Boys" got office.

On the Continent Frederic had again entered into an alliance with France, and Marshal Saxe won a hard battle against the Duke of Cumberland, the younger son of George II, at Fontenoy (1745). But England now persuaded Frederic, by guaranteeing his possession of Silesia, to desert his ally, and he acknowledged Maria Theresa's husband, Francis of Lorraine, as an Emperor.

The war now burst not only in Europe; in North America, in India, and on the sea it marked the beginning of a world struggle for supremacy between England and France. It was the first phase of this struggle which was concluded in 1748 by the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. The right of search⁴², which had been really the origin of the war, was not mentioned — in fact, everything was left exactly as it had been before the fighting began.

Comprehension questions

1. Valuable qualities of Robert Walpole as a Prime Minister.
2. The retirement of Walpole.
3. The War of the Austrian succession. The struggle between which countries did it earmark? What subterfuge did the British resort to in this struggle?

Names and expressions

his country's good — благо своей страны

Civil List — цивильный лист (сумма, выделяемая Парламентом Великобритании на содержание королевского двора и членов королевской семьи).

Anspach, or Ansbach — is a district of Bavaria, Germany.

excise [' eksaiz] — акцизный сбор

Custom duties — таможенный налог

in passing — мимоходом, между прочим

was not slow — не медлил

Chesterfield ['tʃestəfi:ld] (**Earl of**)

Philip Dormer Stanhope (1694-1773)

Pitt William (1708-1778)

in course of time — с течением времени

Anson George — English navigator (1697-1762)

Cartagena ['ka:tədʒəna] — Картахена (Испания)

Silesia [sai'li:ziə]

Walpole, Horace [' vælpel' horəs] (1717-1797) — son of Robert, a famous English writer.

the name of war with Spain without the thing — война с Испанией только по названию, а не на деле

Dettingen ['detiŋən]

Carteret, John ['ka:tərət] (1690-1763) — английский политический деятель

Newcastle ['nju: ,ka:sl]

to get office — занять официальные места

Pelham, Henry ['peləm] (1652-1754), **Prime Minister (1743-1754)**

de Saxe, Hermann Maurice [sa:ks] — marshal of France (1696-1750)

Fontenoy [fontən'wa] — a province in Belgium (later in France)

⁴² The right possessed by the warships of a belligerent state in time of war to board and search merchant vessels to ascertain whether ship or cargo is liable to seizure.

Lorraine [lə'rein]

Aix-la-Chapelle [eks'læ ʃæ'pəl] — French name of Aachen (Prussia).

10. THE SECOND JACOBITE RISING: THE REBELLION OF 1745



A few weeks after the Battle of Fontenoy, Charles Edward, eldest son of the Old Pretender, landed in the west of Scotland with seven followers.

Charles Edward Louis Philip Casimir Stuart (1720-1788), English Prince, called the "Young Pretender" and the "Young Chevalier," was born in Rome on December 31, 1720. At his birth he was created Prince of Wales by his father (as James III), and he bore this title among the English Jacobites during his father's lifetime. The young prince was educated at his father's miniature court in Rome. He quickly began to speak English, French and Italian languages. In 1734 his cousin, the Duke of Liria, afterwards duke of Berwick, who was going to join Don Carlos in his straggle for the crown of Naples, passed through Rome. He offered to take Charles on his expedition,

and the boy of thirteen, appointed general of artillery by Don Carlos, shared with credit the dangers of the successful siege of Gaeta.

The handsome and accomplished youth, whose doings were eagerly reported by the English ambassador at Florence and by the spy, John Walton, at Rome, was now introduced by his father and the Pope to the highest Italian society, which he fascinated by the frankness of his manner and his grace and dignity of his bearing. In 1737 James dispatched his son on a tour through the chief Italian cities, so that his education as a Prince and man of the world might be completed. The distinction with which Charles Edward was received on his journey, the royal honours paid to him in Venice, and the jealous interference of the English ambassador in regard of his reception by the great Duke of Tuscany, show how great was the respect in which the exiled house was held at this period by foreign Catholic powers, as well as the watchful policy of England in regard to its fortunes. The Old Pretender himself calculated upon foreign aid in his attempts to restore the monarchy of the Stuarts; and the idea of rebellion was one which was left for Charles Edward to realize. Of all the European nations France was the one on which Jacobite hopes mainly rested. It was decided that the invasion to England must be timed simultaneously with a Scottish rebellion.

Charles was secretly dispatched to Paris in January 1744. A squadron under admiral Roquefeuil sailed from the coast of France. Transports containing 7000 troops, to be led by Marshal Saxe, accompanied by the young prince, were in readiness to set sail for England. A severe storm effected, however, a complete disaster without any actual engagement taking place.

The loss in ships of the line, in transports, and in lives was a crushing blow to the hopes of Charles, who remained in France for over a year in a retirement which he keenly felt. At Paris he had seen many supporters of the Stuart cause; he was aware that in every European court the Jacobites were represented in earnest intrigue; and he had now taken a considerable share in correspondence and other actual work connected with the promotion of his own and his father's interest. On the 13th of July 1745 Charles Edward sailed from Nantes for Scotland on board the small brig "La Doutelle", which was accompanied by a French man-of-war, the "Elizabeth", laden with arms and ammunition. The latter fell in with an English man-of-war, the "Lion", and had to return to France; Charles escaped during the engagement, and at length arrived on the 2nd of August at Frisch, a little island of the Hebrides. Receiving, however, but a cool reception, he

set sail again and arrived at the bay on the west coast of Inverness-shire.

The Macdonald of Clanranald and Kinloch Moldart, along with other chieftains, again attempted to dissuade him from the rashness of an unaided rising, but they yielded at last to the enthusiasm and charm of his manner. Charles landed on Scottish land with his seven followers who had come with him from France. Everywhere, however, he met with discouragement among the chiefs, whose aid he wanted to have; but at last, by getting support of Cameron of Lochiel, he gained a ground for a serious rebellion.

Walter Scott described these events in his first historical novel "Waverley, or 'tis sixty years since", and he gave a portrait of that gallant and chivalrous young man, who managed to gain the sympathy of all around him:

"A young man, wearing his own fair hair, distinguished by the dignity of his face, and the noble expression of his well-formed and regular features, advanced out of a circle of military gentlemen and Highland Chiefs, by whom he was surrounded. In his easy and graceful manners Waverley afterwards thought he could have discovered his high birth and rank, although the star on his breast, and the embroidered garter at his knee, had not appeared as its indication.".... "Waverley", London, "The Handy Volume", (Ch. XI, p. 299).

On the 19th of August 1745, in the valley of Glenfinnan, the standard of James III (and VIII of Scotland) was raised in the midst of a motley but increasing crowd. On the same day John Cope, as we have already read in the extract from Walter Scott, at the head of 1,500 men left Edinburgh in search of Charles; but, fearing an attack, he changed his route to Inverness, and Charles thus had the undefended south country before him. At the beginning of September, he entered Perth, and his forces became much more numerous during his march. Soon he arrived within a few miles of the astonished metropolis, and on the 16th of September his forces defeated the dragoons of Colonel Gardiner. On the following morning a few of Cameron's Highlanders forced their way through the Cannon-gate. On the 18th Charles publicly proclaimed James VIII of Scotland at the Market Cross and occupied Holyrood.

Cope had by this time brought his disappointed forces by sea to Dunbar. On the 20th Charles met and defeated him at Prestonpans and returned to prosecute the siege of Edinburgh Castle. He threatened to lay the city in ruins; however, at the beginning of November he left Edinburgh never to return. He was at the head of at least 6,000 men; but the ranks gradually thinned by the desertion of Highlanders, whose traditions had led them to consider war merely as a raid and an immediate return with plunder. The Prince had so far received no help from the Jacobites of England, and as the expected aid had not arrived from France, his council opposed the idea of marching south. However, the Prince went on, although the government had three armies in the field — one on Northumberland, another in the Midlands, and a third near London. Carlisle yielded in a week without opposition. Manchester received the Prince with a warm welcome and with 150 recruits. On the 4th of December he had reached Derby and was within a few days march from London.

This was the turning-point of the adventure. London heard of the invasion with dismay, the inhabitants were terror-struck, and a commercial panic immediately began. Two armies under English leadership were now in the field against Charles Edward. London was not at all helpless in such an emergency. Manchester, Glasgow and Dumfries, rid of his presence, had risen against him, and in the absence of any supporting them English forces the prince's council refused to advance farther with their small army of four or five thousand men. On his retreat Charles found that the council was right; the towns where he had been received enthusiastically on his march south now refused to support him. On the 6th of December Charles reluctantly began his retreat northward.

On the day after Christmas he entered Glasgow, and immediately marched to Stirling. He raised the siege of Stirling, and after a weary though successful march rested his troops at Inverness.

By this time the Duke of Cumberland had been appointed commander-in-chief of the royal forces and reached Aberdeen by the end of February. Ten days previously Charles had occupied Inverness. During the whole of March Cumberland waited in Aberdeen for reinforcements. On the 8th of April the Duke marched thence against Inverness; the two armies, not unequal in numbers, met on the 16th on Culloden Moor, where the Jacobites were completely defeated. The victors showed no mercy, and the rebellion was cruelly stamped out.

It took Cumberland only twenty-five minutes to destroy the Highland Army on Culloden Moor. In the circumstances he could hardly have failed. On the day before the battle the Highlanders had eaten only one biscuit each. On the night before the battle they had taken part in a totally disorganized night march. They were, in short, in no condition to do battle. Cumberland, who was called the "Butcher" after that, showed no mercy. The wounded were left to die, the captured were burned alive and mutilated, and the dead were left to rot. After the battle Cumberland destroyed villages and towns, he felt were sympathetic to Jacobism. After many years, in 1881, memorial stones bearing the names of the clans engaged in the conflict were erected at the head of each trench where the clansmen — about 1,000 in number — were buried. A monumental cairn, twenty feet high, marks the chief scene of the fight, and the Cumberland Stone, a huge boulder, indicates the spot where the English commander took up his position. There is an inscription on the Memorial Stone:

"THE BATTLE OF CULLODEN
WAS FOUGHT ON THIS MOOR
16th APRIL 1746
THE GRAVES OF THE
GALLANT HIGHLANDERS WHO FOUGHT FOR
SCOTLAND AND PRINCE CHARLIE ARE MARKED BY THE NAMES
OF THEIR CLANS."

This decisive and cruel defeat sealed the fate of Charles Edward and the house of Stuart. Accompanied by a few faithful followers, Charles at last gained the wild western coast. His life was in great danger, and he wandered on foot or cruised restlessly in open boats among the many barren isles of the Scottish shore, bearing the greatest hardships with marvellous courage and cheerfulness. A year before a reward was set upon his head — £300000, and he lived thus for over five years pursued by the troops and spies of the governments.

Disguised in female dress, he passed through Skye. Towards the end of July, he took refuge in the cave in the hills of Glenmoriston, and at last the news was brought to him that two French ships were in waiting for him at the place of his first arrival to Scotland. He embarked with all possible speed and sailed for France, reaching the little port of Roscoff on the 29th of September 1746. He was warmly welcomed by Louis XV, and since then he was again vigorously intriguing in Paris, and even in Madrid. His efforts proved useless, but he became at once the popular hero and idol of the people of Paris.

Then the British government made peace with France, and it was now impossible to harbour the young prince. Charles was indignant and refused to leave France, and at last he was forced to do it: the French government imprisoned him for a week, and on the 17th of December he was conducted to the French border. Even Pope Benedict XIV advised him not to resist any more. Charles quietly disappeared; for years Europe did not hear of him. But it is now established, almost with certainty that he returned in the neighbourhood of Paris and it is supposed that his residence was known to the French ministers, who, however, firmly proclaimed their ignorance. In 1750, and again, it is thought, Charles was in London, making little plots and risking his safety for his hopeless cause, and even became a Roman Catholic to further his political interests.

In 1785 Charles returned to Rome, where he died in the old Palazzo Muti on the 30th of January 1788.

When he had escaped to France, some of his followers were executed, some were hanged, and others transported. In the Highlands the old clan system was broken up, and a warlike population was gradually introduced to the arts of industry and peace.

Bonnie Prince Charlie is commemorated in a Scottish folk song about his escape over the sea to Skye, after his defeat at Culloden in 1746. The author of this song, often used as a lullaby, is unknown.

The Skye Boat Song

(Chorus)

Speed bonnie boat like a bird on the wing
Onward the sailors cry
Carry the lad that's born to be king
Over the sea to Skye

Loud the wind howls, loud the waves roar,
Thunderclaps rend the air
Baffled our foes, stand by the shore
Follow they will not dare
Chorus

Many's the lad fought on that day
Well the claymore did wield
When the night came, silently lain
Dead on Culloden field
Chorus

Though the waves heave, soft will ye sleep
Ocean's a royal bed
Rocked in the deep, Flora will keep
Watch by your weary head
Chorus

Burned are our homes, exile and death
Scatter the loyal men
Yet ere the sword cool in the sheath
Charlie will come again.
Chorus

Comprehension questions

1. Speak about Charles Edward Louis Philip Casimir Stuart. How did he reveal himself in battle? What education did he receive?
2. How was the exiled house of Stuarts held by foreign Catholic powers? How was it regarded in Britain?
3. Describe the first attempt of a rebellion in Scotland.
4. Charles' arrival in Ivernesshire in 1775.

5. Charles' occupation of Hollyrood. Which other towns yielded to the Prince? Charles's retreat to Inverness.
6. The Battle of Culloden (1776).
7. The outcome of the rebellion.

Names and expressions

Gaeta — Гаэта, залив у берегов Италии
and the idea of rebellion was one which was left for Charles Edward to realize...
 реализация восстания легла на плечи Чарльза Эдварда.
of all the European nations France was the one — из всех европейских наций Франция была самой подходящей
Roquefeuil [ro'keifo:l] — Рокфёй (Ракуэфейль)
Doutelle — Дутелль
Erich — озеро в Инвернессшире (Шотландия).
Hebrides ['hebridi:z] — Гебриды, Гебридские острова
Canieron of Lochiel [lo'kel] — Локел
to embrace a cause which has little to recommend it but its justice — стать сторонником дела, которое очень мало что может рекомендовать, разве что его справедливость
who throws himself — который полагается
kept many Scottish men of rank from his standard — заставляло многих знатных шотландцев держаться подальше от его знамени
his courage failed him — храбрость изменила ему
Aberdeen [ˌæbə'di:n] — Абердин (Эбердин), город в Шотландии
my good friend Lochiel saved them the trouble — мой добрый друг Локел избавил их от этого затруднения
want of artillery — нужда в артиллерии; нехватка артиллерии
the whole body — вся масса, все войско
mode of attack — способ атаки (нападения)
in a word — словом
Perth [pɜ:θ] — Перт, крупный город в Шотландии
the Cannongate ['kænən'geit] — Пушечные Ворота, в Эдинбурге
Market Cross — Крест на рыночной площади в Эдинбурге; там делались герольдами важные сообщения
Prestonpans ['prest(ə)n'pæns]
so far — до сих пор
Carlisle [ka:'laɪl] — город в Камберленде
Derby ['da:bi] — Дербь
Dumfries [dʌm'fri:s] — Дамфрис, город в Шотландии
Culloden Moor ['kʌlədɪn] — Куллоден, или Каллоден
biscuit ['bɪskɪt] (здесь) — сухарь
Skye [skai] — Скай, остров на внутренних Гебридах

11. METHODISTS. WILLIAM PITT THE ELDER. THE STAMP ACT (1765)

The Methodists

Henry Pelham's administration was useful; of its social reforms, many of which were important and lasting, the most famous is the adoption of the New Style, whereby the Gregorian

was substituted for the Julian Calendar; the cause was the omission of eleven days after September 2nd, 1752; but this was not accomplished without raising an outcry that honest men had been defrauded of so much precious time. Poet Robert Burns, by the way, who was born in January 1749, was very ironical about the real date of his birth, and he wrote in his celebrated poem:

"There was a lad was born in Kyle,
But what' na day o' what' na style,
I doubt it's hardly worth the while
To be sae nice wi' Robin."

Here we can also recall the social and religious work of John Wesley, who shortly after taking his degree and being ordained, became about 1730 the leader of a small body of Oxford men nicknamed "Methodists" from their pious and regular conduct. In 1735, with his brother Charles and some other friends, Wesley went on a mission to Georgia, but returned in less than two years and began field-preaching at Bristol in imitation of George Whitefield⁴³. In 1738 he began to organize a special evangelical body of preachers, their aim was to help to regular church services, and not to take their place. From the very first he instituted class-meetings, and in those the singing of hymns. Wesley was constantly travelling throughout the country on missionary work, and he is said to have preached 40,000 sermons and to have travelled 150,000 miles. Before his death, in 1791, he had succeeded to create a religious awakening in England and to set up an independent body (1784) which had stimulated the Church itself into renewed activity.

The doctrines which Wesley emphasised in his sermons and writings are prevenient grace, present personal salvation by faith, the witness of the Spirit, and sanctification. Prevenient grace was the theological underpinning of his belief that all persons were capable of being saved by faith in Christ. As we remember, Wesley's spiritual teacher, John Calvin believed in predestination, that is, that some persons had been elected by God for salvation and others for damnation. He wrote: "All are not created on equal terms, but some are preordained to eternal life, others to eternal damnation. Accordingly, as each has been created for one or other of these ends, we say that each person has been predestined to life or to death." Wesley did not insist on predestination, but he thought that salvation was only possible by the sovereign grace of God. He understood humanity's relationship to God as utter dependence upon God's grace. God was at work to enable all people to be capable of coming to faith by empowering humans to have actual freedom of response to God.



William Pitt the Elder

Pitt, William, first Earl of Chatham (1708-1778) was the prime minister of Britain in 1766-1768 and led it to victory over France in the Seven Years' War.

In 1754 Henry Pelham died. His brother, the Duke of Newcastle, the nominal head of the ministry, decided to pass over to Henry Fox and William Pitt, "the ablest members of the Commons." Let us dwell on William Pitt and his role in the events of those days. While Walpole was in power, some of the international conflicts ended in peaceful settlements, but the Whigs' greed was growing and soon the peacefully-

⁴³ An Anglican cleric, who helped spread the Great Awakening in Britain and, especially, in the American colonies. He staunchly preached a strand of Calvinist theology.

inclined wing of those Whigs who thought it was better to make the most of what they had got without risking their truly vast acquisitions in more military adventures, was outnumbered by the blatantly aggressive wing. This was headed by William Pitt the Elder, later Lord Chatham.

William Pitt the Elder had “the rare power of transfusing his own indomitable energy and courage into all who served under him.” “A spirited foreign policy” has always been popular in England, and Pitt was the most popular of English ministers, because he was the most successful exponent of such a policy. It was, as many believe, a symbolic character for his time. Colonial expansion, we might say, was in his blood for his grandfather used to be governor in Indian colonial domains of England, made fabulously rich on colonial plunder. Like Robert Walpole, he was rough and unceremonious, cynically straightforward in his statements. From what one reads of him in works by historians of various trends, including the admiring kind, he must have considered the attempts of imperialist ideologists to mask the plundering nature of British colonialism disguising it as “the white man's civilizing mission”, “the white man's burden” and all that stuff, as so much hypocritical eyewash and said that colonies were a necessity, wanted because they were highly profitable.

Pitt's policy was to buy allies in Europe who would fight France on the continent. In the war of Austrian Succession, it was Austria, in the Seven Years' War it was Prussia while Austria became an enemy siding with France.

While British gold was thus fighting on the continent with the bodies of foreign soldiers exposed to the enemy bullets, British troops, mostly the fleet, would seize those of French island colonial possessions which could be got easily or with little difficulty, French forces being distracted by the continental warfare.

The Seven Years' War happened a few months after this that Pitt was dismissed from office (November 1755). It was declared in May and opened badly for England by the loss of Minorca, which Admiral Byng had ordered to defend. To save himself, Newcastle sacrificed Byng, who was shot. This coupled with the bad news from America, and in result Newcastle and his ministry were resigned. He was succeeded by the Duke of Devonshire, but the real head of the government was William Pitt, and the king forced him to accept.

In 1757 Pitt and Thomas Pelham-Holles, duke of Newcastle, joined to form a ministry that combined Newcastle's long political experience with Pitt's dynamic energy. Pitt attacked the French Empire boldly, giving commands to ambitious young officers. The British conquered Canada, the area between the Appalachian Mountains and the Mississippi River, the French West Indies, and the French trading posts in West Africa. The English East India Company destroyed French power in India. In the meantime, Pitt used British gold to support Frederick II of Prussia, who was able to hold out against France, Austria, and Russia until exhausted France was ready for peace.

The death of George II in 1760 changed the political situation, for his successor, the young George III, distrusted both Newcastle and Pitt and was determined to assert his own personal power. Pitt resigned in 1761 when his advice to attack Spain was rejected by the king and the cabinet. The following year Spain declared war, and the forces that Pitt had assembled captured Florida, Havana, and Manila. Although the Treaty of Paris (1763) made Britain the dominant imperial power, Pitt criticized the treaty severely.⁴⁴ The rest of Pitt's life

44 Anglo-Spanish War (1762–63). By 1761 France appeared to be losing the Seven Years' War against Britain. Furthermore, Spain suffered from attacks by English privateers in Spanish waters, and claimed compensation. Fearing that a British victory over France in the Seven Years' War would upset the balance of colonial power, Charles III of Spain signed the Family Compact with France (both countries were ruled by branches of the Bourbon family) in August 1761. This brought war with Britain in January 1762. Spain agreed with France to attack Portugal which remained neutral, but which was an important economical ally of Britain. France hoped that this

was marked by political frustration and ill health.

The Stamp Act

In 1765 the Parliament of Britain passed the Duties in American Colonies Act, or the Stamp Act, which imposed a direct tax on the colonies of British America and required that many printed materials in the colonies be produced on stamped paper produced in London, carrying an embossed revenue stamp. These printed materials were legal documents, magazines, playing cards, newspapers and many other types of paper used throughout the colonies. The stamp tax had to be paid in valid British currency, not in colonial paper money. The purpose of the tax was to help pay for troops stationed in North America after the British victory in the Seven Years' War. The Americans said there was no military need for the soldiers because there were no foreign enemies and the Americans had always protected themselves against Native Americans, and suggested it was rather a matter of British patronage to surplus British officers and career soldiers who should be paid by London. The Stamp Act was very unpopular among colonists.

A consensus considered it a violation of their rights as Englishmen to be taxed without their consent— consent that only the colonial legislatures could grant. Their slogan was "No taxation without representation." Colonial assemblies sent petitions and protests. The Stamp Act Congress held in New York City, was the first significant joint colonial response to any British measure; it petitioned Parliament and the King. Local protest groups, led by colonial merchants and landowners, established connections through Committees of Correspondence that created a loose coalition that extended from New England to Maryland. Protests and demonstrations initiated by a new secret organization the Sons of Liberty often turned violent and destructive as the masses became involved. Very soon all stamp tax distributors were intimidated into resigning their commissions, and the tax was never effectively collected.

Pitt defended American resistance to the Stamp Act. Indeed, he advocated "smart" imperialism and was opposed the use of force against the Americans on the grounds that it would lead to the collapse of the empire. The following year George III made him earl of Chatham and turned to him to form a nonpartisan government that would end dissensions at home and unrest in the colonies. His second ministry was a failure; it fell apart in 1768, and his influence after that was negligible. In 1778 Pitt collapsed in the House of Lords while delivering a speech opposing American independence. He died at Hayes in Kent on May 11, 1778.

Comprehension questions

1. The New Style reform. Methodists.
2. William Pitt the Elder.
3. The Stamp Act.

Names and expressions

Gregorian Calendar — грегорианский календарь

Julian Calendar — юлианский календарь

what'na day o' what'na style — в никакой день ни по какому стилю

it's hardly worth the while — едва ли этот промежуток стоит...

new front would draw away British forces, now directed against France. On May 9 Spain invaded Portugal, capturing Almeida, and made Britain send a force of 8,000 men to Portugal, but little more was achieved. The British could now attack the Spanish colonies. A British expedition against Cuba took Havana and Western Cuba in August 1762, along with fourteen ships of the line, the bulk of Spain's Caribbean fleet. One and a half months later, the British took Manila, which meant the loss of both the capitals of the Spanish West Indies and the Spanish East Indies, a serious blow and loss in prestige for Spain. An attack by the British East India Company in South America was not successful, when the warship Lord Clive was sunk by Spanish coastal fire. By the Treaty of Paris (1763) Spain handed over Florida and Minorca and had to withdraw from Portugal and Brazil, in exchange for British withdrawal from Cuba. As compensation for their ally's losses, the French ceded Louisiana to Spain by the Treaty of Fontainebleau (1762).

sae = so

wi' = with

Wesley, John ['wezli, 'wes-] (1703-1791) — теолог и евангелист, основатель методизма

to take one's degree — получить степень, т. е., окончить университет

Georgia ['dʒo:dʒiə] — Джорджия

religious awakening — религиозное возрождение

12. THE SEVEN YEARS' WAR (1756–1763)

Rivalry of Britain with France

The Seven Years' War (1756-1763) was driven by the commercial and imperial rivalry between Britain and France, and by the antagonism between Prussia (allied to Britain) and Austria (allied to France). Besides European great powers of the time, the war was attended by the majority of medium and small states of Europe and had theatres in several parts of the world. It took place in Europe, North America, the Caribbean, India, the Philippines.

The colonial interests of Britain and France clashed around the world - literally everywhere the French flag was wavering in the neighbourhood of the English flag. In the West Indies, the English seized the island of Jamaica, and the French - San Domingo, Martinique and Guadeloupe. In North America, the English possessed the east coast of the Atlantic Ocean, while Canada and Louisiana were colonies of France. In India, the British captured Madras, Bombay and Calcutta, and their rivals - the towns of Pondicherry and Chandernagore. In addition, both countries tried to monopolize the lucrative slave trade.

The Seven Years' War, the French Revolution and the events that followed appeared to be the crucial steps for the removal of the main British opponent from the game. The Napoleonic Wars would last until 1815 and completely exhaust France. The pattern of these wars was very similar to the pattern of the Seven Years' War: while the forces of France clinched with her European neighbours and waged endless wars with numerous coalitions of enemies, Britain expanded and strengthened her colonial empire. Britain herself generally fought "pecuniary fights", constantly directing and paying other countries to wage wars against the British rival. During the mutual destruction of Europeans countries, the British captured the Dutch Cape Colony, the French Seychelles and Ile-de-France. By the end of the long struggle against Napoleon, India would be completely under the British rule and become the richest colony of the Empire, "the Jewel in the Crown." The British learnt from Indians important skills, first and foremost, making fabrics. This became the basis of their commercial boom and Industrial Revolution.

The Seven Years' War in Europe

In this military conflict the alliance of Britain, Prussia, Hanover and Portugal fought against the alliance of France, Austria, Sweden, Saxony, Russia, and Spain. Britain pursued the same colonial interests as in the War of the Austrian Succession (1740–48): she ousted France and, to a lesser extent, Spain from their colonies. Britain took advantage of the fact that at the time the rising power of Prussia, ruled by the Prussian Emperor Frederick II, was struggling with Austria for dominance within and outside the Holy Roman Empire in central Europe. Britain lavishly gave money and sent some troops to help its ally, Prussia.

Officially, Britain was not among the belligerent powers, nonetheless her geopolitical strategies, tactics and diplomatic achievements permitted the English historian John Richard Green to write with undisguised delight: "No war has had greater results on the history of the world or brought greater triumphs to England..."

Until the end of 1757, most European powers saw Frederick II as an "upstart" whom they

wished to put in place. To achieve this, they consolidated a huge army of 419,000 soldiers against 200,000 Prussian soldiers plus 50,000 defenders of Hanover hired for English money at Frederick II's disposal. Led by Frederick II, the Prussian army in 1757 won important victories at Rossbach and Leuthen. These victories were however brought to naught by the victory of the Russian-Austrian troops in the battle of Kunersdorf (1759). In 1761, Prussia was on the brink of disaster. The death of the Russian Empress Elizabeth eased the position of Prussia, as the new Russian Emperor Peter III in 1762 broke the alliance with Austria, ceased hostilities against Prussia and entered into an alliance with Frederick II (Later Catherine the Great - Catherine II of Russia - terminated it, but Russia's engagement in the warfare was not resumed). The Seven Years' War ended in the signing of the Paris Peace Treaty in 1763.

This European war was distinguished by sieges and burning down of towns, as well as by open battles involving heavy losses; overall, some 900,000 to 1,400,000 people died.⁴⁵

Theatres of the war on other continents

As was said above, the main British aim was to destroy France as a commercial and colonial rival. While engaging France in the European wars, Britain was focused on attacking the French navy and colonies overseas. In the Seven Years' War, France was heavily committed on the European continent to defend Austria. So, it had few resources to spare for her colonies and could do nothing to aid them. In fact, the British commercial/colonial victory over France became the main outcome of the Seven Years' War and the attendant wars in the colonies. At first, in 1754–1755 the British attacked the disputed French positions in North America and seized hundreds of French merchant ships. Then, the French and Indian War (1755-1763) began in the New World. The English scenario succeeded: while the French fought on the continent, the British fully occupied Canada, New France in North America, Spanish Florida, they strengthened their positions in India. In 1762, the British also gained Martinique, the richest possession of France in the West Indies, then Grenada, Santa Lucia and San Vincent. In the summer of the same year, they "bit off" a piece of the Spanish Empire, taking Havana and Cuba. And since Spain was weakened, they took its richest colony in the Pacific Ocean - the Philippines. Britain also gained the colony of Senegal on the West African coast and the French trading outposts on the Indian subcontinent. A huge Anglo-Saxon tenure emerged, which would lead to the global supremacy of Britain.

⁴⁵The Seven Years' War and later was the time of the mass migration of Germans from the German territories. Catherine II of Russia issued a manifesto on December 4, 1762, inviting the foreign settlers (so called colonists) to the free lands of the Russian Empire. Thus Germans, mainly peasants, began to immigrate to the Volga region and later the Northern Black Sea coast. This wave of migration came mainly from the lands of Rhineland-Palatinate and Hesse. The reason for this migration was the socio-economic situation in 18th c. Germany. At the time Germany was a backward agricultural country, whose population was mostly farmers and artisans; the national bourgeoisie was very slow to rise. The country consisted of semi-dependent mini-states, the national language began to develop late, people still spoke dialects, they lacked national consciousness and patriotism. All this hampered the cultural and economic development of the future German nation. The gentry grew, accompanied by the growth of tenure and the system of crop rotation, the nobles were driving masses of peasants off their land, and thousands of them, together with soldiers who had lost service and ruined artisans, were roaming the roads of the German lands. Thus emigration for lots of people seemed a desired prospect. (Dietz, V. G. Who Are We, Russian Germans? URL.: http://www.rusdeutsch-panorama.ru/article.php?mode=view&site_id=34&own_menu_id=14127) According to some historians' estimate about every third German moved to Russia. The colonists had the right to communal self-government, they were direct subjects to the throne, rather than the internal government of the Russian Empire. The authorities assured the colonists that they could leave the Empire at any time. Unlike farmers in Germany and local farmers, the colonists were not serfs, they were free. Lots of those peasant families remained in their places of compact residence for more than a century and a half and kept up the German language, faith and other elements of the national culture. Under the Russian Emperor Paul I the German privileges even grew.

The North American theatre of the Seven Year's War

The struggle between England and France for dominance in the North American colonies lasted for almost a century: from 1689 to 1763. The British gained their dominance there only after the Seven Years' War and, particularly, after their victory in the French and Indian War (1755-1763). It was during this time that heroes of Fenimore Cooper's popular novels, proud Indians, did their courageous acts. The fate of North American Indians perhaps has no analogies in world history. Neither the Indian tribe of Mohican (Mohegan), who fought on the side of the British, nor the Huron, who fought under the colours of the French, found any place on that continent any more – both of these tribes, as many other tribes, completely or nearly completely vanished from the face of the earth. It will be pertinent to recall Fenimore Cooper's popular novel "The Last of the Mohicans" with its tell-tale title, which refers to these times.

General Jeffrey Amherst, a British commander-in-chief in North America, after whom several places are still named in the USA and the Commonwealth, conducted such an overtaking policy towards Native Americans, that it caused a new war, called the Pontiac War, which broke out in 1763.⁴⁶ During this war, which threatened the British garrisons west of the Allegheny mountains, Amherst and Colonel Henry Bouquet at Fort Pitt are known to have exchanged the letters concerning the "inoculation" of the Indians with smallpox by means of blankets.⁴⁷ Later two traders at Fort Pitt did give blankets and a handkerchief from the fort's quarantined hospital to two visiting Delaware Indians, and one of the traders noted in his diary: "I hope it will have the desired effect." Smallpox was already present among the tribes of Ohio; at some point after this episode, there was an outbreak in which hundreds died.⁴⁸

Another incident occurred on June 20, 1837. On that day the US Army began to dispense "trade blankets" to Mandans and other Indians gathered at Fort Clark on the Missouri River in present-day North Dakota. Far from being trade goods, the blankets had been taken from a military infirmary in St. Louis quarantined for smallpox and brought upriver aboard the steamboat St. Peter's. When the first Indians showed symptoms of the disease on July 14, the post surgeon advised those camped near the post to scatter and seek "sanctuary" in the villages of healthy relatives. In this way the disease spread, the Mandan and other tribes suffered devastating losses (see Russell Thornton's *American Indian Holocaust and Survival*).

With the arrival of Europeans, Indians also began to suffer from lack of resource, because bison and deer were hunted by the newcomers. For instance, historians attribute the Cherokee tribe collapse to hunting by European settlers: "When the Indians were unable to harvest deer in sufficient quantity to obtain western goods, they became vulnerable, since they no longer were bargaining, but asking for handouts."⁴⁹ As for the bison (buffalo) extermination, it was already accomplished during the American Independence.

⁴⁶It was started by a loose confederation of Native American tribes primarily from the Great Lakes region, the Illinois Country, and the Ohio Country who were dissatisfied with British post-war policies in the region after the British victory in the French and Indian War.

⁴⁷ Jeffrey Amherst and Smallpox Blankets: http://www.umass.edu/legal/derrico/amherst/lord_jeff.html (Retrieved 29 August 2014). Several places are named after Amherst in USA, e.g. Amherstburg, Ontario (location of General Amherst High School), Amherst, Massachusetts (location of the University of Massachusetts Amherst, Hampshire College and Amherst College), Amherst, New Hampshire, Amherst, Nova Scotia, Amherst, New York, and Amherst County, Virginia. However, "The Un-Canadians", a 2007 article in Beaver Magazine, includes Jeffrey Amherst, 1st Baron Amherst, Ezekiel Stone Wiggins, and Robert Monckton in a list of people in the history of Canada who were considered contemptible.

⁴⁸ As early as the first explorations at Roanoke, Thomas Hariot had observed that whenever the English visited an Indian village, within a few days the people began to die very fast. Hariot also reported that, miraculously, diseases had affected only those Indian communities who had plotted against the English.

⁴⁹ <http://www.livescience.com/4606-history-rewritten-choke-collapse.html>

the author of "A History of England for Schools". "France, commanding the St. Lawrence in Canada, the Mississippi, and the valley of the Ohio, seemed likely to drive the English into the sea. Their only hope was to cross the Appalachians and to cut the French settlements in two by interrupting communications between Canada and Louisiana. With this object, in 1754 a fort was founded where Pittsburgh now stands; but it was soon demolished by the French. George Washington sent to attack the new fort built by the French, had to capitulate, and retired across the Appalachians. About the same time General Braddock was sent from England, but when he arrived within a few miles of the Fort he was surprised and his whole force annihilated.

Canada lay open to attack by way of the St. Lawrence. Had a third expedition succeeded in taking Ticonderoga, Canada would have fallen to England that very year. As it was, the same dispositions were made for 1759. Quebec was captured and Canada really secured. Montcalm, the French commander at Quebec, had 15,000 men and an almost impregnable position; the English fleet, anchored a little farther down the river, carried 9,000 troops. All Montcalm had to do, it seemed, was to wait till the autumn rains and the severe Canadian winter drove the English away. Wolfe, however, in the early morning of September 13 moved with his main body to a point on the river where the cliffs rose steeply to the Heights of Abraham on which Quebec was perched; he had scaled the Heights and drawn up his line before the French knew that their picket had been surprised. In the battle that followed the English won, but Wolfe was killed. The capture of Montreal by Amherst in 1760 completed the conquest of Canada. In October 1760, when news of war victories was coming, the death of the king George II gave a new turn to the course of the war.


There is a very romantic legend that General Wolfe read aloud a beautiful poem which every Englishman knew by heart in those days.

It was a dark night, and the oars were muffled as the English soldiers rowed of a rocky height on which stood the French forts of Quebec. As they rowed along, the young English general read aloud a beautiful poem, Gray's 'Elegy on a Country Churchyard'. Wolfe loved the picture of quiet life far away in England which the poem brought to mind.

'The curfew tolls the knell of parting day,
The lowing herds wind slowly o'er the lea,
The ploughman homeward plods his weary way,
And leaves the world to darkness and to me.
Now fades the glimmering landscape on the sight,
And all the air a solemn stillness holds...'

'I would rather be the author of that poem,' said the soldier, 'than take Quebec.'
He did take Quebec.

One holds one's breath as one reads of the noiseless climb up the steep paths, and the sudden surprise of the enemy at the top. There is a stone here now with the name of Wolfe on one side and that of Montcalm on the other; both were heroes and died in the fight — Wolfe at the moment of victory. France now began great preparations to invade Britain; but, as in the case of the Armada, the soldiers were never even landed, and the great fleets were scattered or destroyed."



The Indian theatre of the Seven Year's War

In the 18th c. both England and France were pushing their trade in India; they both had ports and soldiers to protect their interests and tried to drive each other out of India. Both European countries tried to win over rival native princes to their sides. France held power and influence over a vast territory in the south of India with a

population of 35 million people, mainly Hindu, and England - over a vast northern region, mainly Muslim.

The French Governor of Pondicherry was Joseph Francois Dupleix, an excellent diplomat of the eastern school, very clever, but not the strongest leader. It was the French East India company that made the first attempt to create a colonial Empire in India. Since 1740 Dupleix had been forming squads of Indians, placing them under the command of French officers. So, there appeared the first Sepoy troops, who fought so well, that in 1746, the British also decided to form detachments of sepoys. Dupleix was opposed by Robert Clive, later called "Clive of India", at first a young clerk at the service of the East India Company in Madras, but later an administrator who by hook or by crook managed to establish the military and political supremacy of Britain in India. Together with Warren Hastings, Clive is credited with securing India, and the wealth that followed, for the British crown. To the roar of battles on the European Continent, where the French were heavily engaged in battles, India fell into the British hands. The British, with their ability to pit other countries against their immediate rivals, emerged victorious again.

In the 18th c. there were three Carnatic Wars – the first of them took place in 1746–1748. After the British captured a few French merchant ships, the French called for backup from as far afield as Isle de France (now Mauritius), beginning an escalation in naval forces in the area. In July 1746 French commander La Bourdonnais and British Edward Peyton fought an indecisive action off Negapatam, after which the British fleet withdrew to Bengal. On 21 September 1746, the French captured the British outpost at Madras with the help of the troops of Dupleix 's sepoys. Soon, however, controversy sparked between the bourgeois La Bourdonnais and the nobleman Dupleix about how to deal with conquered Madras. La Bourdonnais, who took the city with the help of the ships he had built, believed Madras his personal military gain and promised the British to give it back for a large money ransom. Dupleix insisted on razing this port to the ground, thereby destroying British influence in this part of India. As a result of the quarrel, La Bourdonnais withdrew his ships from India. Remaining without the navy, Dupleix could not successfully fight the British. Anwar-ud-din, the Nawab sent a 10,000-man army to take Madras from the French but was repulsed by a small French force in the Battle of Adyar. The French then made several attempts to capture the British Fort St. David at Cuddalore, but the arrivals of reinforcements halted these, and eventually turned the tables on the French. British Admiral Edward Boscawen besieged Pondicherry in the later months of 1748 but lifted the siege with the advent of the monsoon rains in October. The British were weakened by the withdrawal of the force under Boscawen. Great difficulties arose, and at some point, it looked as if the English would be driven from India right away. However, the French gave way, and in the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748), Madras was given back to the British, without its fortifications being destroyed, in exchange for the French fortress of Louisbourg in North America, which the British had captured. The result was not slow to show in the following year, when, despite peace in Europe, a new war broke out between the English and French companies in India. By the way, the First Carnatic War was the first military experience of Robert Clive, who was taken prisoner at Madras, escaped, and then participated in the defence of Cuddalore and the siege of Pondicherry.

The Second Carnatic War was a proxy war of Britain and France, continuing in India in 1749–1754. On one side was Chanda Sahib, the Mughal Empire's Sepoy, Divan of the Carnatic, and Muzaffar Jung, supported by the French, and on the other was Nasir Jung, the Nizam, and his protege Muhammad Ali, supported by the English, vying for the Nawabship of Arcot. Muzaffar Jung and Chanda Sahib captured Arcot while Nasir Jung's subsequent death allowed Muzaffar Jung to take control of Hyderabad. Muzaffar's reign was short as he was soon killed, and Salabat Jung became Nawab. In 1751, however, Robert Clive led British troops to capture Arcot. The garrison left by Chanda Sahib to defend Arcot, struck with panic at the sudden coming of the foe,

abandoned the fort. Clive and his forces took over the city and the fort without firing a single shot. When apprised of the loss of Arcot, Chanda Sahib immediately dispatched 4,000 of his best troops with 150 of the French, under the command of his son, Raza Sahib, to recapture it. On the 23 September Raza Sahib entered the town and invested the fort with an army of 2,000 native regular troops, 5,000 irregulars, 120 Europeans, and 300 cavalries. However, the death of the assault commander in the final charge broke the spirit of Chanda Sahib's force. Raza Sahib was defeated and later killed by the British. Following this Chanda Sahib escaped to Tanjore, only to be captured by the Tanjore army and was beheaded by a Tanjore general. The English quickly installed Muhammed Ali as the Nawab of Arcot. The war ended with the Treaty of Pondicherry, signed in 1754, which recognised Muhammad Ali as the Nawab of the Carnatic.

The outbreak in 1756 of the Seven Years' War in Europe resulted in renewed conflict between French and British forces in India - the Third Carnatic War (1756–1763). The Third Carnatic War spread beyond southern India and into Bengal where British forces captured the French settlement of Chandernagore (now Chandannagar). In 1756 in the battle of Plassey near Calcutta the French troops together with those of the Nawab of Bengal, the French ally, despite a great numerical superiority over the English forces, were defeated. In fact, Clive had 3,000 men at Plassey in the face of 60,000, the enemy with cannons and elephants for attack, and swift dromedaries to flee away upon. And still it was Clive who was victorious. Some British historians write, it was due to Clive's "brilliant cleverness and daring", but in fact the secret of the outstanding victory was quite prosaic: it was Clive's organizing treachery that won the victory. This great beast-of-prey had persuaded some of the feudal princes on the side of the Bengal Nawab to betray their native leader and go over to the British side. The bribe paid to the traitors was a trifle compared to the stupendous sums Clive got later from his colonial machinations, and then most of the coin paid was that of promises which were not kept.

As a result of the battle of Plassey of 1756, Bengal was at the disposal of the East India Company. The British colonizers had got excellent schooling in colonizing methods, the knowledge of the colonial people's psychology, the way to influence their convictions and beliefs — a schooling that would come to be of great service to them later, when the empire so painfully created collapsed like a soap bubble while the influence was still there.

In the south, the British defended Madras, and General Eyre Coote defeated the French, commanded by Comte de Lally at the Battle of Wandiwash in 1760. After Wandiwash, the French capital of Pondicherry fell to the British in 1761. The surrender of Pondicherry to Coote in 1761 marked the fall of the French influence in India; but there were still native peoples contending with the British in the north, and all kinds of administrative difficulties in the south. The Treaty in Paris in 1763 formally confirmed Muhammed Ali in the position which Clive had won for him. The British possession in southern India was recognized. In 1775 Clive became British governor of Bengal.

Clive reformed the service of the East India Company, but when he returned to England all the old abuses cropped up again; officials' intent of making a fortune had no scruples in extorting all they could from the oppressed natives of Bengal. In 1773 Lord North had passed a regulation of India Act, creating a Supreme Council of five members, and appointing Warren Hastings, Governor of Bengal, as the first Governor-General of India. By the Act the Governor-General was controlled by his council, and Hastings's council opposed him in every detail of his policy. The Act did not abolish the East India Company, whose directors still clamoured for dividends, though they were no longer responsible for the government of the country. The majority of the council regarded themselves as the representatives of the government as opposed to the directors and looked upon Hastings as an oppressor who was only intent to send home wealth wrung from the natives. Thus, they opposed his alliance with the Nawab of Oude, and denounced the employment of English soldiers against the Rohillas, with who the Nawab was in war. As a matter of fact, the alliance secured Bengal from being invaded by a sturdy people of the Western

Deccan.

After four or five years of colonial friction Hastings succeeded to master in the council; he first asserted himself by prosecuting one of his opponents' native agents, who was tried and hanged; then the opportune death of one of the members gave him a casting vote. He discovered that the people of the western Deccan had been intriguing with the French, and marched against them, and after a two years' war compelled them to sue for peace.

In 1780, Hyder Ali of Mysore, who allied with France, invaded the Carnatic. He offered strong anti-colonial resistance against the military advances of the British East India Company during the First (1767–1769) and Second (1780–1784) Anglo–Mysore Wars earned an important place in the history of southern India for his administrative acumen and military skills. He concluded an alliance with the French against the British and used the services of French workmen in raising his artillery and arsenal. Hyder Ali opened hostilities against the British in 1780, with significant success in early campaigns. As the war progressed, the British recovered some territorial losses. Both France and Britain sent troops and naval squadrons from Europe to assist in the war effort, which widened later in 1780 when Britain declared war on the Dutch Republic. In 1783 news of a preliminary peace between France and Britain reached India, resulting in the withdrawal of French support from the Mysorean war effort. The British consequently also sought to end the conflict with Mysore, and the British government ordered the Company to secure peace with Mysore. This resulted in the 1784 Treaty of Mangalore, restoring the status quo antebellum under terms company officials such as Warren Hastings found extremely unfavourable.

These wars had been expensive, and to pay for them Hastings did not hesitate to bring pressure upon the native princes; especially he extorted large sums from the Princess of Oude, the mother and widow of the late nawab, on the ground that the new nawab had not paid the troops lent him to conquer his enemies.

By breaking the power of the native princes and organizing the government and revenue, Hastings secured India for England. In 1783, Fox proposed to transfer the authority of the Company to the Crown, but his Bill, though it passed the Commons, was, owing to the king's influence, rejected by the Lords. Fox's Bill would have made the Whigs too powerful. The king let it be known that those peers who voted for the India Bill would be considered as his personal enemies. Its rejection was followed immediately by the fall of the ministry.

Comprehension questions

1. Rivalry of Britain with France: general.
2. North American theatre of war.
3. The annexation of Canada.
4. Indian theatre of war.

Names and expressions

Boscawen, Edward [bos'kəwən] (1711–1761)

Dupleix, Joseph Francois [dju:'pleks] (1697–1763) — French governor in India

Carnatic [ka:'neitik]

Mohammed Ali [mə(u)'hæmid a'li] — Мухаммед Али

Chunda Sahib ['tʃʌndə 'sa:(h)ib] — Чанда Сагиб

Deccan ['dekən] — Декан (Индия)

Pondicherry [pondi'ʃeri]

Coote ['ku:t]

native tribes to contend with — туземные племена, с которыми надо было сражаться

had no scruples in extorting all they could... — без зазрения совести вымогали все, что могли...

Warren Hastings ['worən 'heistiŋz] (1732-1818) — Уоррен Гастингс
Nawab of Oude [nə'wɔ:b, -'wɑ:b] — набоб
Rohillas [rə'hiləs]
as a matter of fact — фактически
Hyder Ali of Mysore ['haid(ə)r a:'li ɒv mai'so:] (?-1782) - sultan of Mysore, an Indian state.
St. Lawrence ['lɔr(ə)ns] — река святого Лаврентия
Ohio [əu'haɪəu] — Огайо (река)
Alleghenies [,æli 'geɪnɪz]
Prussia ['prʌʃə]
Cumberland [kʌmbələnd]
unless Pitt was dismissed — если не сместить Питта
Hastenbach
Klosterseven
Brunswick ['brunswɪk]
Rhyne [raɪn]
Grefeld ['gri:fəld]
Lorndorf ['lɔ:ndɔ:f]
Hochkirchen ['hɔkhaɪmə]
Hanoverian [hɑ:nəʊvəriən]
Minden ['mɪndən] — город (Пруссия)
Hawke ['hɔ:k]
Quiberon Bay [kwɪbərən]
Wolfe, James [wulf] (1727-1759)
Quebec [kwɪ'bek]
Duquesne [du:kɑ:n]
Ticonderoga [tɪkəndə'rɔʊgə]
Montcalm, Louis Joseph [mont'kalm] (1713-1759)
Abraham ['eɪbrəhæm]
their picket had been surprised — их пикет был застигнут врасплох
Montreal [,mɒtri'o:l]
Amherst, Jeffrey [æm' hæ:st] (1717-1797) — British field marshal
o'er = over
one holds one's breath as one reads — перехватывает дыхание, когда читаешь...

13. GEORGE III (1760–1820). INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT. HISTORY OF AMERICAN COLONIZATION AND AMERICA'S STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE

George III

George William Frederic, George III (1738-1820), was the eldest son of Frederic Louis, Prince of Wales, and he was born on the fourth of June, at Norfolk House, St. James's Square, London. The Prince passed his youth in an atmosphere of intrigue and jealousy. He knew nothing of the outside world. He was a shy boy and did not like company.

George was often rude to those who offended him. He never talked to a minister except standing and keeping the minister standing however long the interview might last and refused the judges to dispense with their wigs when they were not at the bench. "I will have no innovations in my time", he said.

From his childhood the Prince spoke French and German and knew something of Italian; but he wrote English ungrammatically and always spelt badly. Everybody knew that he was remarkably calm in the moments of danger.

George considered all opposition as an affront to himself, and an evidence of moral shame, some of his petulance must be attributed to his morbid excitability of his brain, which broke-out from time to time in attacks of insanity.

Chiefly in order to embarrass his father, George as a prince yet had favoured the Tory opposition. Tory views of government were reflected at that time in Bolingbrook's "Idea of a Patriot King," which laid down the theory that a good king was one who ruled his people for their own good in his own way, unhampered by the control of a party system. The Princess of Wales had carefully installed those ideas into the mind of her son, and the young king was eager to act upon them. The speech from the throne lit the opening of George's first Parliament declared the expediency of concluding the war by an honourable peace. Pitt, on the other hand, soon got to know that France had entered into a new family compact with Spain, and therefore proposed that war should be declared with the latter country at once. His advice was rejected; but his information was soon proved to be accurate, and war was declared with Spain at the end of 1761.

The Earl of Bute, now the real head of the ministry, although intent upon stopping the war and determined not to give any more subsidies to Frederick the Great, found that the fleet had been so well organized by Pitt, that Martinique, Grenada, Havana, Manila and the Philippines were all captured within a year by Rodney and other English admirals.

These victories helped Bute to make peace, and although the terms were not favourable enough to England, the Peace of Paris (1763) set the seal upon this country's destiny as the great colonising and imperial Power. At first, of course, in the spirit of that age Englishmen only saw in the expansion of the colonies a monopoly of boundless wealth for themselves, and it required the revolt of North America to make them realize fully their responsibilities and to teach them a saner view of imperialism. The chief possessions secured by England in the Peace of Paris were Canada, several islands in the West Indies, Senegal in Africa, and Minorca; while in India France had to restore all conquests made since 1749 and be content with the rectories she had then held.

Bute's triumph was not long-lived; the peace was anything but popular, and the ministry resigned very soon after it was concluded and gave place to the ministry headed by Pitt's brother-in-law George Grenville. One of the new government's first actions was to prosecute John Wilkes, a Member of Parliament, who in his journal the "North Briton" had criticized the terms of the peace. Wilkes was arrested on a charge of seditious libel, and a general warrant was given. The arrest was quashed by the Chief Justice on the ground that general warrants were illegal, and that Wilkes, as a member of Parliament, was privileged; but the government was strong enough to pass a resolution in the Commons that Parliamentary privilege did not cover such an offence, and that Wilkes should be expelled from the House. The chief result of all this was that Wilkes became a popular hero, and in 1768 he was returned to Parliament although he was not allowed to take his seat. John Wilkes she also supported the colonies in North America who objected to being taxed by the British Parliament in which they were not represented. Looking ahead, in five years, on December 16th 1773, the Boston Tea Party occurred which became the prelude to the American Revolution; in 1777 France, Spain and Holland joined the war cutting off of the British forces from supplies coming by sea; in 1783 the British government recognized the independence of America.

Industrial development

We can rightly say that in the 18th c. England transformed from a rather backward and poor country whose economy was also undermined by revolutions, wars and unrest, to a powerful country with advanced and rapidly growing industry.

At the beginning of the reign of George III, in 1760, England was still mainly an agricultural country, its few manufactures - of which cloth was the most important — were often carried on in quite small villages. Their production was crude and primitive. But being the chief colonizer of the East, England learnt the skills and secrets of crafts, which, followed by a series of mechanical inventions, gave a great impetus to manufacture and eventually, the industrial revolution.

The City safes that were quickly getting chock full of colonial gold were to play a decisive role in the fate of the small island separated by the ever-turbulent waters of the English Channel from the European continent. Clive alone returned to England with a fortune of a million pounds sterling. Historians estimate the gains of the higher officials of East India Company in the period immediately following the Seven Years' War at 21 million pounds, an astronomic figure for those times. It came not only from using India as a market for British goods (compulsory trade was an ordinary proceeding) and the monopoly of tax collecting which was a tremendous asset, the British officials being consummate masters of squeezing the last coin from a starving peasant's hand and snatching the last handful of rice from a starving baby's mouth. It also came from "encouraging", in the official phrase of the time, certain crops that promised high profits for the colonizers. Thus, for instance, opium trade being extremely profitable, Indian peasants were forced to grow poppies for next to nothing, while the colonizers exported it to China at unbelievably high prices. That was the completion of the previous accumulation process. The money thus gained went to finance inventions and sponsor the building of machines, iron foundries, roads, canals, etc. Slave trade which was very active in the middle of the century brought in huge profits as well.

In 1750 a new slave-trading company was founded, and numerous merchants in London, Bristol, Liverpool went in for slave-trade.

Karl Marx wrote: "With the development of capitalist production during the manufacturing period, the public opinion of Europe had lost the last remnant of shame and conscience. The nations bragged cynically of every infamy that served them as a means to capitalistic accumulation" and he denounced those historians who "trumpet forth" as "a triumph of English statecraft that at the Peace of Utrecht, England extorted from the Spaniards by the Asiento Treaty, the privilege of being allowed to ply the Negro-trade, until then only carried on between Africa and the English West-Indies, between Africa, and Spanish America as well. England thereby acquired the right of supplying Spanish America until 1743 with 4,800 Negroes yearly."

The 18th century was the time of the agrarian revolution. The Parliament-running squires would pass acts of Parliament allowing the landowners to enclose lands since land had become private property after the feudal "holding" rights were abolished. About two million of common lands were enclosed. By the middle of the century there was no more common land in England and there were no more peasants or yeomen. The beneficiaries of the notorious "Glorious Revolution", the new nobles and City – financiers, who went in for capitalistic farming, merely drove the peasants off the land "en masse". As to the enclosure by Acts of Parliament, two thousand and two hundred of them, passed in the 18th c., were enough to make thousands of peasants landless — a willing prey to any enterprising exploiter who would be sure to take advantage of their plight. The protest movement of the expropriated peasants, though sweeping, was of no avail; petitions were rejected, disturbances taken care of and more Acts of Parliament passed ousting more sufferers from their hereditary nests.

By the eighties of the 18th c. historians no longer speak of peasantry as a class. A numerous army of agrarian proletarians was appearing, hired labourers ready to take up any job. The

capitalistic farmers had nothing in common with that sort of people; they only hired them. England was becoming a country of big capitalistic agricultural estates producing food for the growing town population. The home market was thus growing.

Foreign markets were growing as well, new trading companies were created for trade with nearly the whole world, bringing in enormous profits (some of them, however, mere speculative bubbles like the South-Sea company, a humbug concern that ruined many would-be financiers).

The manufactories of the previous centuries could no longer provide for the growing demand so the need for well-organized industry was imperative. So, conditions were ripe for the industrial revolution that in a hundred years made England "the workshop of the world".

Technical Inventions

The unrestrained exploitation of colonies was a vital source of accumulation of capital and the British Industrial Revolution. According to the American historian Brooks Adams, "Very soon after Plassey the Bengal plunder began to arrive in London, and the effect appears to have been instantaneous, for all authorities agree that the "industrial revolution," the event which has divided the 19th c. from all antecedent time, began with the year 1760. Prior to 1760, according to Baines⁵⁰, the machinery used for spinning cotton in Lancashire was almost as simple as in India; while about 1750 the English iron industry was in full decline because of the destruction of the forests for fuel. At that time four-fifths of the iron in use in Britain came from Sweden. Plassey in India was fought in 1757, and probably nothing has ever equalled the rapidity of the change which followed. In 1760 the flying-shuttle appeared, and coal began to replace wood in smelting. In 1764 Hargreaves invented the spinning-jenny, in 1779 Crompton contrived the mule, in 1785 Cartwright patented the power-loom, and, chief of all, in 1768 James Watt matured the steam-engine. In 1781 Watt patented his steam engine.

But though these machines served as outlets for the accelerating movement of the time, they did not cause that acceleration. In themselves inventions are passive, many of the most important having lain dormant for centuries, waiting for a sufficient store of force to have accumulated to set them working. That store must always take the shape of money, and money not hoarded, but in motion." [Adams 1898] Similar progress was made in many countries at the time. Thus in



Hargreaves' spinning jenny

⁵⁰Edward Baines, co-author of "History of the Cotton Manufacture in Great Britain."

Russia, even before Watt's modification, Ivan Polzunov created the world's first two-cylinder steam engine (1765), which enabled work without the use of hydraulic power, that is, including completely dry places - a great step forward compared to existing steam engines with auxiliary hydraulic drives. The inventor Ivan Kulibin developed a project of a 298-meter bridge across the Neva with wooden lattice trusses and the first iron bridge across the Volga, came up with an original ship launching system, a riverboat with hydraulic engine, moving against the tide (vodokhod), a lantern spotlight with a parabolic reflector of tiny mirrors, a mechanical coach with pedal power, improved glass-polishing for optical instruments.

In the 18th c. steam-engines came to be used in industries. Cotton and hosiery were the first trades to benefit from the steam-engine; Nottingham and the towns of Lancashire became great workshops. But this was only the beginning of an industrial revolution which was to change England from being mainly an agricultural into a great manufacturing country.

Increased output was of little use without improved means of transit. Roads were improved (cf. McAdam's covering) and canals built, the canal between Manchester and Liverpool was opened in 1767.

New Classes: Bourgeoisie and Proletarians

A natural outcome of the new conditions was that the workers no longer congregated in little villages or worked in their own homes, but crowded together in huge cities and worked in factories.⁵¹ As manufactures developed there was an increasing influx of people from the country into the towns; at the same time, owing partly to the enclosure of common land by the great landowners to give the lands to the sheep as pastures, those who remained in the country became poorer and poorer.

The growing factories and plants attracted the newly-formed class of industrial workers — "operatives" as they were called, to new industrial centres in the North-Western part of England, Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool, Glasgow, etc. The nation was dividing, the two antagonistic classes were formed, and all social relations were undergoing a striking transformation. The bourgeoisie was gaining in importance, the proletarians were beginning to realize their class belonging.

The former manufactory workers thought of strikes as a means of resisting the tightening pressure of exploitation. True, the idea originated early in the 18th c. but it assumed a systematic nature by the middle of the century. The strikers were headed by the incipient trade unions not yet permanent organizations but semi-legal combinations of toilers, the proletarians still in the process of formation as a class, taking its source in the ruined peasantry whom the "Parliamentary enclosures" were driving to the cities, craftsmen artisans ruined by the hopeless competition with machine production. There was a mass migration of workers to the new industrial centres of the North-West where they lived in unbelievable squalor and misery. The machines reduced the production process to simple monotonous fatiguing operations, no skill was wanted, so women and children joined the ranks, in some branches of light industry constituting overwhelming majorities since their labour was cheap and their helplessness made them easy prey to the industrialists' greed. They worked long hours in stuffy, dark and airless shops. No wonder the factory children kept dying. The grown-ups had the same working hours only they worked on Sundays as well and became invalids at forty, if they lived to that age. The starvation wages, permanent undernourishment and permanent overwork prepared excellent grounds for epidemics which took a heavy toll in the workers' districts.

But the reserve army of the unemployed was always there, preference for child labour and employment of women gave the owners excellent chances of cutting down wages with impunity.

⁵¹The conditions at factories were very hard, workers, including women and children, worked 16 hours a day, making a meagre livelihood.

Still, already during the first decades after the beginning of the industrial revolution the operatives continued struggling. They could not, at this early day, understand where the root of their hardships lay, for they could not realize the nature of capitalist relations. They directed their wrath against the immediate causes of their sufferings, those that deprived them of jobs, made the product of their heart-breaking labour cheap. So, they destroyed the hateful machines attacking mills and setting them on fire. The weavers of Manchester, Preston, Bolton and other textile centres gathered in great numbers (they called themselves Luddites after a certain Lester apprentice who avenged his wrongs breaking to smithereens his exploiting master's loom, we will speak about him in more detail further on) and in huge crowds went from factory to factory breaking the looms.

Of course, the Industrial Revolution took a long time to complete itself, and assumed different forms in different parts of the country; but its general result was to transform all the English society by preparing the way for the transference of political power from the landed to the manufacturing classes.

The American Colonies. White settlers and the indigenous population

The English colonization of America dates back from 1584, when Walter Raleigh undertook the first voyage to America and made contact with friendly Indians. This led to the establishment of the Roanoke Colony in Virginia (named so in honour of Elizabeth I the Virgin Queen). But the colony did not exist long: it petered out in 1586. In 1587 John White founded a new colony which did not exist long either. And only in 1607 a group of 143 colonists established themselves at Jamestown. In two years, in 1609, the population of the colony was already over 700 people. [Nicholas 1982: 130] In 1620, 102 Puritans - men, women, and children left Plymouth, England, for America on the Mayflower. They were later called Pilgrims, or Forefathers. On November 21, 1620, the Mayflower dropped anchor in the sheltered harbour off the site of present-day Provincetown, Massachusetts. On December 21, 1620, after an exploratory voyage along Cape Cod, the Pilgrims landed and disembarked from the Mayflower near the head of the cape and founded Plymouth Colony. Today, people in New England celebrate December 21 as Forefathers' Day. The 1628 chartering of the Massachusetts Bay Colony resulted in a wave of migration. After 1630 the original 102 English colonists who founded Plymouth were absorbed by the massive migration of the Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony near Boston.

In their colony, the Pilgrims were encountered by the Indian tribe of Wampanoag, who helped them to survive the hard winter and taught them many important skills.⁵² In March 1621 the chief of Wampanoag, Massasoit, visited Plymouth and signed a treaty of friendship with the English giving them permission of occupy the approximately 12,000 acres of what was to become the Plymouth plantation.⁵³

⁵² In 1600, Wampanoag lived in the southeast of the current states of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, as well as the area surrounding the modern Martha's Vineyard, Nantucket and the Elizabeth Islands. Their number was about 12,000. By the beginning of the 21st century, Wampanoag population was about 2,000 people. While before they spoke the Massachusetts Algonquian language family, now they fully switched to English.

⁵³ It is very doubtful that Massasoit fully understood the distinction between the European concept of owning land versus the native idea of sharing it. Unlike Europeans, the Indians took from nature only what was necessary for life. They did not derive any profit, or surplus value, from their possessions and had nothing to divide between them. It must have been difficult for the Wampanoag to imagine how any people so inept as the white newcomers could ever be a danger to them.

The world around, Indians believed, was the creation of the Great Spirit, therefore the land was holy and belonged to no man, sacred were also all the creatures that existed on this land: animals, plants, natural forces. A sense of unity with nature, the desire for harmony with it, the view on a person as a particle of the living and spiritualized world were at the core of Indian identity, the foundation of all spiritual life of Native Americans. It is this attitude to nature

The friendship and cooperation continued for a while, and the Pilgrims were grateful enough that fall to invite Massasoit to celebrate their first harvest with them. Massasoit and 90 of his men brought five deer, and the feasting lasted for three days. This holiday came to be called the Thanksgiving, today celebrated in the USA on the fourth Thursday of November as a day of giving thanks for the blessing of the harvest and of the preceding year. Although relations were generally peaceful, some Wampanoag were taken by slavers, and the population suffered diseases introduced by white traders and colonists; three large epidemics 1614–20 killed three-quarters of the Wampanoag and entire villages vanished.

In 1675-76 a brutal war with the son of the deceased at the time Massasoit, Metakom or Metakomet ("King Philip"), began. Metakom wished to retaliate for the death of his brother at the hands of the English.⁵⁴ Because of the unequal struggle, three thousand members of the Wampanoag tribe were massacred, and hundreds of survivors among the Indians were sold into slavery. So extinguished the Wampanoag tribe.

The colonists expanded west into the Connecticut River Valley and during 1637 broke up the powerful Pequot confederacy that opposed them. Afterwards they entered into an alliance with the Mohegan (Mohican) upsetting the balance of power in New England Indian community. For the time being, this tribe emerged as dominant there. With the French in Canada focused on the fur trade from the Great Lakes, only the alliance of the Dutch and Mohawk in New York stood in the way of the English for their supremacy on the North American continent. Boston traders had tried unsuccessfully to lure the Mohawk away from the Dutch in 1640 by selling firearms, but the Dutch had countered with their own weapons, and the process dramatically escalated the level of violence in the Beaver Wars, which were raging along the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes. In 1664, the English captured New York from the Dutch and signed their own treaty with the Mohawk.

Between 1640 to 1675 new waves of settlers arrived in New England and pushed west into native lands. There was an especially large amount of immigration after 1660, when the Restoration ended the military rule of Oliver Cromwell, and Puritans were in extreme disfavour with the new English monarch, Charles II. Barely tolerant of other Christians, Puritans treated Native Americans as unreasonable heathen savages, representatives of an inferior race. They also believed that God himself had foreordained them to rule on the new land. They began to take away the Indian land and hunting grounds.

By 1665, the English no longer needed the Native American skills to survive, and fishing and other commerce had largely replaced the fur and wampum trade, which had been the mainstays of the colonial economy during the early years. While there was nothing to equal the Wampanoag devastation of 1614-20, the native population had continued to decline from continuing epidemics: 1633, 1635, 1654, 1661 and 1667. The Puritans' solution to this after 1640 was the missionary work of John Eliot and others to convert the native population. Attendance at church was mandatory, clothing and hair changed to proper colonial styles, and even a hint of traditional ceremony and religion was grounds for expulsion. Tribal culture and authority disintegrated in the process.

that European colonists and American settlers could not understand. They perceived it as "savagery and paganism" that Indian hunters asked forgiveness from slaughtered animals, that they looked upon forest, land, water as living beings, that they did not consider themselves masters of the world, but brothers of animals and birds. In turn, the Indians were shocked by the consumerism of the Whites to the environment. As Dee Brown writes, "The Indians knew that life was equated with the earth and its resources, that America was a paradise, and they could not comprehend why the intruders from the East were determined to destroy all that was Indian as well as America itself."

⁵⁴Massasoit's eldest son, Wamsutta, known among the English as King Alexander, died under mysterious circumstances after visiting the British colonial administration in Plymouth.

Since the early 18th c. George I and his successors actively exiled criminals to North America. The crimes punishable with expulsion to the Colonies included piracy, larceny, robbery, burglary, smuggling, poaching, rioting, looting, sheep theft, forgery, arsons etc. Criminals were sent as indentured serfs for a period of 7 to 14 years, and those who illegally returned to England earlier were subject to death penalty. The condemned were sold to shipowners for 3 (later 5) pounds, and those, in turn, sold them to planters for 10 pounds (women - for 8 pounds). The deportation dwindled during the Seven Years' War and ended after the secession of the United States from Great Britain. In 1786 the first colony for criminals was built in Australia, where criminals were exiled until 1867.

In the 18th-19th cc. the white settlers' pressure on the Indian population grew. From the territory of Massachusetts, they moved to the north and to the south along the coast of the ocean, as well as to the west into the continent. High profits from sugar, cotton and tobacco encouraged settlers' further planting in Maryland and Virginia. They began spreading on those terrains westward, exerting heavy pressure on the Indians. The seizure of heathen Redskins' lands became common. Within a few decades after the beginning of the colonization of the east coast of North America, many tribes of New England and Virginia simply disappeared. Colonies inexorably moved to the west, and the policy of the white settlers towards indigenous populations remained unchanged.

The famous phenomenon of *Frontier*, a region at the edge of a "settled area", on the one side of which was the area of the Whites, on the other - the Indians, originated in North America. Frontiers officially appeared in 1763, after the Great Revolt of Pontiac. Frightened by the scope of Indian resistance, the British government banned the colonists' illegal occupation of Indian lands to the west of an imaginary line that stretched for thousands of miles from north to south along the Appalachian Mountains. However, the settlers did not comply with the royal decree and continued to move westward. Together with them moved the Frontier. After the American Revolution of 1775-1783, unauthorized development of Indian lands by the so-called squatters continued, which led to repeated clashes between settlers and local tribes.

U.S., however, tried to avoid wars involving regular troops, and acted smarter. Territorial issues were decided on a contractual basis, so authorities formally recognized Indian landowners. However, this foundation had a "double bottom." Land concessions were imposed on Indians by any means. Sometimes it was enough to bribe or alcoholise some chiefs that they gave up possessions of their tribes in favour of the Whites. If it was impossible to fraudulently obtain the desired land, the Americans created an appearance of fair and equal relations with the Indians. Negotiations with them normally proceeded on one and the same scenario. White leaders said something to the following effect: "Some bad white people had already settled in your land, and we cannot drive them back. You need to sign the contract and give up this part of the land. But the remaining land will be recognized as the property of the tribe, and no White will ever appear on it without your permission." The Indians did not want war and agreed to those conditions. The Frontier became official, and all the land of the free tribes received the status of Indian Territory, which was not within the jurisdiction of the United States. (At the same time, for example, it did not prevent the United States from buying in 1803 giant Louisiana, which was in fact an Indian Territory. But the tribes living there, did not even know about the transaction.)

For any Indian chief the observance of treaties and obligations was a matter of honour. Therefore, the Indians, agreeing to land concessions, never violated agreements unilaterally (except in cases where the sale of land had taken place without the consent of the tribe). At the same time, the US violated 99% of all contracts concluded with the Indians, nearly each of the over 350 treaties were broken. The settlers continued to seize land illegally, more and more advancing Frontier into Indian territory. In response, Indians went on the warpath, whereupon the army stood up for colonists, and wars began. Sooner or later, Indians were defeated, and then under the muzzles of guns they were forced to give up another "portion" of their land. That

amounted to a new contract, and after a few years, the situation repeated itself. Finally, Indians were pushed off into unwanted and unusable lands, barren reservations.

Tecumseh, a Native American leader of the Shawnee and a large tribal confederacy chief tried to put an end to the invasion of American settlers. During the Anglo-American War of 1812-1814, Tecumseh's confederacy allied with the British and helped in the capture of Fort Detroit. Prior to the raid, Chief Tecumseh delivered a powerful speech upon a rock that is preserved to this day at Fort Malden. After the U.S. Navy took control of Lake Erie in 1813, the Native Americans and British retreated. American forces caught them at the Battle of the Thames and killed Tecumseh in October 1813. As the prominent leader of the Anglo-American War was killed, the Indian hopes were dashed. Tecumseh left many eloquent notes, among which: "Where today are the Pequot? Where are the Narragansett, the Mohican, the Pokanoket, and many other once powerful tribes of our people? They have vanished before the avarice and the oppression of the White Man, as snow before a summer sun. Will we let ourselves be destroyed in our turn without a struggle, give up our homes, our country bequeathed to us by the Great Spirit, the graves of our dead and everything that is dear and sacred to us? I know you will cry with me, 'Never! Never!'"

There were malicious acts on the part of white settlers. Thus the Puritans of New England, in 1703, by decrees of their assembly set a premium of £40 on every Indian scalp and every captured Redskin; in 1720 a premium of £100 on every scalp was offered; in 1744, after Massachusetts Bay had proclaimed a certain tribe as rebels, premiums were set even for scalps of women and children. Some decades later, the colonial system took its revenge on the descendants of the "Pilgrim Fathers", who had grown seditious in the meantime. At English instigation and for English pay they were tomahawked by Redskins. The British Parliament



The Cherokee Trail of Tears

proclaimed bloodhounds and scalping as "means that God and Nature had given into its hand."⁵⁵

The Whites loathed the presence of the Redskins next to them. While in South America, colonists more or less reconciled to the proximity of the local population and often had mixed families, (which was termed "miscegenation"- "interbreeding of races"⁵⁶), the North American

⁵⁵Marx C. Capital Vol. 1, Ch. 31.

⁵⁶According to etymonline.com, the term was coined irregularly in American English in 1864. However, it has been broadly used by British politicians, scientists, historians. "Miscegenation" is still used disapprovingly in quite

settlers cleansed occupied territories. While the Spanish practised *encomiendas* - divisions of communities and bestowal of them upon would-be Spanish masters, English settlers passed legislation that "banished forever" mixed race couples. From the late 17th c. onwards anti-miscegenation laws began to operate in the United States. In 1776, seven out of the Thirteen Colonies that declared their independence enforced laws against interracial marriage. These laws, abolished only in 1967, played a large role in defining racial identity and enforcing the racial hierarchy in the USA.

With the election of Andrew Jackson for US president, truly dark times came for the tribes east of the Mississippi. In 1830, the Indian Removal Act was passed by Congress. The law authorized the president to negotiate with Indian tribes in the Southern United States for their removal to federal territory west of the Mississippi River in exchange for their ancestral homelands. The act enjoyed strong support from the non-native peoples of the South, who were eager to gain access to lands inhabited by the Five Civilized Tribes. While Native American removal was in theory voluntary, in practice great pressure was put on Native American leaders to sign removal treaties. Most observers, whether they were in favour of the Indian removal policy or not, realized that the passage of the act meant the inevitable removal of most Indians from the states. Some Native American leaders who had previously resisted removal now began to reconsider their positions, especially after Jackson's landslide re-election in 1832. The Removal Act paved the way for the forced expulsion of tens of thousands of American Indians from their traditional homelands to the West, setting them on the "Trail of Tears" - forced resettlement of native populations. Affected tribes included the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, Iroquois, Shawnee, Winnebago and other tribes. The first removal treaty signed after the Removal Act was the Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek on September 27, 1830, in which Choctaws in Mississippi ceded land east of the river in exchange for payment and land in the West. The Treaty of New Echota, signed in 1835, resulted in the removal of the Cherokee on the Trail of Tears. On their way along this Trail of Tears from Georgia to Oklahoma about 4,000 members of the tribe perished.

The Seminoles and other tribes, along with fugitive slaves, resisted the removal. The heroic Second Seminole War lasted from 1835 to 1842 and resulted in the defeat of the Seminoles. Only a small number of them survived, around 3,000 were killed in the war. After that war almost all the territory east of the Mississippi had been cleared of the native population. The American government allowed the surviving Seminoles to remain in the south Florida swamplands. The writer Thomas Mayne Reid in his "Osceola the Seminole", written soon after the Seminole Indian Wars, depicts many of those historical events quite accurately.

After the war 1835-1842 the Mississippi was recognized as "permanent Indian border." Behind it stretched an endless wild prairie, where the last free Indian tribes found shelter. However, the Whites once again violated the border and streamed onto the prairie. The first victim of colonization among the steppe tribes was the Pawnee - they repeatedly conceded their land to newcomers. But such tribes as the Dakota (Sioux), Cheyenne, Arapaho, Utah, Apache, Comanche and Kiowa offered stubborn resistance to the Americans, which reached its peak in the 60-70 of the 19th century.

Yet the movement of settlers into the West was implacable and somewhat reminiscent of carpet bombing - the only difference being that in a certain area not enemy targets were destroyed, but the living space of indigenous inhabitants captured. During this period, the US

respectable sources, say, in the entry "Colonial India" of Wikipedia the authors state that "In 1510 (a Portuguese commander) Afonso de Albuquerque conquered the city of Goa, which had been controlled by Muslims. He inaugurated the policy of marrying Portuguese soldiers and sailors with local Indian girls, the consequence of which was a great miscegenation in Goa and other Portuguese territories in Asia." http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Colonial_India (retrieved April 24 2015).

military and settlers devised a cynical slogan: "The only good Indian is a dead Indian." (the slogan was allegedly coined by Philip Henry Sheridan, a United States Army officer and Union general).

The fight against recalcitrant tribes of the Great Plains was a difficult challenge for the United States. To solve the problem once and for all, the Americans used against the Indians unprecedented punitive measures: they purposefully destroyed the huge herds of bison, or buffalo, the hunt for which was the steppe tribes' basis of life. Thus, the above-mentioned American general Philip Henry Sheridan conceived the following strategy: in the Winter Campaign of 1868–69 he attacked the Cheyenne, Kiowa, and Comanche tribes in their winter quarters, taking their supplies and livestock and killing those who resisted, driving the rest back into their reservations. Later, "to pacify" the Indians of the Great Plains, he sent professional hunters, who trespassed on Indian land and killed the bison. With over 4 million bison killed by 1874, Sheridan applauded: "Let them kill, skin and sell until the buffalo is exterminated." By the end of the 19th c. the buffalo were almost totally destroyed: less than one thousand of them remained.

The authors of Microsoft Encarta Reference Library (2001) write: "Although the introduction of new diseases was the main cause of the rapid decline of indigenous populations, other reasons were genocidal warfare, massive relocations and removals of Native Americans from their homelands, and the destruction of traditional ways of life. With white encroachment on their land, Native Americans no longer had access to their traditional hunting, gathering, and farming areas. Their subsistence patterns broke down, leading to malnutrition and greater susceptibility to disease. Relocation to new areas, often among hostile Indian tribes that were already living there, meant that people demoralized by their circumstances had to establish new subsistence patterns as well as come to terms with their forced dependency.

By 1900, these factors, along with increased mortality and decreased fertility, had reduced the North Native American population from its 16th c. 2-12 million⁵⁷ to its lowest point of only about 250,000 (actually, 237,000) people in the United States and about 100,000 in Canada." Today, Latin America is home to 30-49 million Indians, in North America there are 2.48 million in the United States (according to the Census of 2000) and 805,000 in Canada (Census of 1996) - (from Encarta 2001).⁵⁸

The Boston Tea Party

Between 1763 to 1775, successive British governments took decisions which resulted in the loss of the 13 rebellious colonies in America. The British victory in the Seven Years' War had been costly in human and financial terms. In 1763, George Grenville, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, reckoned that Britain's budget deficit was in excess of £122 million. Desperate to find new sources of revenue, Grenville looked to the colonies and viewed from cash-strapped London, the North American settlements were very attractive. In 1763, the average Briton paid 26 shillings per annum in taxes whilst a Massachusetts taxpayer contributed one shilling each year to imperial coffers. Americans, British officials reasoned, benefited from the protection afforded by the British army and the Royal Navy. France might at any moment try to regain her footing; and it seemed only fair that the colonists should contribute to their own defence.

⁵⁷The first figure is cited, e.g. by Douglas Uberlaker, the second (more traditional) – by Ward Churchill, other scholars suggest numbers in between these.

⁵⁸In pre-Columbian America (before 1492), estimates for the Indian population range from 40 million to 90 million for all of the Americas, and from 2 million to 18 million for the aboriginal population north of present-day Mexico.

Greenville therefore proposed that America should maintain a force of 10,000 men to be partly paid for by a stamp tax on legal documents.

So, Parliament adopted a Stamp Act in March of 1765. Under the terms of the Act, scheduled to take effect on 1 November, almost anything formally written or printed would have to be on special stamped paper for which a tax must be paid. Among the items covered by the tax were wills, deeds, diplomas, almanacs, advertisements, bills, bonds, newspapers, playing cards and even dice. Anyone who was involved in any legal transactions, purchased a newspaper or pamphlet or accepted a government appointment would have to pay the tax. In short, the Stamp Act would affect nearly all Americans. Grenville intended, with the full agreement of Parliament, that the Stamp Act should not only raise revenue, it should clearly demonstrate that the British government through Parliament exercised political sovereignty over the colonies.

Now, Britain's American colonies had very different origins and traditions: the northern, or New England, had been founded by Puritans; in the extreme south -Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia — there was a slave-owing aristocracy; while in the centre there were the resins of the old Dutch settlements conquered in the reign of Charles II, and a distinctly Roman Catholic colony like Maryland. They had enough political freedom, but the Mother Country regulated their trade to her own advantage: the colonists were compelled to accept imports, including the most necessary commodities, only from England; that they should manufacture for themselves articles manufactured in England was considered out of the question. At the same time, smuggling was exceedingly common, and a very large, though illegal trade was thus being earned on with the French and Spanish Indies.

And by the taxation the king and the English were determined to assert their authority over the colonies; the colonists were equally determined to resist them. The stamps were seized and the courts were closed till the lawyers decided to disregard the Act altogether; merchants refused to import, and other citizens to use goods from England. The cry was raised that the taxation was tyranny; port dues were tolerable as an external charge, but the Stamp Act must be resisted. The contention was illogical, but logic is not always the best test of government.

The trouble with America gave the king one more excuse for getting rid of his ministers; Grenville was replaced by the Marquis of Rockingham, an honourable but rather incapable Whig, who was regarded by George III merely as a degree less unpleasant than his predecessor. The party now organized under the name of the "king's friends", did not hesitate to intrigue against the new ministry. Pitt stood aloof — he was as opposed to government by party as George himself— but supported Rockingham and his secretary, Edmund Burke, in repealing the Stamp Act. The declaration of Parliament's right to tax the colonies which accompanied the repeal, kept suspicion alive in America.

The ministry, attacked on its general policy by Pitt and disliked by the king, soon fell; its place was taken by one formed by Pitt himself, now created Earl of Chatham. But bad health prevented him from taking any active part in politics, and he resigned in 1768, but in 1767 his Chancellor of the Exchequer had created fresh trouble with America by imposing import duties on glass, paper, paints, and tea. The revenue expected from the new source was trifling; it was earmarked for use of America, and the colonies accepted the principle of external taxation. But political principles are never fixed, and the colonists now demanded that if they were to be taxed, they should be "taxed by their own Assemblies." By the time when Chatham sent in his resignation his ministry was composed almost entirely of Tories.

"We will not allow the British Parliament to thrust their hands into our pockets," said the colonists. They wanted to control their own taxation. Sooner than give way, the colonists resolved to fight. For nearly three years there was continual friction between the English authorities and the colonists.

In 1773 a riot, later called Boston Tea Party, broke out in Boston, which led to more serious developments. A number of men disguised as Indians boarded some tea-ships in Boston Harbour

and emptied their cargo, valued at 18,000 into the sea. The governments now headed by North, carried out the king's wishes by making Salem the capital of the province and closing Boston harbour; at the same time the charter of Massachusetts was altered in such a way as to give more power to the Government and to the Crown. This event was called "The Boston Tea Party."

The colonists were now thoroughly roused; a congress held at Philadelphia of all the colonies except Georgia denied the English right of taxation and decided to break off commercial dealings with this country (1774). This decision was not approved by all the colonists, as was seen later, when 20,000 men joined the English army. At last, after the congress, North passed a resolution compromising difficulty by offering America self-taxation, while maintaining Parliamentary authority. It was too late, because at that very moment the colonists were preparing for war. It began in the spring of 1775 with a skirmish at Lexington between the royal troops under General Gage and the American militiamen. The immediate result was another congress at Philadelphia, which rejected North's proposals and appointed George Washington as commander-in-chief of the army it proceeded to organize.

Extracts from the letter of Benjamin Franklin to his friend in England.

"Philadelphia, July 7th, 1775.

- Dear friend! "

The congress met at a time when all minds were so exasperated by General Gage's attack on the country people that propositions for attempting an accommodation were not much relished, and it has been with difficulty that we have carried another humble petition to the crown, to give Britain one more chance, one opportunity more of recovering the friendship of the colonies, which, however, I think she has not sense enough to use, and so I conclude she has lost them for ever.

She has begun to burn our port towns. She may doubtless destroy them all... No tradesman out of Bedlam ever thought of increasing the number of his customers by knocking them on the head; or of making them to pay their debts by burning their houses.

If England wishes to have us as subjects, and that we should submit to her, she is now giving us such miserable specimen of her government that we shall ever detest and avoid it as an example of robbery, murder, famine, and fire... Enough has happened., one would think, to convince your ministers that the Americans will fight, and that this is a harder nut to crack than they imagined...

We have now an army on the establishment... My time was never more fully occupied. In the morning at six I am at the committee of safety, appointed by the assembly to put the province in a state of defence; which committee holds till nine, when I am at the congress, and that sits till after four in the afternoon. ... It will scarce be believed in England that men could be as diligent with us from zeal, for the public good, as with you for thousands per annum. Such is the difference between uncorrupted new states and corrupted old ones. "

Comprehension questions

1. George III and the policies during his reign.
2. The industrial revolution: conditions and background.
3. Technical inventions.
4. Social relations after the industrial revolution.
5. The American colonies: New England in the 16th-17th c. White settlers and Native Americans.
6. Frontiers.
7. The decline of Indian tribes. Causes: driving off their lands, epidemics, wars, extermination of buffalo and deer, etc.
8. White settlers' pressure on the Indian population in the 18th-19th cc.
9. The Boston Tea Party.

Names and expressions

he never talked to a minister except standing — он всегда разговаривал с любым министром исключительно стоя

when they were not at the bench — когда они не были в суде (при исполнении обязанностей)

for their own good — для их блага

Bute [bju:t]

Martinique [,ma;ti'ni:k] — Мартиника

Rodney, George Bridges (1719-1702) — English admiral.

Philippines ['filipi:nz]

the peace was anything but popular — мир ни в малейшей степени не был популярным (был каким угодно, только не популярным)

Grenville, George (1712-1770) — Гренвиль

Wilkes, John ['wilks] (1727-1797) — Уилкс

Virginia — Виргиния (Вирджиния)

Carolina — Каролина

port dues — портовая пошлина

Burke, Edmund - Бёрк (1729-1797)

Chatham — Чатам

import duties — пошлина на ввоз

Hargreaves, James — Харгривз (?-1778)

Watt, James [wot] — Уатт (1736-1819)

sooner than give way — чем уступить, предпочитали

Salem ['seilem] — Салем

Franklin, Benjamin (1706-1790)

in a state of defence — в состоянии обороны

for the public good — для общественного блага

per annum — ежегодно, в год (лат.)

14. AMERICAN REVOLUTION, OR THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR OF

1775-1783


In 1775, war broke out between the British and the American colonists. By 1776, the colonists had declared themselves independent and in 1783, following a prolonged and bloody war, Britain was forced to recognise the independence of the United States.

By 1775, the American populace, with some exceptions, were won over by the idea of American Rights and eventually revolution. By May 20th, a crowd of 4,000 appeared in the State House Yard in Philadelphia to demonstrate popular support for independence. Most states sent delegates to Philadelphia with instructions to vote for independence. The debate in Congress was to try to get Middle States and the Carolinas to be unanimous. Some judges and towns had already declared independence or sent governors packing. Pennsylvania's western counties rose in a militia that numbered tens of thousands. Philadelphia also armed as of 1775.

Loyalism had some proponents in Middle States, Quakers, Scots, French Indian War Veterans with British land grants, merchants and elites with British business or commissions, but never a full third across the Continent. In New England, planter Virginia, or in Scots-Irish enclaves, it would be hard to find support for King and Parliament at all. Americans avidly read the pamphlet "Common Sense" of the English radical Thomas Paine and pushed their colonies to declare independence and form state governments. Paine argued that the colonies should declare

themselves independent because “there is something very absurd, in supposing a continent to be perpetually governed by an island.” Colonists formed militias and took arms against British soldiers, whom they considered violators of their American rights. Before the declaration was signed, the two most powerful colonies were Virginia and Massachusetts. The war began in Massachusetts; troops from New England were gathered to the neighbourhood of Boston almost spontaneously. The Second Continental Congress (July 2, 1776) resolved that the colonies ought to be put in position of defence, and the first practical step for this was the selection of George Washington as Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces of the United Colonies. He refused any salary. He accepted the position, asking "every gentleman in the room" to remember that he did not believe himself to be equal to the command and accepted it only as a duty. On the 3rd of July Washington took command of the forces

George Washington (1732-1799) was the first president of the United States and one of the Founding Fathers of the United States, together with John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison. George descended from John, who had taken land at Bridges Creek, Virginia. Of Washington's early life little is known. His education was only elementary, except in mathematics, in which he was largely self-taught. Although Washington had throughout his life a good deal of official contact with the French, he never mastered their language. But there must have been some careful reading of good books, because he acquired a dignified and effective English style. Washington left school in the autumn of 1747. The next three years were spent in the service as a surveyor of his relative's property, and an appointment as public surveyor soon followed. In October 1753, on the eve of the last French and Indian war, Washington was chosen as the agent to warn the French away from their new posts on the Ohio, in Western Pennsylvania. Shortly after his return he was appointed lieutenant-colonel of a Virginia regiment. Here he showed for the first time that fiery energy which always lay hidden beneath his calm exterior. He ranged the whole field on horseback, making himself the target for Indian bullets, and saved the expedition from the annihilation. After his return, Washington was commissioned commander of the Virginia forces, at twenty-three years old. In the winter of 1757 his health broke down, but in the next year he had the pleasure of commanding the advance guard of the expedition under General John Forbes which occupied Fort Duquesne and renamed it Fort Pitt. At the end of the year the war in Virginia was at the end. For the next fifteen years Washington's life at Mount Vernon, where he made his home after his marriage, was that of a typical Virginia planter of the prosperous sort. His attitude towards slavery does not seem to differ much from that of many other planters of that day; he did not think highly of the system, but had no repugnance to it, and saw no way of getting rid of it. Like others of the dominant planter class in Virginia, Washington was repeatedly elected to the House of Burgesses. He was present on the 20th of May, 1765, when Patrick Henry introduced his famous resolutions against the Stamp Act. He was the richest man of the period (\$525 million, by modern estimate). Most of this wealth can be traced to his success as a land speculator, an enterprise that grew out of his early career as land surveyor. Added to that was his firsthand experience of the frontier country beyond the Allegheny Mountains gained during the French and Indian War. The area's potential, strategically and economically, was the key that opened the door to financial opportunity.



Encarta Encyclopedia, Art Resource, NY/(p) 1992 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved.

assembled for action against the British garrison in Boston.

The battle at the Bunker Hill took place on June 17, 1775. It was a decisive victory for General Gage; it enabled him to hold Boston for nearly a year, but it also convinced him that the war would not prove such an easy matter as most people in England believed. On September 1, 1775 George III sent a personal message to Catherine II of Russia. Playing on the monarchist feelings of the Empress, the King in lofty terms asked for Russian troops to quell the rebellion in the American colonies. However, England's efforts to find an ally in Russia failed.

George Washington highly estimated this move. However, Washington had a difficult task before him; his troops were irregular volunteers, unused to the restraints of discipline and divided by local jealousies. Luckily, he was a born organizer, and by strength or will succeeded not only in keeping his men together, but in

dominating the irresponsible committees of Congress. He was greatly helped by the policies of waiting of General Gage and his successor, General Howe, who thought the troops under their command too few to risk any very active measures. As a matter of fact, the standing army was so small that the home government in Britain had to buy soldiers from the petty German princes, a

measure unpopular enough in England, but regarded in America as a good pretext for publishing the Declaration of Independence (1776), written by Thomas Jefferson.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal", — was it written in the Declaration, — "that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, and they all have in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States.

He (the King) is at this time transporting large armies of foreign mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the head of a civilized nation.



Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826) wrote most of the text of the Declaration of Independence, which reflected Jefferson's interest in the political philosophy of John Locke as well as other Enlightenment thinkers. The eloquence of the language is his own.

We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in general Congress assembled, appealing to the supreme judge of the world do in the name and by authority of me good people of these colonies are, and of right ought to be, Free and Independent States; and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, and to do all other acts and things, which Independent States, may of right do. And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honour."

Earlier in the year the British had evacuated Boston, and the struggle now centred on the possession of New York. When William Howe, Commander-in-Chief of the British forces, was joined by his brother Richard Howe and the fleet, Washington had to retire, and the town was occupied by the English. Washington, with a dispirited, ill-fed, and almost mutinous army, retreated into Pennsylvania, while Howe, instead of attacking him or marching on Philadelphia, went into winter quarters. Re-crossing the Delaware on Christmas Day, Washington cut off a German outpost at Trenton in a night attack, and shortly afterwards captured three British regiments at Princetown; but his defeat at Brandy wine Creek gave Howe a possibility to occupy Philadelphia. Washington passed the winter in camp of Valley Forge; his army was less than three thousand men, and they had very little of food and other supplies. Yes, the winter of 1777-1778 was dreadful, but in spite of the misery of his men all went to show that Washington's public character had been hardened to its permanent quality. "These are times that try men's souls," wrote Thomas Paine at the beginning of 1776, but Washington had no need to fear the test.

Elsewhere the colonists were more successful: certainly, their scheme for the invasion of Canada had come to nothing, and General Burgoyne, after expelling them from Ticonderoga had decided to join forces with Clinton, who was on his way from New York. But when he crossed the Hudson River, he found himself cut off by a superior force; there was nothing for him but to surrender with his whole army to General Gates at Saratoga (1777).

Burgoyne's surrender was the turning-point of the war, for it decided the success of Franklin's embassy to France for help against England. The French government hesitated no longer; it made an alliance with the United States of America, whose independence they recognized. The war between England and France was at once declared; Spain and the United Netherlands soon joined France.

After France and Spain declared themselves on the side of the colonists, the British government again turned to Catherine II of Russia, but was again refused. Catherine had long been anxiously watching the rising naval power of England and strongly opposed her attempts to declare the ports of France and Spain in a state of siege. British warships had illegally tried to inspect all neutral merchant ships that went to these countries for the purpose of seizure of contraband of war. In response to the British claims, Catherine in 1780 sent the Declaration of Armed Neutrality to other Governments. Although the basic idea of this declaration had already been expressed in the past, Russia was the first state that decided to actually implement the new principles of maritime law in international practice. Russia, Denmark, Sweden formed the First League of Armed Neutrality aimed at protection of shipping of neutral countries against the British claims for search of their vessels.

All these events led to a curious situation in England. Chatham⁵⁹ proposed peace with America on any terms in order to concentrate all the strength against the foreign enemy (France); the Rockingham party suggested that the best policy was to prevent the Franco-American alliance by acknowledgement of American independence, Lord North passed an Act to repeal the tea duty, and to send commissioners to America with power to make any concessions except independence. The commissioners were sent, but Congress refused to listen to them. The king and the majority of the English were in favour of continuing the war. Chatham, who, if the king had let him form a new ministry, might have found a way out, died in the act of protesting against "the dismemberment of this ancient and most glorious monarchy."

The American war was decided by sea-power. If England yielded its command of the sea, American independence was assured. With France and Spain fighting for the U.S. and the First League of Armed Neutrality as their direct ally, this victory was very possible. The rival fleets, in the summer of 1781, were watching one another in the West Indies. De Grasse, the French admiral, had a larger number of ships. So long as the English squadron in the north was strong enough to protect him, Clinton at New York could communicate by sea with Cornwallis at Yorktown; but when de Grasse eluded Admiral Hood and broke through, Cornwallis was isolated and had to surrender to Washington, who was attacking him on the land side. New York was now the only English foothold, but no reinforcements could come in. The war now resolved itself into a naval struggle between the allies of France and England. Minorca fell early in 1782, and Gibraltar was hard pressed.

England was in dire straits. It was clear that she had lost her former colony, and desperately tried to preserve her title of the mistress of the seas. In 1782, Rodney won the Victory of the Saints. After the fall of Yorktown, Hood and de Grasse had both sailed from Martinique to meet him. But Rodney, who had now joined Hood, went off in pursuit, to engage, and if possible, defeat de Grasse before he could reach the Spaniards. He was successful. When towards the end of the same year Howe relieved Gibraltar, the Allies and England, where Rockingham was now Prime Minister, were glad enough to consider proposals for peace; it was signed in Versailles in 1783, and arranged for the recognition of American Independence and the restoration of most conquests by both sides.

Washington retired to Mount Vernon. By this time, the popular canonization of that man had begun. He occupied a position in American public life and in the American political system,

⁵⁹ William Pitt, 1st Earl of Chatham


which no man could possibly hold again. When the Federal Convention met at Philadelphia in May 1787 to frame the constitution, Washington was present as a delegate from Virginia, and a unanimous vote at once made him the presiding officer. He approved the constitution, believing, as he said, "that it was the best constitution which could be obtained at that epoch, and that this or dissolution awaits our choice, and is the only alternative." When the time came to elect a president, there was no hesitation: no one thought of any other person except George Washington in connection with this duty. The unanimous vote of the electors made him the first president of the United States.

Comprehension questions

1. George Washington's early biography.
2. The situation in the American colonies in 1775-1776.
3. The American army under Washington and the British army under Gage and Howe.
4. Washington and Howe's manoeuvres.
5. Colonists' victory at Saratoga and its outcome.
6. Describe the struggle of Britain and Americans and their allies on the sea.
7. The recognition of American Independence and Washington's election the first president of the United States.

Names and expressions

- he never mastered their language** — он так и не овладел их языком
marked for life — отметила его на всю жизнь
lieutenant-colonel — лейтенант-полковник
his health broke down — здоровье его ухудшилось
Mount Vernon — Маунт Вернон, городок на р. Потомак в 15 милях от теперешнего Вашингтона
was that of — was the life of
he did not think highly of the system — он был не особенно высокого мнения об этой системе
House of Burgesses — орган местного самоуправления, вроде магистрата
not to be equal to the command — недостойн командовать.
only as a duty — только в качестве долга
the home government — т. е, правительство Англии
the Delaware — Делавэр, река, начинается около Нью-Йорка
Brandywine Creek ['brendiwain kri: k]
Bisrigoyne, John [b3:'goin] (1722-1792)
Ticonderoga [tikande'rouga] — Тикондерога, укрепленный форт
The Hudson — Гудзон
Saratoga — Саратога
the tea duty — пошлина на ввоз чая
Versailles — Версаль



15. WILLIAM PITT THE YOUNGER AND THE SOCIO-POLITICAL SITUATION IN EARLY 19th C. BRITAIN. FRENCH REVOLUTION (1789)

William Pitt the Younger (1759-1806), Chatham's son, accepted office on George III's persuasion. He was prime minister of Great Britain in 1783-1801 and 1804-1806. He

is acclaimed by many British as the man who restored Britain's confidence and prosperity after the American Revolution, "a resolute leader of the nation in war against France."

The first thing he did in office was to bring in an India Bill. By it the East India Company retained most of its patronage of India, while a Board of Control, appointed by the government, supervised its political side — an arrangement which lasted till 1858.

Socio-political situation in early 19th c. Britain

By the end of the 18th c. the population of England was eight million while only 160 thousand had the vote. Those 160 thousand were "the cream of society" who never soiled their hands with work. The industrial bourgeoisie had no access to voting let alone the petty bourgeoisie or workers. The system of "rotten boroughs" had become proverbial. The lords, owners of estates from times immemorial entitling them to voting sold the seats in Parliament to the highest bidder, so that one hundred and twenty-eight lords appointed 245 members of the House of Commons; there was a lord who appointed nine MPs. The ones to buy the seats from the lords were mostly the speculators made rich by colonial robbery, representatives of the highest commercial aristocracy, etc. But mostly it was the landed aristocracy which monopolized the power, and for them the Corn Laws were an enormous asset, for keeping bread prices artificially high, it also kept land rents high accordingly which was what the great landowners wanted.

It was the Corn Bill that showed the bourgeoisie who had been content so far to be allowed to mind its own business of money-making and not interfere in the political life of the country such as law making and Parliament debates, that this very same political activity might matter a lot for their money-making possibilities. The Corn Laws might benefit the land-owning lords and the commercially minded aristocracy, but they hit the industrial interest quite hard. High bread prices meant hungry workers and constant disturbance and riots and strikes and eventual necessity of raising the wages. And the trouble was, that there was an increasingly alarming political note sounded by the rioters. After Pitt's Combination Acts were passed in 1799 and 1800 by which trade unions were made illegal, class struggle became more violent than ever. While the strikes of protest were battles fought "with extreme bitterness" as historians remarked, the political note was not so threatening as it grew to be during the discussion of the Corn Bill in Parliament and after the Corn Law was passed. The people were beginning to realize that no amount of talking and protesting and rioting would be of any avail whatsoever until the state apparatus was an instrument of those who were intent on making money on the people's misery and pursuing their class interest. The movement of radicalism was developing, radical clubs, so-called Hampden clubs, were springing up everywhere.

There were two wings in the radical movement. The moderate or right wing was led by philosophers like Jeremy Bentham, James Mill, Francis Place. Theirs, if they were roughly summed up (for each had his own peculiar philosophy) was a utilitarian approach to the burning problems of the day. One was right if his conduct resulted in happiness for all concerned; the individual man was governed by two master motives, the pursuit of his own happiness and the avoidance of his own pain; hence all classes of population required an equal share of political power so that they could see to it that their individual happiness should be justly made possible in the course of deciding on some common policy, common action. The state, therefore, should move towards democracy. This uncomplicated if primitive philosophy, philistine in its essence, found response in the mind of the ever growing industrial bourgeoisie and was taught to the workers so that they could be used in the struggle for the Parliamentary reform which was the first step to democratization and a chance for the industrial bourgeoisie to take part in the pursuit of happiness which for the bourgeoisie meant growing wealth. For in the Benthamite philosophy of common sense and social contract expressed in the state as an organ designed to protect property, a Parliament that happened to protect the property of the landed aristocracy only, had

to be reformed by means of having the franchise extended to those who had property to protect. The method of reform was the only necessary and sufficient way of eradicating injustice and developing industry and trade on the free trade basis.

The left wing was headed by such petty-bourgeois democrats as Henry Hunt ("orator Hunt", as he was called by the people), Richard Carlyle, William Cobbett. The latter expressed the left radicals' ideas with the greatest fervour and directness. In his appeals to the labourers and operatives he urged political action, persistent struggle for Parliamentary reform, for voting rights as a key to the solution of all problems.

Cobbett managed by sheer force of will and wonderful perseverance to snatch an education and become a journalist founded a paper, "Weekly Political Register" in 1802. He was equally opposed to the frankly reactionary Tories and to the hypocritically liberal Whigs. His paper, soon to become a centre of British radicalism, appealed to the government to take urgent measures improving the workers' living standards. But the farmer in him always got the better of the thinker: his ideal was in the countryside, away from the ruthless civilization, the factories, where cooped up in airless workshops the workers pine and waste their lives; not that he underestimated the importance of political struggle; he thought it was absolutely necessary in the form of a struggle for a reform of Parliament, for universal suffrage, for a truly democratic Parliament.

Ireland and legislative independence

The troubles in America had not failed to react on Ireland, which, indeed, suffered from much the same commercial hardships and restrictions as had provoked the colonists. The war with America aggravated these hardships, for it ruined the Irish linen trade by closing its principal market and cut off the growing commercial connection with France. The great distress in Ireland compelled North's government to relax the restrictions; unfortunately, the relief was given in a niggardly spirit and did little to conciliate Ireland. But common grievances helped to soften religious hatred, and a small beginning was made by the Irish Parliament in alleviating the worst disabilities of the Catholics.

During the war there was fear of a French invasion, and the government had to give arms to 40,000 volunteers, Catholics as well as Protestants. The volunteers had proved their loyalty; they now demanded their reward, and North had to remove entirely all restrictions on Irish trade. Their victory made Irish more exacting; in 1780 Grattan proposed in the Irish Parliament, but was unable to carry, a declaration of legislative independence. Meanwhile the volunteers were still under arms, and in 1782, when America had practically won her cause, they made the same demand as Grattan. The Irish Parliament soon supported them. Rockingham's government gave way, and Ireland thus became almost an independent state.

While Grattan was working at the behalf of the Catholics in Ireland, their grievances were being considered in England. In 1778 a Bill was passed allowing English Catholics under certain conditions to become landowners, and freeing Catholic priests from danger of imprisonment. The same measure would have been extended to Scotland but there were violent Protestant riots there which prevented it. This fanaticism, in its turn, reacted on England, where in 1780 an agitation was set on foot by George Gordon, a crazy Member of Parliament, for the repeal of the Act recently passed. The "No Popery!" cry led to the sacking of Catholic chapels belonging to the foreign embassies, and the timidity of the government encouraged the mob to loot the houses of those who were in favour of toleration. For four days London was at the mercy of the rioters, prisons were broken open and the Bank of England was attacked. At last the king himself ordered the military to act, and quiet was at once restored. Seventy-two houses and four gaols had been destroyed; more than three hundred persons had been killed. George Gordon was acquitted, but twenty-one rioters were hanged.

In 1789 the king gave way, and Pitt's government found itself in a difficult position. The

ministry recognized as clearly as the Opposition that the Prince of Wales had the best claim for the regency; however, while Fox maintained that the prince's right was not subject to Parliamentary interference, Pitt not only held that Parliament had the sole right to appoint, but carried a Bill which conferred the Regency upon the Prince of Wales with definite restriction of his powers. The prince was a friend of Fox and a partisan of the opposition. Pitt retained office only by the timely recovery of the king.

The French Revolution

In 1789, the words "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" powerfully sounded over Europe for the first time. That was the main slogan of the French Revolution - one of the most interesting events in the world history. As British historians write, ruinous wars and careless finance had driven France into bankruptcy; a burden too heavy even for the whole nation to bear was quite intolerable when the aristocracy and clergy were exempt from their share. The States-General, summoned by Louis XVI — they had not met since 1614 — to consider the situation, resolved themselves into a National Assembly and began to question the whole system of government, quarrels between the different orders — nobles, clergy, and commons — had their effect on the Paris mob, which, putting into crude practice the teaching of philosophers like Voltaire and Rousseau, clamoured for the reconciliation of society on the basis of equality. The storming of the Bastille, the great state prison — the symbol of despotism— was the first act of revolutionary violence, which soon spread throughout the country; everywhere the aristocracy were attacked and their privileges with those of the clergy, abolished. It meant the fall of feudalism in France. The success of the American colonists had made a deep impression on Frenchmen; Lafayette and other volunteers returned home with a great admiration for the new Republic. That the prestige of monarchy had suffered was seen when the Paris mob marched on Versailles and compelled Louis XVI and his queen, Marie Antoinette, to accompany them as virtual prisoners to the Tuileries. It should be noted that the essence of the French bourgeois revolution was the struggle of the emergent banking conglomerate against the traditional aristocracy, to whom the republic as a form of political rule was much more preferable than monarchy.

The reaction of the French Revolution in England was at first generally sympathetic. Pitt was in favour of letting France work out her own salvation in her own way. In January 1790, Pitt said that "the present convulsions of France must sooner or later terminate in general harmony and regular order" and that "whenever the situation of France shall become restored, it will prove freedom rightly understood, freedom resulting from good order and good government; and thus circumstanced, France will stand forward as one of the most brilliant Powers in Europe." Fox and most of the Whigs were loud in approval; professed democratic and republicans like Tom Paine (1737-1809) hailed the new movement with delight; clubs and societies sprang up in many large towns, "avowedly afflicted to the democratic clubs in France"; in Birmingham and Sheffield there was a certain amount of rioting. But a statesman Edmund Burke denounced the Revolution from the first. To him it was not a revolution at all, in the sense of the term familiar to Englishmen from their own experience of 1688; it was, Burke maintained in his "Reflections on the French Revolution", not a remodelling of the constitution but a mere outbreak of anarchy to be repressed by all possible means. When in 1791 the National Assembly, which declared war on Prussia and Austria for supporting the exiled French aristocrats, Burke's denunciation began to tell; when in 1793 Louis XVI was sent to the guillotine, English goodwill was almost entirely alienated.

The war between France and England soon came about. Its chief cause was that the French Republic's victory over the Prussians and overrunning the Austrian Netherlands permitted her to occupy Belgium. The French Convention decided to open the Scheldt – the river in Holland which the Dutch had closed - to international commerce. They offered 'fraternity and assistance' to oppressed peoples, annexing Savoy and bringing the Revolution to conquered territories by

sequestering noble and ecclesiastical property. All this alienated the British and Dutch. England was a party to the previous treaties and was bound to uphold them against French aggrandizement. Besides, Britain's own existence too was at stake, as the Republic was "stirring up sedition in Britain." This was not made a pretext for war, although it led the government to unnecessarily harsh measures against agitators at home.

The French Convention declared war on England at the beginning of 1793. Pitt at once started to form a coalition, and before the end of the year succeeded in gaining the adhesion of Holland, Spain, Prussia and Austria. But although attacked by this formidable array of powers from without and handicapped by Royalist rising in La Vendee and Brittany, the Republic met with triumphant success. Step by step the Allies were driven back: the Austrians and Prussians had to retreat beyond the Sambre to the Rhine; the English had to abandon Holland, where in 1795 the French proclaimed a Batavian Republic. Only at sea did France suffer defeat. On the "Glorious First of June" Lord Howe won a great naval victory off Ushant; the Cape of Good Hope — a Dutch colony, but French possession after their proclamation of the Batavian Republic was captured; and some islands were taken in the West India.

The Convention had disappeared, after an orgy of slaughter known as the "Reign of Terror." The controlling power in France was now an oligarchy called Directory. Mob rule had been ended by Napoleon Bonaparte, a Corsican officer of artillery, who had dispersed an attack upon the Tuileries by his famous "whiff of grape shot". The Directory carried on the war with unabated vigour. While Moreau and Jourdan attacked Germany, Bonaparte himself was put in command of the army of Italy and proceeded to expel the Austrians from that country. Completely successful in this, he invaded Austria itself, and forced the Austrian Emperor to accept the Treaty of Campo Formio (1797).

Meanwhile the war had brought prosperity and distress to England. Her naval supremacy had increased the volume of trade, but bad harvests had increased the price of bread; starving men blamed the war for their troubles, and for a time there was a violent demand for peace. Famine served as a cloak for sedition, and the government hurriedly carried two unwise and unnecessary measures enlarging the definition of treason and limiting the freedom of holding public meetings. The agitation influenced Pitt in making overtures for peace in 1796; but when he was told that France would hold to all her conquests, there was nothing for it but to continue the war. The prospect was not encouraging; England's one remaining ally, Austria, was almost exhausted, and once Austria yielded England would be isolated; a probable invasion might complete her ruin. As a matter of fact, General Hoche attempted to invade Ireland in 1796, but his fleet was dispersed by storms. These fears caused a run on the Bank of England, which led the government to suspend cash payments.

Amid all this depression and gloom came the cheering news of Jervis's victory over the fleets of France and Spain off Cape St. Vincent (1797). The battle is memorable not only because it raised the courage of the British in a time of stress and crisis, but also because it destroyed Spain's reputation as a first-class maritime power, and gave Nelson, whose initiative had a large share in the victory, a place in the front rank of British Admirals.

Comprehension questions

1. Characterise William Pitt the Younger.
2. Speak on the socio-political situation in early 19th c. Britain
3. The Corn Law.
4. Radical liberals and petty-bourgeois democrats.
5. Ireland and attempt at its legislative independence
6. Protestant riots.
7. The French Revolution and the war with England.
8. Horatio Nelson and his handling the mutinies in the navy.

Names and expressions

- on the ground** — на основании
the Commons — Палата Общин
in a word — одним словом
Pitt, William, son (1759-1806)
had not failed — не преминули
to give arms — вооружить
Grattan, Henry ['grætən] (1746-1820) — Irish orator and statesman.
government gave way — правительство уступило
set something on foot — проводить в жизнь, положить начало
the "No Popery!" cry — крики "Долой папистов!"
the king gave way — король совсем сдал (здоровьем и рассудком)
the States-General — Генеральные Штаты
different orders — разные сословия
Bastille [bæ'sti:l] — Бастилия
Lafayette, Marie Joseph, etc. [ˌla: f(e)i'et] (1757-1834)
Tuileries [tju: il'ri:] — Тюильри
was at stake — было под угрозой
Ushant Island [u'ʃa: nt 'aɪlənd] (France)
Moreau, Jean Victor [mo:'rɔ] (1763-1813) — French General.
Jourdan, Jean Baptiste ['dʒo: da:n] (1762-1833) — Count, Marshal of France
there was nothing for it but — ничего не оставалось, кроме как...
San Juan de Nicaragua [sæn 'hwa: n də ,ni:kə 'ra:gwə]
he was brought to the death door — он был на волоске от смерти
Calvi [kəl'vi:]
he burned to win affection... — он весь горел желанием заслужить хорошее отношение...
Duncan, Adam ['dʌŋkən] (1731-1804)
Camperdown village [kæmpə'daun], N. Holland

16. IRELAND AND THE WAR. THE REBELLION OF 1798. THE ACT OF UNION



*Statue of Theobald Wolfe Tone (1763 – 1798) at Bantry, County Cork
Theobald Wolfe Tone is regarded as the father of Irish republicanism and leader of the 1798 Irish Rebellion.*

When the Peace of Amiens was signed — truce would be a better word, for Napoleon was not likely to stop the course of French aggrandizement — Pitt was no longer in office. To understand the reason of his resignation we must go back and describe the effect of the war on Ireland.

The grant of legislative independence had not united the nation as had been expected; the Catholics, who had had a large share in the victory and outnumbered the Protestants by twelve to one, were still excluded from Parliament. It is worth recalling that Protestants were largely descendants of the English and Scottish settlers planted in Ireland by the English government, and at the time they were still considerably fewer in number than the Catholic indigents. The Protestant minority's determination to keep all power to themselves had reawakened the religious feuds; Catholic

"Defenders" and Protestant "Peep-o'-Day Boys" were practically at war. The success of the French Revolution put new heart into the opposition; one more attempt was made to unite Irishmen in a national movement against a government, which was scandalously corrupt and ready to vote exactly as English bribery and English interests demanded.

In 1791 Wolfe Tone, a Protestant Dublin lawyer, founded the Society of the United Irishmen in Belfast with the definite object of breaking away from England altogether. This society, an organization of Republican democrats, functioned in 1791-1798. It included Protestants and Catholics among its members. The revolutionary elements of Ireland were positive in considering unity a key to independence. Wolfe Tone's idea, like that of many Irish revolutionaries, was separation of Ireland from England and proclaiming it a Republic. Their programme included radical reforms and universal suffrage. They fought for the abolition of aristocratic feudal privileges of the landlords and the Anglican church. However, they did not dare to demand that the landowning rights of the Irish bourgeoisie be abolished. They corresponded with the revolutionary leaders in France in the same way as did similar societies in England.

The branches of United Irishmen were soon founded in all Irish towns. Contrary to the English big bourgeoisie rushing into the arms of Tory reaction at the first signs of widening-popular movement, the shop owners and the bourgeois intelligentsia did not betray the movement but only moderated the United Irishmen's programmes.

Alarmed by Tone's success, Pitt, although he himself was interested in complete union with Ireland, persuaded the first Parliament to grant the Catholics with suffrage, while they were still excluded from Parliament and office. Grattan was opposed to the revolutionary movement, and he together with his supporters and followers — most of the Protestant and many of the Catholic gentry — hailed with satisfaction and hope the appointment of Earl Fitzwilliam as Lord Lieutenant (1795). But the English party in Ireland was too strong for any removal of Catholic disabilities by constitutional means; within two months Fitzwilliam was recalled, to the great disappointment of all Irish patriots.

His withdrawal was followed by the outbreak of religious war in Armagh in 1795. The Irish Catholics won a victory there. Protestants retaliated with the foundation of the Orange Order.⁶⁰ The United Irishmen now sent Wolfe Tone and Edward Fitzgerald to ask for French help. However, the expedition of General Hoche, sent by the Directory in 1796, was unsuccessful. But in the following year the government was confronted by a conspiracy in Ulster, purely political

⁶⁰The Loyal Orange Institution, more commonly known as the Orange Order, is a Protestant fraternal organisation based primarily in Northern Ireland. It was founded in County Armagh in 1795 – during a period of Protestant-Catholic sectarian conflict – as a Masonic-style brotherhood sworn to defend Protestant supremacy. Its name is a tribute to the Dutch-born Protestant king William of Orange, who defeated the army of Catholic king James II at the Battle of the Boyne (1690). Its members wear Orange sashes and are referred to as Orangemen. The Order is best known for its yearly marches, the biggest of which are held on 12 July ('The Twelfth'). Although strongest in Northern Ireland, the Order also has a significant presence in the Scottish Lowlands and lodges throughout the Commonwealth and United States. Politically, the Orange Order is a conservative British unionist organisation with links to Ulster loyalism. It campaigned against Scottish independence in 2014. The Order sees itself as defending Protestant civil and religious liberties, whilst critics have accused the Order of being sectarian, triumphalist and supremacist. It has also been criticised for associating with loyalist paramilitary groups. As a Protestant society, non-Protestants cannot become members unless they agree to adhere to the principles of Orangeism and convert, nor can Protestants get married to Catholics. Orange marches through mainly Catholic and Irish nationalist neighbourhoods have often led to violence

The opponents of the Order of Orange, the Society of United Irishmen, was formed by liberal Presbyterians and Anglicans in Belfast in 1791. It sought reform of the Irish Parliament, Catholic Emancipation and the repeal of the Penal Laws. By the time the Orange Order was formed, the United Irishmen had become a revolutionary group advocating an independent Irish republic that would "Unite Catholic, Protestant and Dissenter." In 1796, when United Irishmen activity was on the rise, the British government hoped to thwart it by backing the Orange Order from 1796 onward. Historians Thomas A. Jackson and John Mitchel argued that the government's goal was to hinder the United Irishmen by fomenting sectarianism – it would create disunity and disorder under pretence of "passion for the Protestant religion." Mitchel wrote that the government invented and spread "fearful rumours of intended massacres of all the Protestant people by the Catholics." Historian Richard R Madden wrote that "efforts were made to infuse into the mind of the Protestant feelings of distrust to his Catholic fellow-countrymen." Thomas Knox, British military commander in Ulster, wrote in August 1796 that "As for the Orangemen, we have rather a difficult card to play...we must to a certain degree uphold them, for with all their licentiousness, on them we must rely for the preservation of our lives and properties should critical times occur."

and chiefly Protestant in its nature, and by a general rising of the Catholic peasantry, almost entirely economic in its origin. Yet as might be expected, the Republicans of Ulster had really very little in common with the small cultivators in Leinster, who were finding the burden of the system intolerable.

The United Irishmen, which had stopped legitimate activities as a result of repressions and after 1794 acted clandestinely, became an underground centre of preparation for the 1797 anti-English rebellion. However, the cruelty of the government crushed out the conspiracy in Ulster. The leaders Edward Fitzgerald and Samuel Neilson were betrayed before the day appointed for the rising (May 23, 1798) and arrested. Theobald Wolfe Tone, the founding member of the United Irishmen and the father of Irish republicanism, was captured at Letterkenny port on 3 November 1798 and died sixteen days later in unclear circumstances. The rebellion was virtually left without leaders. Crucially, the British government foiled the planned rising in Dublin which was to be the central core of the planned rebellion.

One of the fervent rebels was young Robert Emmet (1778-1803), youngest son of Robert Emmet, physician to the lord-lieutenant of Ireland, a great patriot of Ireland. He was born in Dublin in 1778, and entered Trinity College in October 1793, where he had a distinguished academic career, showing special interest and abilities for mathematics and chemistry, and acquiring a reputation as an orator. But he removed his name from the college books in April 1798 without taking a degree, as a protest against the inquisitorial examination of the political views of the students conducted at the university. So, leaving a learned career, he turned to the political activity, he was at this time already to a great extent in the secrets of the United Irishmen — his brother Thomas Addis Emmet was one of the active leaders. One of Emmet's friends was Thomas Moore, also a student of the University in Dublin, afterwards a famous poet, author of series of little poems "Irish Melodies". One day Moore was playing on the piano the old melody "Let Erin remember", and Emmet started up exclaiming passionately, "Oh, that I were at the head of 20,000 men marching to that air!"

The rebellion had now resolved itself into a religious war, and although its nominal leader was Bagenal Harvey, a Protestant, the real force behind it were the Catholics, or "priests", as they were disparagingly called by the English. Wexford was occupied by the rebels, who had their headquarters at Vinegar Hill. An attack on New Ross was repulsed with heavy loss; a further defeat at Arklow decided the issue of the rebellion. There were some excesses in Leinster which alienated the Protestant Republicans of Ulster, and that province, already disarmed, gave no help to the rebels. So far, the Irish government had received no help from England, but after Arklow General Lake was reinforced by English troops; with these he defeated the rebels at



Robert Emmet

Vinegar Hill and stamped out all resistance with severity. When all was over the long-expected help arrived from France; General Humbert landed in Killala Bay with about a thousand men. Reinforced by the Irish, he attacked a superior force of 5,000 men at Castlebar and utterly routed it. However, when Lake met him with overwhelming numbers at Ballina he had to surrender.

The Irish made another attempt in 1802, when Emmet arrived in Ireland from France, and received information being in Dublin that seventeen counties were ready to take up arms if a successful effort was made in Dublin. For some time, Emmet remained concealed in his father's house making preparations. A large number of picks were collected and stored in Dublin during the spring of 1803, but firearms and ammunition were not plentiful. So, the attempt ended with no result.

Emmet made his escape; a detachment of soldiers dispersed his followers. After hiding for

some days in the mountains he went to the house of his bride, where on the 25th of August Emmet was seized and arrested. He was tried for treason and was hanged on the 20th of September 1803. Before his execution Emmet said in his famous speech that he did not want any inscription to be written on his grave, because he was not to be named till Ireland is free. And his friend, poet Thomas Moore, hinted at Robert Emmet in one of his "Irish Melodies":

"Oh! Breathe not his name; let it sleep in the shade
Where cold and unhonoured his relics are laid'
Sad, silent and dark, be the tears that we shed,
As the night-dew that falls on the grass o'er his head
But the night-dew that falls, tho' in silence it weeps,
Shall brighten with verdure the grave where he sleeps.
And the tear that we shed, tho' in secret it rolls,
Shall long keep his memory green in our souls."

In 1843, John Kells Ingram wrote a remarkable poem *The Memory of the Dead* commemorating the Irish rebels of 1798:

Who fears to speak of Ninety-Eight?
Who blushes at the name?
When cowards mock the patriots' fate,
Who hangs his head for shame?
He's all a knave or half a slave
Who slights his country thus,
But a true man, like you, man,
Will fill your glass with us.

We drink the memory of the brave,
The faithful and the few.
Some lie far off beyond the wave
Some sleep in Ireland, too;
All, all are gone, but still lives on
The fame of those who died
All true men, like you, men
Remember them with pride.

Some on the shores of distant lands
Their weary hearts have laid;
And by the stranger's heedless hands
Their lonely graves were made.
But though their clay be far away
Beyond the Atlantic foam;
In true men, like you, men,
Their spirit's still at home.

The dust of some is Irish earth
Among their own they rest;
And the same land that gave them birth
Has caught them to her breast.
And we will pray that from their clay
Full many a race may start
Of true men, like you, men,

To act as brave a part.

They rose in dark and evil days
To right their native land;
They kindled here a living blaze
That nothing shall withstand.
Alas! that might can vanquish Right
They fell and pass'd away;
But true men, like you, men,
Are plenty here today.

Then here's their memory--may it be
For us a guiding light,
To cheer our strife for liberty
And teach us to unite.
Through good and ill, be Ireland's still
Though sad as theirs your fate;
And true men, be you, men,
Like those of Ninety-Eight!
(From *Songs of Irish Rebellion*)

The danger to which the Empire had been exposed by the rebellion of 1798 persuaded Pitt to press for a real Union with Ireland. The chief obstacle to it was the Irish Parliament, which was not likely to vote for its own distraction, but by lavish bribery its opposition was at last bought off, and in 1800 the Act of Union of Britain with Ireland was passed. To strengthen the British control over Ireland the Irish parliament was abolished. Instead, four Irish bishops and twenty-eight elective Irish peers were given seats in the House of Lords, and a hundred Irish members were returned to the British House of Commons; commercial equality with England was ratified for Ireland; and the Established Church of Ireland was declared one with the Church of England. The Irish Catholics did not prevent the Union, and it was due to the fact that they were led to believe that it would be followed immediately by Catholic emancipation. Pitt supported their claims and proposed to his Cabinet a measure for relieving them from their disabilities. But the king had persuaded himself that such a measure would violate his coronation oath, and therefore absolutely refused to consider it.

All these events were not so easy for the Irish Patriots, of course; they felt themselves defeated and offended, and they did not want to lose their ancient culture. Many of the patriots were imprisoned and transported as convicts in awful conditions across the ocean. But in 1783, as we already know, England lost her colony America, following a prolonged and bloody war. And in 1787 King George III in his speech to Parliament announced that "a plan had been formed... for transportation a number of convicts in order to remove the inconvenience which arose from the crowded state of the gaols." So, Australia was "founded" on 26 January 1788 when the First Fleet of prisoners and their military gaolers landed at Sydney Cove. For the first fifty years or so of its existence "white Australia" was primarily an increasingly extensive gaol. So many members of the Ireland rioters were transported there.

In those days most people in Britain, as elsewhere, were illiterate, and newspapers were few and expensive. In large British cities the function of the modern popular daily was performed by street-ballads. These "broadsides" ballads on separate sheets of paper often gave the latest news of the day in even less accurate and more colourful form than is usual for modern evening newspapers. They wrote about murders, hangings, riots, and victories; the sailors of the street ballads sold their "copies" for penny each and sang their contents to the passers-by.

They sang:
 "The loss of America what can repay?
 New colonies seek for at Botany Bay."
 "For a general good make a general sweep,
 The beauty of life in good order to keep,
 With night-prowling hateful disturbers away,
 And send the whole tribe unto Botany Bay.
 Ye chiefs, who go out on this naval exploit,
 The work to accomplish, and set matters right,
 To Ireland be kind, call at Cork on your way,
 And take some White Boys unto Botany Bay."

Comprehension questions

1. The situation in Ireland at the turn of the 19th c.
2. Wolfe Tone and the Society of the United Irishmen.
3. The events in Ireland in 1795-1796.
4. The Order of Orange counter the Society of the United Irishmen.
5. The "conspiracy" in Ulster in 1797.
6. The rebellion of 1798 and the subsequent religious war.
7. Robert Emmet.
8. The Act of Union with Ireland of 1800. The disappointment of the Catholics.
9. The deportation of the Irish rebels and other convicts to Australia.

Names and expressions

outnumbered the Protestants by twelve to one — на двенадцать католиков приходился один протестант

"Peep-o'-Day Boys" — one of the revolutionary organisations in Ireland

put new heart — заново воодушевила

to break away from — отделиться от

Tone, Theobald Wolfe [təʊn 'θiəbo: ld wulf] (1763-1798) — Irish revolutionist

17. BRITISH ECONOMY AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE, INDUSTRIES AND PRICES IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Economic and social development of 18th c. Britain

During the 18th century very important changes were taking course in Britain. Ireland, owing to various causes, did not take much part in the industrial movement; but England and Scotland were rapidly becoming industrial and commercial countries.

This does not mean, of course, that agriculture was not still very important, but that an increasing number of people were employed in trade and manufacture, and that a larger proportion of the wealth of the country was produced and owned by commercial men. The result of this was that political power was gradually passing from the owners of the land — the landlords, the older nobility, and the country gentry — into the hands of a new class — the merchants, and ship-owners, and manufacturers.


Among the poorer classes of society, the separation between town and country became more and more marked. It was more profitable to collect workers in large factories in towns, than to search for them scattered in villages. On the other hand, as the towns grew in size, the people were no longer able to live just as in former days. These changes, though they led to a great

increase of the national wealth, did not make the people happier, either of the town, or in the country. Wealth, too, was even less evenly distributed, so the rich were becoming still richer, and the poor still poorer.

The growth of population in England during the 18th c. was remarkable. In 1790 the population was eight and a half million — that is to say, it was more than half as large as it had been seventy years before. But this growth took place in the towns, especially in the great towns of Yorkshire and Lancashire, and not in the country districts. It was quite natural if we remember the increase of manufactures, and the fact that they flourished most in the north, where coal and iron were at hand. The south and the east of England, which in the old days had been the most populous and important parts of the country, gave place to the north, which now became the great nursery of England's wealth.

During the earlier part of the 18th c., the agricultural labourer in Britain was in general better off than the peasant of France or of Germany, both countries being enfeebled by wars. But the improvement of agriculture and the growth of trade did not make him any good. On the contrary, his wages fell, while the price of food and other necessities rose. After 1750, the number of paupers increased in an alarming rate. The church during this period was not in a healthy condition. Too many of the clergy neglected their duties, especially in the far districts.

Woollen manufactory and cloth market



The homespun textile industry. Here, a view of workers preparing flax in Ulster. On the left, spinning the yarn; centre, boiling it; and right, reeling it for use. [Burke 1985]

(From "A Six Weeks' Tour through the Southern Counties of England and Wales " by Arthur Young, p. 130, London, 1769)

Witney is very famous for its woollen manufactory, which consists of what they call grey pieces, coarse bear skins, and blankets. The two first they make for the North American market; vast quantities are sent to the river St. Lawrence and likewise to New York. Their finest blankets, which rise in price to £3 a pair, are exported to Spain and Portugal; but all are sent to London first, in broad-wheel wagons, of which four or five go every week. The finest wools they work come from Herefordshire and Worcestershire and sell from 8 pennies to 10 pennies a pound.

The coarsest come from Lincolnshire; they call it daglocks; they are used for making the coarse bear skins. There are above 500 weavers in this town who work up 7000 packs of wool annually. Journeymen can earn from 10 shillings to 12 shillings a week all the year round, both summer and winter; but they work from four to eight, and in winter by candle light; the work is of that nature that a boy of fourteen earns as much as a grown-up man. The boy of seven or eight earns by quilling and cornering 1 shilling 6 pence and 1 shilling 8 pence a week, and girls the

same. Old women of sixty and seventy earn 6 pence a day, in picking and sorting the wool; a good stout woman can earn from 10 pence to 1 shilling a day by spinning, and a girl of fourteen 4 pence or 5 pence.

(From "A six months' Tour through the North of England" by Arthur Young, vol. I, p. 131, London, 1771)

The county between Wakefield and Leeds continues very beautiful; but the roads are stony and very ill-made. At this town, but more in the neighbourhood is carried on a vast manufacturing trade; Leeds cloth market is well known and has often been described. They make chiefly) broad cloths from 1 shilling 8 pence yard to 12 shillings, but mostly of 4 shillings 6 pence and 5 shillings. Good hands at this branch would earn about 10 shillings 6 pence a week the year round, if they were fully employed; but as it is, cannot make more than 8 shillings. This difference is a melancholy consideration.

A boy of thirteen or fourteen has about 4 shillings a week; some women earn by weaving as much as the men. The men at what they call the offal work, which is the inferior branches, such as picking rinting, etc, are paid a penny an hour. The spinning trade is constant, women earn about 2 shillings and a half or 3 shillings a week. Girls of thirteen or fourteen earn 1 shilling 8 pence a week. A boy of eight or nine can have two and a half pence a day; a boy of six years old 1 penny a day. The business of this town flourished greatly during the war, but lost much at the peace, and continued very languid till within these two years, when it began to rise again.

Prices

Much oat bread eat, 10 or 11 ounces for 1 penny. Butter 8 pence for 18 or 19 ounces.

Cheese 4 pence.

Mutton 4 pence.

Beef 4 pence.

Pork 4 pence.

Bacon 7 pence.

Veal 2.5 pence.

Milk — in summer 0.5 pence, in winter 1.5 or 2 pence a pint.

Manufacturers house rent — 40 shillings.

Their firing — 20 shillings.

The Supply of Timber

From "General View of the Agriculture of the County of Sussex," by A. Young, p. 84 (London, 1791)

Sussex has long been celebrated for the growth of its timber, principally oak. No other county can equal it in this respect, either in quantity or quality. It overspreads the Weald in every direction, where it flourishes with a great degree of luxuriance... Large quantities of beech are raised upon the chalk hills, and this tree also flourishes in great perfection. The great demand for oak bark has, of late years, been the cause of the large falls of oak, but, in consequence of the high price of bark, the trees rise so amazingly, that the fee simple of extensive and well-wooden tracks has been paid by the fall of timber and underwood in two or three years. Upon some estates in the western part of the county, the value of oak has increased 100 per cent in twelve years. When to this amazing increase in the value of wood is added the more easy communication to seaports than formerly from the improvements which have taken place in the roads, it is not surprising that the late falls have been so large, and that greater supplies have been brought to the dockyards than the county will be able to supply in future. The quantity now standing, of a size fit for the Royal Navy, compared to what it has been during half a century, is inconsiderable, and as there is no regular succession in reserve, it must follow that the supply will grow less and less each year.

Coalmining and iron manufacture

From "A Six Months' Tour", vol. III, p. 8

The people employed in the coal mines are prodigiously numerous, amounting to many thousands; the earnings of the men are from 1 shilling to 4 shillings a day and their firing. The coalwaggon roads, from the pits of the water, are great works, carried over all sorts of inequalities of ground, so far as the distance of nine or ten miles. The tracks of the wheels are marked with pieces of timber let into the road, and the wheels of the waggons must run on them, one horse is able to draw it, and that with ease, there are fifty or sixty bushels of coal in a waggon. There are many other branches of business, and they require much carriage in a regular track, that greatly want this improvement, which causes the lowering of the expenses of carriage.

About five miles from Newcastle are the iron works... they are supposed to be among the greatest manufactories of the kind of Europe. Several hundred hands are employed in it, and 20,000 a year is paid in wages. Each person earns from 1 shilling to 2,5 shillings a day, and some of the foremen so high as 200 a year. The quality of iron they work up is very great, and there are employed three ships to the Baltic, and each makes ten voyages yearly, and brings seventy tens at a time.

...In general, their work is for exportation, and are employed very considerably by the East India Company. During the war their business was extremely great; it was worse after the peace; but for anchors and mooring chains the demand these last seven or eight years has been very regular and spirited. Their business, however, for some time past, has not been equal to what it was in the war.

The work of coalminers was so hard that looked a "sad gallery" of blind, lame, prematurely decrepit, asthmatic and crippled or semi-invalid (The Gentleman's Magazine (1782), quoted in Poulsen C. The English Rebels. Russian Edition. P. 160)

Wages in 1795

F. Eden, "The State of the Poor," vol. I, p. 571, 572, 574 (London, 1797)

Northumberland About sixty years ago reapers in this county received 4 pence a day; forty years ago, they received 6 pence a day and diet; these wages continued for several years much the same. Young in his "Northern Tour" states agricultural wages to have been, thirty years ago, from 5 shillings 2 pence to 8 shillings 9 pence. So, wages kept advancing irregularly till last year, when they were generally 2 shillings a day without victuals. An old tailor in the neighbourhood of Morpeth, who is now upwards of ninety, says, that when he was between twenty and thirty years of age. 4 pence in a day were the common wages for a man in his lime of business, with diet, that, a few years afterwards, they rose to 6 pence, which were the highest day-wages he ever took for sewing; common tailors in Morpeth now receive 1 shilling a day, and their victuals. He adds, that although the usual day's pay for a reaper, when he was young, was 4 pence, he and a partner, if they were remarkably good reapers, demanded 6 pence for a day, which their employer at last agreed to give, although his wife grumbled because she thought that was extravagance; however the tailor proposed that he and his partner should do as much work in a day as three of the best farmer's best reapers usually performed; and the employer agreed. Common labourers, sixty years ago, barely received 4 pence a day, and victuals; they have now 10 shillings a week, with a house and fuel but no board. Spinners of wool thirty years ago had 2 pence a day and board; they have now 4 pence a day and victuals. About fifty years ago they only received 9 pence a week and diet. Women, working in the fields as weeders, etc., thirty years ago had 4 pence a day without diet: they have now double that sum. Masons, in Newcastle forty years ago, were paid 1 shilling 4 pence and 1 shilling 6 pence a day; they now receive 2 shillings 6 pence and 2 shillings 9 pence. A mason's labourer, forty years ago, had 1 shilling; he has now 1 shilling 6 pence a day.

Oxfordshire

The ordinary wages of labourers are: for men 8 shillings the week; and 12 shillings the week in harvest, together with three pints of beer; women, in common, have 3 shillings the week; and 6 shillings at harvest; children above nine years of age, can earn from 1 shilling to 3 shillings the week. Men, by ordinary work, can earn from 10 shillings to 12 shillings the week; and from 16 shillings to 18 shillings in harvest. Each cottage has a small garden, which supplies the family with potatoes. A considerable quantity is also distributed among the poor, every winter, by Lord Harcourt. He likewise allows such families as behave well, a guinea a year for every fourth child, till the child is ten years old; and when it goes to service, some clothes are usually given. Poor families are also enabled to send their children to school without any expense; and various other charities are bestowed by Lord and Lady Harcourt on the parish. Every parishioner is allowed to purchase flour at 7 pence. Potatoes cost 2 shillings a bushel; bacon 9 pence, and meat 5 pence a pound.



A street in Exeter, where people live in a lean-to shed among the pigs which they rear, and where there is no drainage. [Burke 1985]

Yorkshire Common wages with diet, from Martimas to Lady day, 5 shillings a week; from Lady-day to Midsummer, 6 shillings; from Midsummer to Michaelmas, 9 shillings; from Michaelmas to Martimas, 6 shillings. Common wages, without diet, 9 shillings the week, in winter, and 12 shillings in summer. In harvest, men receive 12 shillings and 14 shillings the week, and victuals; and women 6 shillings and 7 shillings the week, with beer, but no meat. There is very constant employment in the winter. The labourers are, in general, supplied by their employers with corn, etc., much below the market price. The rent of cottages varies according to the quantity of land annexed, and are from £ 1 to £ 1 10 sh. Many of the cottages on this coast are miserable hovels, built of mud and straw. Such habitations are sometimes granted by the parish to poor families; and sometimes the parishes supply their poor inhabitants with fuel. Many cottagers cultivate potatoes in their garths and gardens, some have a pig, and a few keep cows.

From the preceding statements the reader, I trust, be enabled to form some general idea of the present condition and circumstances of the labouring classes of the community. Of course, everyone will readily acknowledge that during the last two years they were subjected to great distress, from a rise in the price of the necessaries of life, unexampled within the present century. It is not, however, from a view of their situation, in a period of scarcity, that we are to estimate the comparative ability of a man to support himself by his labour, in modern and in ancient

times. Still less is the period of War to be selected, at the moment of ascertaining the ordinary comforts and gratifications of the peasant or working manufacture. It does not fall into my plan to enter into minute comparative estimates relative to the progress of society in England; but there can be little doubt that the ten years ending in January 1793, exhibit the most flattering appearances, in every circumstance that has been considered, by political economists, as demonstrative of national prosperity. The demand for employment, and a subsequent advance income have risen in a progressive ratio; and to those who investigate the state of the nation, without a disposition to blame the present, and admire the past which too often influences even "persons endowed with the profoundest judgement, and most extensive learning," both these and other symptoms of increasing industry and wealth must have been perfectly satisfactory. It may, indeed, be contended, that the rapid advance in the Poor's Rate, is the best proof of the inability of labourers to maintain themselves on the ordinary wages of Labour. But before this can be admitted, it should be proved, that more persons are maintained by the present Poor Rate, which probably exceeds three million sterling, than were by half that sum twenty years ago. Even allowing this to be the fact, it by no means proves that the labourer, whom it has been the fashion of late years, upon benevolent, though mistaken, principle of policy, to quarter on the parish, would, if unassisted by the overseer, have been unable to benefit himself, whilst his employer was getting riches by his labour.

Adam Smith. David Ricardo

In the economic thought the theory of free trade by Adam Smith (1723-1790) gained dominance. Smith believed that when an individual pursues his self-interest, he indirectly promotes the good of society. Self-interest (the principle of *laissez faire*) and competition in the free market, he argued, would tend to benefit society as a whole by keeping prices low, while still building in an incentive for a wide variety of goods and services. Nevertheless, he was wary of businessmen and warned of their "conspiracy against the public or in some other contrivance to raise prices." In his understanding, the economic developments are guided by objective laws and are independent of the volition of an individual. He called those laws "natural" and tried to deduce them from the nature of the human being. But in fact, "the natural properties of man" upon which Smith proceeded were nothing but characteristic features of the capitalist of his time. So, in his attempt to discover the "natural" laws of economy he actually investigated the capitalist production.

The heart of Smith's economic philosophy was his belief that the economy would work best if left to function on its own without government regulation. In these circumstances, self-interest would lead business firms to produce only those products that consumers wanted, and to produce them at the lowest possible cost. They would do this, not as a means of benefiting society, but in an effort to outperform their competitors and gain the greatest profit. But all this self-interest would benefit society as a whole by providing it with more and better goods and services, at the lowest prices. To explain why all society benefits when the economy is free of regulation, Smith used the metaphor of the "invisible hand": "Every individual is continually exerting himself to find the most advantageous employment for whatever capital he can command. It is his own advantage, and not that of society, which he has in mind, but he is in this, as in many other cases, led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention, for the pursuit of his own advantage necessarily leads him to prefer that employment which is most advantageous to society." The "invisible hand" was Smith's name for the economic forces that we today would call supply and demand, or the marketplace.

Smith sharply disagreed with the mercantilists who, in their quest for a "favourable balance of trade," called for regulation of the economy. Instead, Smith agreed with the physiocrats and their policy of "*laissez faire*", letting individuals and businesses function without interference from government regulation or private monopolies. In that way, the "invisible hand" would be free to guide the economy and maximize production. However, he differed with the physiocrats who

argued that land was the only source of wealth. In Smith's view, a nation's wealth was dependent upon production, not agriculture alone. How much it produced, he believed, depended upon how well it combined labour and the other factors of production. The more efficient the combination, the greater the output, and the greater the nation's wealth.

In his book "The Wealth of Nations" (1776) he undertook to prove that the real source of a country's wealth lay in labour and the division of it was an essential factor for increasing labour productivity and social well-being. In a famous section, Smith turned to the pin industry to demonstrate how the division of labour and the use of machinery increased output. "One man draws out the wire, another straightens it, a third cuts it, a fourth points it, a fifth grinds it at the top for receiving the head; to make the head requires two or three distinct operations..." Proceeding upon the principle that labour is the source of wealth Smith regarded the relations that spring up between the producers of this wealth, as the foundation of society. Though he came near the conception that bourgeois society is divided into exploiters and the exploited he failed to see the significance of class struggle and the role the broad masses played in history, and he was also opposed to any kind of workers' unions which he considered to be an infringement on the freedom of competition. Karl Marx exposed the contradictions that he detected in Smith's theory of political economy. Adam Smith advocated free trade. To him the activity of a few individuals in the sphere of commerce and industry was the driving force of social progress. Smith's theory was at the heart of the "imperialism of free trade", so peculiar to the Anglo-Saxon imperial policy (details on the concept of Free Trade see in Chapter 30).

His contemporary David Ricardo (1772-1873) was a proponent of the free trade on the international scale. To demonstrate its advantages of free trade, Ricardo developed a concept we now call the principle of comparative advantage. Comparative advantage enabled him to demonstrate that one nation might profitably import goods from another even though the importing country could produce that item for less than the exporter. Ricardo's explanation of comparative advantage went as follows: Portugal and England, both of whom produce wine and cloth, are considering the advantages of exchanging those products with one another. Let's assume that: a) x barrels of wine are equal to (and therefore trade evenly for) y yards of cloth; b) in Portugal 80 workers can produce x barrels of wine in a year. It takes 120 English workers to produce that many barrels; c) 90 Portuguese workers can produce y yards of cloth in a year. It takes 100 English workers to produce y yards of cloth. We can see, Ricardo continued, that even though Portugal can produce both wine and cloth more efficiently than England, it pays them to specialize in the production of wine and import English cloth. This is so because by trading with England, Portugal can obtain as much cloth for 80 worker-years as it would take 90 worker-years to produce themselves. England will also benefit. By specializing in cloth, it will be able to obtain wine in exchange for 100 worker-years of labour rather than 120. As a member of Parliament, Ricardo pressed the government to abandon its traditional policy of protection. Though he did not live to achieve that goal, his efforts bore fruit in the 1840s when England became the first industrial power to adopt a policy of free trade.

Comprehension questions

1. Economic and social development of 18th c. Britain.
2. Woollen manufactory and cloth market.
3. The supply of timber.
4. Coalmining and iron manufacture.
5. Wages in Britain in 1795.
6. How did F. Eden try to sugar-coat the miseries of the poor in "The State of the Poor"?
7. Adam Smith's theory.
8. David Ricardo's theory.

Names and expressions

Young, Arthur (1741-1820) — English agriculturist and writer

£ — pound sterling

good hands in this branch — умелых (искусные) работники в этой области

the year round — круглый год

inequalities of ground — неровности почвы (земли)

pieces of timber let into the road — в землю вделаны деревянные планки (вроде деревянных рельсов)

iron works — металлические заводы (по выплавке железа)

they are supposed to be... — предполагается, что они....

of the kind — подобного рода

falls — (здесь) — лесоповал

upwards of ninety — за девяносто

in common — обычно

Martimas — день св. Мартина (11 ноября)

Midsummer, or Midsummer Day — Иванов день (24 июня)

Lady Day — Благовещение

Michaelmas — день св. Михаила (29 сентября)

necessaries of life — жизненно необходимые товары

it does not fall into my plan — в мои планы не входит

the Poor's Rate — налог в пользу бедных

18. BRITISH ART AND LITERATURE IN THE 18th CENTURY



The period of time between the English and the French revolutions was significant in several respects. England brought forth a national school of art and produced some important works of literature. William Hogarth (1697-1794), a prominent painter and engraver, lived and worked in the reign of George II. He depicted the manners of his time with a combination of truth and satire. William Hogarth was born in London. His father, Richard Hogarth, who died in 1718, was a schoolteacher and literary hack, who had come to the metropolis to seek that fortune which was denied to him in his native Westmorland. William was early distinguished by a talent for drawing. He was apprenticed to a silver-plate engraver, Ellis Gable. Hogarth was very popular among his contemporaries as a portrait painter. He was also author of many works, such as "Gate of Calais" (1749), "Four Stages of Cruelty", and others. After all, as a draughtsman, an engraver or a painter he has his unique position among English artists — he is known as a humourist and a satirist upon canvas.

Thousands of pounds are now paid for a picture by Thomas Gainsborough (1727-1788), who was another celebrated artist of the same time — a little later. But when he was a boy, living in an English village, nobody ever thought he was going to be a famous artist. He loved drawing better than his school lessons, and, instead of playing with other boys, he would wander off into the fields and woods to study the flowers and trees, the sunshine and shadows, the birds and the fishes. One day he saw a man looking over his father's orchard, as though he would like some of



Mrs. Richard Brinsley Sheridan (about 1785) by Thomas Gainsborough Bridgeman Art Library, London/New York

the pears hanging there. Little Thomas pulled out his pocketbook and drew a picture of the man. That night the orchard was robbed. The boy's sketch was shown, and it was found that the man whom he had seen and drawn was the thief. That was so clever of the boy that at last his father made up his mind to let him be an artist, and he became one of the greatest artists ever known in England.

As a self-taught artist, he did not make the traditional grand tour or the ritual journey to Italy but relied on his own remarkable instinct in painting. Gainsborough is famous for the elegance of his portraits and his pictures of women in particular have an extreme delicacy and refinement. As a colourist he has had few rivals among English painters. His best works have those delicate brush strokes which are found in Rubens and Renoir. They are painted in clear and transparent tone, in a colour scheme where blue and green predominate. The particular discovery of Gainsborough was the creation of technique so that the sitters and the background merge into a single entity.

England has never had a more famous painter of portraits than Joshua Reynolds (1723-1799), who knew how to use colour. He was also noted for his ability to capture character. His portraits have a bold and vigorous feeling and suggest strength rather than daintiness like Thomas Gainsborough's. When Reynolds was twenty-one, he caught a cold which left him deaf for life, and before he died, he became almost blind, so that his last years were very sad. But he was a great and clever man, and besides being a painter he was a very fine writer. His lectures on art are still read.

The 18th c. was also one of the most outstanding periods in English literary history. It was the time of the Enlightenment, a powerful intellectual movement directed against feudalism and

absolutism, as the Enlighteners recognized no religious authority in their attempts to submit all the principles of social relations and state forms to the implacable test of Reason. They showed the harm of feudal relations that crippled personality and their ideal was the personality of a "natural man", free from feudal involvement, limitations and inhibitions, that is a man that was part of the newly formed bourgeois society. But that individual proved to be nothing more than an ordinary 18th century bourgeois type with all the consequences that circumstance implied, i.e., greed, unscrupulous desire of enrichment at the expense of the exploited masses.

Seeing this, the Enlighteners believed that instruction and education could work wonders and the "natural individual" could be transformed, if properly enlightened, into an ideal individual. This was a truly tragic illusion and the Enlighteners laboured under it till they saw their own limitations and the disastrous discrepancy between their ideal and the reality of life.

The contradictions in ideology led to a sort of political crisis which in its turn enhanced contradictions. Thus, the progressive phenomenon of parliamentary system development was



Joshua Reynolds. Nelly O'Brien, 1760 to 1762. Wallace Collection, London/Bridgeman Art Library, London/New York

accompanied by monstrous corruption, embezzlement, bribery. All those, and other, vices were cultivated by the ruling oligarchy the members of which were becoming adepts in corruption while the Parliament itself was becoming a plaything for the ruling circles.

The moderate wing of the English Enlighteners supported the Establishment and advocated only occasional reforms to make the existing social order more perfect. This wing included the stance typical of the 18th c. reality, when the British Empire was created, ever new lands were discovered and captured.

Daniel Defoe (1660-1731) extolled energy and activity characteristic of English bourgeoisie at the early stages of its development. He turns his protagonist's diary into a realistic novel, discovering a new genre. His hero, Robinson Crusoe, remains a bourgeois property-owner even when isolated from society, he is both a social type and an individual with an individual's peculiarities.

Daniel Defoe is considered to have been the "father of English journalism." In his writings (such as "The Shortest Way with the Dissenters") he sharply criticised the Tories' religious intolerance, the vices of the age, the manners of the aristocracy, the superstitions and folly of the people, etc. The comic effect of his essays was achieved by a style where the absurdity of the subject was contrasted to the gravity of expression. For his journalism Defoe was subjected to the indignity of standing in the pillory in a public square and cheered by the people for his courage, so that his punishment was turned to a triumph.

Samuel Richardson (1689-1761) made the second step in the development of the Enlighteners' realistic novel. In his moralistic novels in letters, "Pamela" and "Clarissa" he shows the bourgeois society as ideal and strives to make it more perfect. While the realistic novel of the early epoch of the Enlightenment reflected the beginning of the bourgeois order in England and pictured exotic surroundings, the criminal world, etc., the seventeen-forties when the bourgeois way of life was moulded into stability, saw the creation of the moralistic novel. The heroines' virtue is rewarded while deviations from virtuous conduct are punished. Richardson's moral ideal was clearly based on bourgeois common sense. Disregarding the problem of individual and society he concentrated on the problem of bourgeois family ethics.

While the moderate wing of English Enlighteners elaborated the moral norms of the bourgeois society based on recognizing the existing social conditions as the best and most just, the radical democratic wing stressed the discrepancy between the "natural morality" and the existing class society. The most consistent of the latter, Jonathan Swift (1667-1745), born in an Irish attorney's family and educated at Oxford, a passionate satirist of genius lashing at the rapacity, oppression and injustice of the English ruling circles, rejected the idea of constitutional monarchy. He began with satires directed against religious fanaticism ("Tale of a Tub") and rose to the scathing satire of the English oppressors' cruelty in starving the Irishmen ("A Modest Proposal for Preventing the Children of Poor People in Ireland from Being a Burden to Their Parents", 1729) where he suggests that Irish babies should be fattened to be killed for their meat that the English consumers would enjoy roasted or boiled. In his world-famous novel "Gulliver's Travels" he denounced the vices of the bourgeois society with unprecedented vehemence, and strength. His allegorical portrayal of contemporary life is in fact a heart-rending depiction of the vices inherent in the society based on the compromise between the bourgeois-minded aristocracy and aristocratically minded bourgeoisie.

The Enlighteners' realism was another step in the development of this school of writing as compared to Shakespeare's realism. The characters that found their way into the Enlighteners' realistic novels of morals and family life were not titanic characters tortured by titanic passions, not kings or warriors whose everyday life did not concern the author; they were ordinary people of bourgeois background or even servants; the authors describe their everyday doings and thoughts which were prosaic enough; no wonder prose, and not poetry, was used to reflect the everyday life of the bourgeois society.

The democratic tendencies of the Enlighteners were fully expressed in the work of Henry Fielding (1707-1754) who came of an impoverished aristocratic family which circumstance probably was decisive in determining his democratic sympathies since he had to make his living and so came into contact with all sorts and conditions of men. As a playwright he specialized in social-political comedies where he satirized the aristocracy, the ruling oligarchy, etc. ("The Coffee-House Politician", 1730; "Don Quixote in England", 1734; "Pasquin", 1736; "The Historical Register for the Year 1736", 1737). Loose morals, corruption, hypocrisy was exposed with killing talent. In his brilliant satire "The Life of Mr. Jonathan Wild the Great (1743) describing the career of a notorious thief (a thrust at Sir Robert Walpole the Whig prime minister) he gives an allegorical description of English social and political life where the two political parties rob the public with equal zeal. Fielding's masterpiece was "The History of Tom Jones, Foundling" (1749). It was in fact the summit in the development of 18th century social novel and the direct ancestor of the modern realistic novel. A truly great Enlightener, Fielding had faith in the traits of goodness and desire of moral perfection that characterise the broad democratic masses.

Another radical Enlightener, Tobias George Smollett (1721-1771), a Scotchman belonging to the junior branch of an old aristocratic family, wrote novels that were scathingly realistic in their descriptions of the horrors of English social life, the cruelty of silly officers actually torturing young sailors ("The Adventures of Roderick Random", 1748), or in descriptions of family life ("The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle", 1751; "The Expedition of Humphrey Clinker", 1771). Smollett's work was the next step in the development of the realistic novel of the 18th c.

The Enlighteners' optimistic approach to social phenomena suffered many shocks of contemporary reality, so it was only natural that in their last period the worship of hard reason proved a failure since belief in the ability of the bourgeois system to guarantee universal happiness was apparently no more than illusion. That was why sentimentalism and pre-romanticism developed in English literature at the end of the century.

Laurence Sterne (1713-1768) was probably the most prominent of the sentimentalists. In fact, it was his "Sentimental Journey" (1768), a sort of sequel to "Tristram Shandy" (1759-1767) that

gave this literary trend its name. He is sorry for the poor, though his sympathy is somewhat abstract, just an emotional approach to life. Oliver Goldsmith (1728-1774) in his "Vicar of Wakefield" (1766) shows the loose morals of the aristocracy and appeals to the readers' feelings of compassion for harmless impractical cranks who are directly opposed to the hard-as-nuts calculating heroes of the advancing bourgeoisie.

Pre-romanticism, which originated among the conservative end-of-the-century writers was expressed by a group of authors specializing in the so-called "Gothic novel" (the scene in those novels was always laid in medieval castles, etc., hence the name). Though the "Gothic novel" was an attempt to reflect the complex and entangled, contradiction-ridden nature of the bourgeois society that was emerging to existence, the form in which it was done was irrational, fantastic, weird. The genre was originated by Horace Walpole (1717-1797) whose novel "The Castle of Otranto" (1765) was striking for the number of horrors, mysteries, ghosts and such stuff which gambol through its pages. Ann Radcliffe (1764-1823) conformed in the same vein in her famous novel "The Mysteries of Udolpho" (1794). The realistic side of the Gothic novel was ensured by the emphasis laid on the nature of the conflict, the property interests that turn men into beasts making them sadistic murderers. Many of the later realists made use of the "Gothic novel" writers' experience to express the contradictions of bourgeois society the laws of which they never could grasp.

It was Robert Burns (1759-1796) who glorified the optimistic and proud spirit of the independence-loving man of toil. His poetry will never lose its appeal for it is inseparably bound with the common people from whose folklore he drew his inspiration and whose values determined the nature of his humanism; that is why Burns is a poet whose significance transcends national barriers. In his poetry he was so deeply national, so absolutely inseparable from his people whose poetical spirit, clear insight and broad intelligence he embodies that he became a kind of symbol of the people's vitality and emotional depth. No benefit of systematic education (and he had none) could have given this genius what he received from his people whose life he shared and on whose philosophy of life he based his poetry, and it is their idea of

human dignity having nothing to do with wealth, rank and titles that his resonant lines express ("A Man's a Man for All That").

The profound democratic convictions of the poet permeate not only his poetry of social protest but also his lyrics ("A Red, Red Rose", "John Anderson, My Jo", etc.) He sang his independence-loving people's glorious past ("Bannockburn"), the altruistic heroism of his people's martyrs like Wallace; he was inspired by the French Revolution of 1789 and sang the revolutionary ideals in



St. Paul's Cathedral designed by Christopher Wren, completed in 1710.

fiery verse ("The Tree of Liberty").

The most outstanding figure in drama was David Garrick (1717-1779), an actor and playwright. His contribution to the art of staging was known as character acting. Unlike the tradition of his predecessors his acting was very natural and expressive. He proved that natural playing was more exciting than the most elegant declamation. By sheer expressiveness and native brightness, vitality and intelligent reference to nature Garrick carried the audiences away to a new understanding of Macbeth and Lear and Hamlet and put new spirit into comedy.

The 18th century is the age of classicism both in art and in architecture. The English court and nobility had cultivated a fancy for the "antique" which in their belief was a sign of wealth and power. We have already read in the previous parts of our book about Christopher Wren.

The Adam brothers, the eminent architects of the time, proved particularly ingenious in applying the principles of classicism both in town-planning and country house design. Though they followed the traditions of their predecessor Wren, they, nevertheless, contrived to make the solid and bulky exteriors go beautifully with the elegance and graceful ease of the interiors, which, too, were strictly classical in shape. Sentimentalism was then in vogue and it was a custom with the aristocracy to spend their leisure hours at home with their own folks. This consequently heightened their interest in furniture and decorative art. The Chippendale chairs shortly found their way first to the mansions of the aristocracy and then to those of the bourgeoisie, affecting the tastes of the latter accordingly. Thomas Chippendale was a celebrated cabinetmaker who made his mark producing beautiful, elegant and remarkably comfortable furniture.

Sculpture in the 18th century shows a tendency to imitate the antique. Tomb sculpture was transformed: figures now almost in classical dress were grouped in front of pyramidal background.

The art of old ages became a subject for study ever since the middle of the 18th c. when English private collections were being speedily replenished with the antiquities obtained in Rome. The "Society of Dilettanti" which was established in 1733 favoured and even subsidized a number of expeditions to explore specimens of antique architecture.

English scientists began to frequent Greece. The British Ambassador in Greece ordered sketches and copies of some antique sculptures and subsequently succeeded in obtaining sanction to take pieces of ancient sculpture home. As a result of this barbarism England fell into possession of a great number of marvellous antiquities which included twelve statues of the Parthenon, fifteen metopes and fifty-six plates of friezes and the like. In 1816 a special bill was passed according to which the Elgin marbles from the Acropolis of Athens became English state property and were conveyed to the British museum.



Cavalry from the Parthenon Frieze, West II, 2-3, British Museum

This was how the greatest samples of Greek art were first revealed to European scientists. It is remarkable that the recognition of artistic values of these sculptures was not unanimous. Some English connoisseurs insisted that the Parthenon sculptures originated in Rome, in the later period, and according to their account they hardly rose above handicraft. The proper evaluation of these priceless antiquities came later largely due to the delight in and high appreciation of these treasures by the most

renowned connoisseurs of the continent. The sculptures of Parthenon were not the only discoveries of those years. The English scientists went on with their investigations of the Greek art and they were overawed by the beauty of the Greek Temples. The English architects made a study of the construction principles of the Acropolis of Athens. It was largely due to them that the authentic Greek art became known in Europe, while previously it had been known exclusively through Roman copies.

Comprehension questions

1. Speak on the following remarkable personalities: William Hogarth.
2. Thomas Gainsborough.
3. Joshua Reynolds.
4. The time of the Enlightenment in Britain and philosophy of the Enlighteners.
5. Daniel Defoe.
6. Samuel Richardson.
7. Jonathan Swift.
8. Henry Fielding.
9. Tobias George Smollett.
10. Lawrence Sterne.
11. Robert Burns.
12. Christopher Wren.
13. The Ancient Greek art in Britain. The Parthenon Frieze.

Names and expressions

literary hack - литературный поденщик

William was early distinguished by a talent for drawing - Уильям стал рано проявлять талант рисования

he would wander off into the fields and woods - он бродил по полям и лесам

the sitters and the background merge into a single entity - натурщики и фон сливаются в единое целое

suggest strength rather than daintiness - предполагают силу, а не утонченность

to submit all the principles of social relations and state forms to the implacable test of Reason - подвергнуть все принципы общественных отношений и государственных форм неумолимой проверке Разума

unscrupulous desire of enrichment at the expense of the exploited masses - бессовестное стремление к обогащению за счет эксплуатируемых масс

the progressive phenomenon of parliamentary system development was accompanied by monstrous corruption, embezzlement, bribery - прогрессивное явление развития парламентской системы сопровождалось чудовищной коррупцией, хищениями взяточничеством

This wing included the stance typical of the 18th c. reality - это крыло выражало позицию, типичную для XVIII века

standing in the pillory - стоя у позорного столба

rose to the scathing satire - поднялся до язвительной сатиры

Loose morals, corruption, hypocrisy were exposed with killing talent – талантливо обличались аморальность, коррупция, лицемерие

the worship of hard reason proved a failure - преклонение перед всеилием разума не решало проблем

to reflect the complex and entangled, contradiction-ridden nature of the bourgeois society - отразить сложный, запутанный и противоречивый характер буржуазного общества

glorified the optimistic and proud spirit of the independence-loving man of toil -

воспевал оптимистический и гордый независимый дух человека труда

contrived to make the solid and bulky exteriors go beautifully with the elegance and graceful ease of the interiors - сочетает красоту и объем экстерьеров с элегантностью и изящной легкостью интерьеров

As a result of this barbarism England fell into possession of a great number of marvellous antiquities - В результате этого варварства Англия стала обладателем множества чудесных древностей

they were overawed by the beauty of the Greek Temples – они восторгались красотой греческих храмов

19. NAPOLEON BONAPARTE. ANTI-FRENCH COALITIONS. THE MURDER OF RUSSIA'S EMPEROR PAUL I (1801)



Encarta Encyclopedia, (p) 1992 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved./G. Tomisich/Photo Researchers, Inc.

Napoleon Bonaparte (Buonaparte), Emperor of France (1769-1821), was born on Corsica on the 15th of August 1769. The father's literary tastes, general inquisitiveness, and powers of intrigue reappeared in Napoleon, who, however, derived from his mother the force of will, the power of forming a quick decision and of maintaining it against all odds, which made him a terrible opponent both in war and in diplomacy.

As a little boy, Napoleon avowed his resolve to be a soldier. While the other children used themselves with ordinary games, Napoleon delighted most in beating a drum and wielding a sword. After finishing his schooling Napoleon entered the artillery regiment, quartered at Valence, first as a private, and then as a corporal and a sergeant. Only in January 1786 did he actually begin to serve as junior lieutenant. His father died of cancer in 1785, and Napoleon felt added responsibility. At this time, he was still delusively hoping to free his native island from the French yoke.

However, during his free time, the young officer studied history and cognate subjects and began to see the British rivalry as the chief underlying cause of both the French and Corsican mishaps. Of Cromwell he wrote: "Courageous, clever, deceitful, dissimulating; his early principles of lofty republicanism yielded to the devouring flames of his ambition; and, having tasted the sweets of power, he aspired to the pleasure of reigning alone." At that time Napoleon served at Auxonne, where he commanded a small detachment of troops sent to put down disturbances in neighbouring towns. The first events of the French Revolution were destined to mould anew his ideas and his career.

External events served to unite him more closely to France. The reorganization of the artillery, which took place in the spring of 1791, brought Bonaparte to the rank of lieutenant in the regiment of Grenoble. Bonaparte took the oath of obedience to the Constituent Assembly. By and by, he began to identify his fortunes with those of the French Republic.

The arrival of Bonaparte in Toulon coincided with a time of crisis in the fortunes of the republic. In 1793, France was girdled by foes; and the forces of the first coalition invaded her territory at several points. The royalists of Toulon had admitted British and Spanish forces to share in the defence of that stronghold (29th of August 1793). The blow to the republican cause was the most serious. Pitt cherished hopes of dealing a death blow to the Jacobins. But fortune now brought Bonaparte to blight these hopes. A commander of the artillery of the republican forces was heavily wounded before Toulon, and Napoleon was ordered to take his place. He soon put the artillery in good order. On the 30th of November the British, Spanish and Neapolitan forces were beaten back with a loss.

Afterwards Napoleon took part in the expeditions to the southern ports attempting to drive the English from Corsica, which fell through. Then followed Bonaparte's brilliant Italian campaign. In 1795 Bonaparte was placed in command of the Army of Italy and later on March 2, 1796 he was appointed commander-in-chief. After he arrived on the front, he launched attacks almost immediately and won clear victories over the Austrians at the Battle of Montenotte (12 April 1796) and Mondovì (Piedmont) (21 April 1796). In total during the lightning campaign French losses were 6,000 compared with more than 25,000 for the Allies. The Army of Italy was now reinforced to almost 50,000 and Bonaparte continued the offensive, striking at Austrian forces. Placing Mantua under siege, Bonaparte then led a French division south to invade and occupy Tuscany and the Papal States, defeating Papal forces at Fort Urban. Next, he turned north and with 20,000 men defeated some 50,000 Austrians under Field Marshal Wurmser at the battles of Lonato and Castiglione. The Austrian commander was forced back into the Alps.

The Battle of Rivoli (14–15 January 1797) was a key victory in the French campaign in Italy against Austria. Napoleon Bonaparte's 23,000 Frenchmen defeated an attack of 28,000 Austrians, ending Austria's fourth and final attempt to relieve the Siege of Mantua. Rivoli further demonstrated Napoleon's brilliance as a military commander and led to French occupation of northern Italy. Soon after, Mantua finally fell to the French, making it possible for France to continue advance eastwards towards Austria. After a brief campaign during which the Austrian army was commanded by the Emperor's brother, the Archduke Charles, the French advanced to within 100 miles of Vienna, and the Austrians asked for a suspension of hostilities. Bonaparte's campaign, therefore, was undoubtedly the most important in bringing an end to the War of the First Coalition (1792-1797) – the coalition of the Habsburg monarchy of Austria and the Kingdom of Prussia against France. By 1797 Austria and Prussia surrendered to France which made Holland and Spain her allies.

His successes strengthened the young general's conviction that he was destined for a great future. He took care to assure his ascendancy by sending presents to the Directors in Paris, large sums of treasury and works of art to the museums of Paris. Thus, after the crowning victory of Rivoli, Bonaparte became an idol of the French nation, and the master of the Directory.

After signing the peace with Austria and Prussia only Britain was at war with France. In an attempt to neutralise Britain, in 1796-1805 the French tried to invade Ireland, where the local population would willingly support the anti-British actions. Napoleon's British Army (*Armée de l'Angleterre*) was mustered on the shores of the English Channel. They were trained in camps in Boulogne, Bruges and Montreuil.⁶¹ At the beginning of 1798, Napoleon had reconnoitred the northern and western French coasts. Demonstrative actions were successful: England was convinced that the landing in Ireland was being prepared, so the English fleet was engaged in the blockade of Gibraltar and the northern French ports, leaving the French the open road across the Mediterranean to Egypt.

Napoleon began his Egyptian campaign to protect French trade interests, undermine Britain's access to India, and establish scientific enterprise in the region.⁶² In June 1798 he seized Malta and in July transported his expeditionary force to Egypt beginning the conquest of that country as a preliminary to an advance upon India. Cairo fell after the Battle of the Pyramids (July 21, 1798). However, on August 1-3, 1798, Nelson in command of the Mediterranean fleet won a victory in the Battle of the Nile. The destruction of the French Mediterranean fleet allowed the British Navy to block the French and allied ports. In particular, British ships cut Malta from

⁶¹ Training *Armée de l'Angleterre* and other arrangements were very costly, so in 1803 France had to yield its vast North American territory to the United States in exchange for a payment of 60 million French francs (\$ 11.25 million). The entire amount was to be spent for the planned invasion of Britain, which however never happened.

⁶² Much of it, in fact, was accomplished, Jean-François Champollion, a French scholar, philologist and orientalist, who deciphered the Egyptian hieroglyphs and founded Egyptology.

France, making use of the revolt in Malta, which forced the French garrison to retreat to Valletta. The ensuing British siege of Malta lasted for two years (1798–1800), before the defenders, the population of Malta, because of hunger were forced to surrender.

Napoleon's army in Egypt was cut off from France. To dig in more firmly, Napoleon started a conquest of Syria and laid siege of Accra. But with the English help the fortress was able to hold on and Napoleon had to leave. He fled to Egypt where he got the news of Pitt's activity in organizing the Second coalition with Austria, Russia, Spain, the Kingdom of Naples and Turkey. True to the old method of war by proxy, fighting with others' hands, Britain contributed money leaving her allies, Russia and Austria, to do the actual fighting.



Fyodor Ushakov

Seeing that he could not extricate his army from Egypt after Nelson cut his army off from France, Napoleon now left his army to shift for themselves and went back to France. When Napoleon arrived in Paris Pitt had already succeeded in forming a Second Coalition (1798–1802).

The Russian troops under Alexander Suvorov had to help the Austrians to repulse the French from Northern Italy. Honouring the obligations of Russia to the coalition, they fought valorously, engaged in a large number of battles and won glorious victories. Vasily Klyuchevsky called it "the most brilliant entrance of Russia on the European scene." By the middle of 1799 they neared the southern borders of the French Republic. At the same time Fyodor Ushakov, the Russian admiral, who is renowned for not having lost any of his 43 battles, dealt crushing blows to the French fleet.

The Russian victories cancelled Napoleon's Italian conquests in Europe. There appeared a unique opportunity to end the war. Alexander Suvorov's put forward a strategic plan of further offensive against Grenoble, Lyon and Paris. However, the Austrians balked this plan. Rejecting Suvorov's version of the campaign, the Austrian Government for its part made the Russian Emperor Paul I move the army to liberate Switzerland. Suvorov's troops had to cross the Alps, which was very dangerous. "I was driven to Switzerland to be destroyed," wrote Suvorov. And indeed, the close examination of Suvorov's Alpine adventure shows rather unambiguously that the Russian troops were devoted to destruction and only the genius of Suvorov was able to overcome all the tribulations. Meanwhile, had the European allies accepted it, the Napoleonic wars would have been ended not in 1814, but fifteen years earlier.

A whole chain of betrayals led to Suvorov's troops encirclement in the mountains, without food and with a limited amount of ammunition. All his plans were baffled, it was already just about the salvation of the army. The Russian troops were able to break through but lost about one-third (from 21 to 15 thousand men). But even in such a desperate situation Suvorov was able to take 1,400 French prisoners. Alas, the severity of the campaign and the years took their toll - Generalissimo Suvorov died on arrival in St. Petersburg on May 6, 1800, not having time to enjoy the well-deserved awards.

Meanwhile, Napoleon in France made a coup and overthrew the Directory, which was meeting with utmost difficulties at home, as heavy taxes, royalist risings, and general brigandage brought unpopularity and embarrassment to the government. Napoleon had little difficulty in overthrowing it and having himself nominated as First Consul for ten years. The period of the Consulate marks the zenith of Napoleon's mental powers and creative activity. In August 1802 the powers of the First Consul, which had been decreed for ten years, were prolonged to the duration of his life.

Napoleon as the First Consul soon turned defeat into victory. In the summer of 1800, he suddenly invaded Italy and annihilated the Austrians at Marengo (14th of June), this battle was of special importance, as it consolidated the reputation of Bonaparte at a time when republican opposition was gathering strength. Negotiations for peace followed, but they led to nothing as

yet. Towards the end of the year Moreau defeated the Austrians again at Hohenlinden. The Emperor of Austria was glad to make peace now — two months later in Luneville, by which France won Belgium, the left bank of the Rhine and the control of the entire northern Italy, where it created an Italian Republic.

In the meantime, the British landed in the Netherlands and the British fleet captured Malta and other Mediterranean strategic points. It was a severe blow to the Russian Empire. Paul I, who was fed up with the miserable treachery of the allies, began negotiations about an alliance with France, embodied by Napoleon. That was the end of the Second Coalition. After the actual withdrawal of Russia from the war, neither the Austrians nor the British were able to oppose the Corsican Genius. But, while the troops of the Viennese monarchy at least tried to stop Napoleon's force, the British never fought themselves without extreme need and preferred to wage proxy wars enlisting others to fight and die. This time, seeing that no one wanted to die for the British interests, the islanders concluded the Peace of Amiens between France and Britain (March 1802).

The murder of Russia's Emperor Paul I

Since Peter I and Catherine II, Russia had had a great weight in European politics and actively participated in it but had never had any special advantages from her association with Europe. Likewise, Russia's participation in the Second Coalition did not bring Russia any benefits either. Kurfursts and princes sought to achieve gains on the blood of a common Russian soldier, the British on the seas almost blocked the Russian international trade. While the Russian troops dealt Napoleon the crucial blow, depriving him of his Italian acquisitions, all the benefits from that campaign went to Austria, which did not fulfil its obligations by the treaty. The "miracle Bogatyrs", as Suvorov called his Russian comrades-in-arms, were disposed of. By the end of Suvorov's Italian campaign, the Austrian command even went the length of cancelling the Generalissimo's orders.

Then, there was the joint Russian-British expedition in the Netherlands leading to numerous unjustified casualties of Russians. In that campaign, the Russian Auxiliary Corps of Lieutenant-General Ivan von Fersen operated against the French in the Netherlands under the British command. Initially the Russians knocked the French out of three retrenchments, seized a few batteries, three fortified villages and captured 1,000 French and 14 guns, but the British procrastinated and the French took advantage of this procrastination, striking at Russians, settled in Bergen (North Holland), with all their might. The Russian troops lost about three thousand people, while the British lost about one thousand. The British denial of support led to the evacuation of the Russian Expeditionary Force to Britain. There the Russian troops stayed in such poor conditions, that brought about an increase in the death toll. They literally melted from hunger and disease. As a result of that expedition, England gained all the Dutch fleet and Russia gained nothing, only sustaining losses.

Finally, there was Malta and the Order of Hospitallers. During the Egyptian campaign, Napoleon had captured Malta and expelled the Knights of the Order, many of whom took refuge in Russia. Paul I reacted favourably to the exiles and was elected the Grand Master of the Order. The English Admiral Nelson, coming with a fleet to Malta, appealed to Paul I as the Grand Master asking him to consider a temporary appointment of his captain, Alexander Ball, as the military governor of the Island. Consent was obtained, moreover, Paul awarded Ball the title of Commander of the Order of Malta. Nelson did not keep his word and after the expulsion of the


French from Malta, it fell under the British control.⁶³

Deeply outraged, Paul I abandoned the Second Coalition. He terminated the alliance with Austria and recalled the Russian ambassador from Vienna. In the same year, he recalled the Russian ambassador in London for very similar reasons - the treacherous British attitude to the Russian soldiers. Then Russia formed the Second League of Armed Neutrality with Denmark and Sweden (1800-1801). The armed neutrality was intended to protect neutral shipping against the British royal navy's wartime policy of unlimited search of neutral shipping, in an attempt to cut off military supplies and other trade to the First French Republic.⁶⁴

For his part, Napoleon knew that the participation or non-participation of Russia in the war on the French side played a decisive role in the distribution of forces. "Only Russia can be the ally of France" - that was his conclusion from past events. And he began to actively seek an alliance with the Russian Tsar. Paul I, whose resentment against his former allies' treachery was great, after a long hesitation, decided to reach out to France, who had beheaded her king, Louis XVIII. The Emperor of Russia was able to learn from his mistakes. Now he saw clearly that Russia was at war with France for the interests alien to her, and there was nothing to get in return for her participation. The logical conclusion from these thoughts was the need for an alliance between Russia and France. He began to make conciliatory gestures. In 1800, Count Rostopchin presented a report, where he wrote: "England has armed all the powers against France - through threats, cunning, and money." Paul I wrote opposite these words: "So they did - us, sinners, included." On July 18, 1800, the French government offered to return to their homeland some

6,000 Russian prisoners of war free of charge and without any conditions. Moreover, the Russian soldiers came home dressed in new specially sewn uniforms, with new weapons, with their banners and all military honours. It was hard to imagine a more spectacular gesture. Also, through diplomatic channels, it was intimated to Paul I that Bonaparte's troops should defend Malta, at the moment besieged by the British, and that France was ready to transfer it to its "rightful owner", i.e. to the jurisdiction of Russia.

The French monarch in exile, whose court was at the time in Russia, was asked to leave its limits. General Sprengporten, known for his pro-French sentiment, was sent from St. Petersburg to France on a special mission. He was received with great honour. The contours of the new union were slowly beginning to take shape. Seeing that Russia made a sharp turn in her policies, the British attempted to prevent Paul I from changing his course, however, as always, they wanted to get everything without giving anything in return. Having captured Malta and trampled on the rights of the Maltese Order, they offered Paul I, the



The murder of Tsar Paul I of Russia. A print from *La France et les Français à Travers les Siècles*, Volume IV, 1882-1884.

⁶³Under the terms of the Treaty of Paris of 1814, Malta became British, Britain turned it into its colony and naval base. Only in 1964 Malta gained independence from Britain, in 1974 it was proclaimed a republic, but until 1979, when Malta liquidated its last British naval base, the Queen of England was still considered the head of state there.

⁶⁴The British government considered it a form of alliance with France and attacked Denmark, destroying parts of its fleet in the first Battle of Copenhagen and forcing it to withdraw from the League. Britain also occupied the Danish West Indies between March 1801 and April 1802. Paul's death in March 1801 and the accession of Alexander I led to a change of policy in Russia, and the alliance collapsed. Russia later joined the British in a coalition against Napoleonic France.

Grand Master of the Order, to take Corsica – Napoleon's birthplace. That was the last straw. Paul I was now fully determined to establish an alliance with Napoleon. Under those circumstances, according to many Russian historians, as well as foreign researchers, such as Ernest Laviss, Alfred Nicolas Rambaud, Alexius Hoffmann, and others, the formation of the joint plans of Bonaparte and Paul's military campaign in India began. By Napoleon's plan, a 35-thousand Russian Corps was to start from Astrakhan, cross the Caspian Sea and land in the Persian city of Astrabad. A same-sized French corps of the Rhine Army under the command of Moreau had to go down to the mouth of the Danube, cross it to Taganrog, and then move through Tsaritsyn to Astrabad. The armies were further assumed to join in their Indian campaign. The victory in India was not unlikely, the more so that there were centres of French influence there, where the local elite was well-disposed towards the French and quite the contrary – to the British. Russia started preparations for a full-scale war. The ships of Britain were embargoed, their goods confiscated, their crews arrested and sent into internal Russian provinces. On January 12, 1801 Paul I ordered Ataman of the Don Vasily Orlov to set out on the march. 41 Regiment of the Don Cossacks, 500 Kalmyks and two companies of horse artillery began to move to the valleys of the Indus and the Ganges. Soldiers of the two best European armies appearing in India could lead to unpredictable consequences. The real union of France and Russia threatened to undermine the global hegemony of Britain.

The answer had to be lightning fast. A plot was prepared, which was thought to be the only way to stop the Russian Emperor. The conspirators Palen⁶⁵, Bennigsen, Zubov, Talyzin associated with the British Ambassador Whitworth. The plot was prepared in great haste: the British ambassadorial mission had already been prescribed to get out of Russia, Whitworth had been sent from the Russian capital with a police escort and forced to wait long for the arrival of his passport at the border. But the deed was done. On the night of March 12, 1801 in St. Petersburg in his own Mikhailovsky Castle the Russian Emperor Paul I was mortally hit and strangled with a scarf. The official history at first said that the Emperor died of apoplexy, and then that the Emperor was murdered by certain nobles he had downed (Paul I was determined to turn the Russian nobility, which he saw as decadent and corrupt, into a form of chivalric order, and dismissed from court anyone who did not share his vision. This, together with his reforms improving the life of the peasantry, brought Paul into conflict with some of the nobility). But as later findings revealed, it was not short temper and "tyranny" that were the causes of the conspiracy against him, it was a political murder with a British trace.

Those days also witnessed an explosion of a bomb near Bonaparte's cortege in Paris. As luck would have it, Napoleon was not hurt by the assassins. But when he learnt of Paul I's murder, he said, "They missed out in Paris, but got me in St. Petersburg." Crown Prince Alexander, who overnight became Emperor Alexander I, after his accession to the throne, did not dare to touch the murderers of his father even with a finger. The very next day after the death of Paul I, the detachment of Cossacks was recalled back. The possible mutually beneficial alliance between France and Russia was nipped in the bud, and Russia's policy sharply returned to its normal pro-British direction.

A short respite before a new round of fighting thus ended. The British, true to their principle of fighting by proxy, immediately began to get a new anti-French coalition, and Napoleon began

⁶⁵Count Peter Ludwig von der Pahlen was a Russian courtier who played an important role in the assassination of Emperor Paul. He became a general in 1798, a count in 1799, and was the Military Governor of St. Petersburg from 1798 to 1801. Levin August Gottlieb Theophil (Leontiy Leontyevich Bennigsen), Count Bennigsen, a German general in the service of the Russian Empire, born into a Hanoverian family in Brunswick and served successively as a page at the Hanoverian court and as an officer of foot-guards where he participated in the Seven Years' War. In 1764, he retired from the Hanoverian army and entered the Russian service. It is known that he took an active part in the planning phase of the conspiracy to assassinate Paul I.

to prepare for landing on the British Isles. The English gold, which had strewn the new Emperor Alexander I's path to the throne, more than once made Russian policies strange and illogical. In 1805 and 1807 Alexander I would lead Russia into unnecessary wars for other countries' interests. There was still the Peace of Tilsit (1807), which Russia used to its advantage, but the opportunity of an alliance was missed again, which resulted in the French invasion of Russia in 1812. As a result, as long as half the century Russia was engaged in her futile self-assertion in Europe rather than her own interests and the building of a just world.

Significantly, the government reforms, initiated by Paul I, were abandoned after his death. The noblemen who had been implicated in Paul I's murder, thus supporting the British, attained an important indulgence to the Russian gentry from Alexander I (begun under Catherine I): this class were exempted from the service to the Russian Empire - state, military or public. The concept of etatism and service to one's nation was degraded. The elite could live off their estates, money, land and peasants' labour without any responsibility to the society they lived in. And, having squandered their fortunes, they landed up in their coveted Europe, betraying and disdaining their own people. We can well assume that the eventual consequence of this was the betrayal of the last Emperor of the Russian Empire – Nicholas II, when the generals and top aristocracy delivered him an ultimatum and in fact deposed him in 1917.

Comprehension questions

1. Napoleon's youth. The success of the Italian campaign of 1796-1797. The end of the First Coalition (1782-1797).
2. Armée de l'Angleterre. Napoleon campaign in Egypt. Malta.
3. The Second Coalition (1799–1800). Alexander Suvorov's campaigns. The betrayal of Suvorov's troops. Russian Emperor's displeasure with the allies' dishonesty.
4. Napoleon as First Consul. His victory at Marengo. The Italian Republic.
5. The British betrayal of the Russian Corps in the Netherlands.
6. The British capture of Malta and other Mediterranean strategic points.
7. Russia's abrogation of the Second Coalition: summary of causes and reasons.
8. The armed neutrality of Russia, Denmark and Sweden.
9. Russia's alliance with Napoleonic France (1800). Napoleon's demonstrations of good will.
10. The murder of Paul I. Its consequences.

Names and expressions

Napoleon [nə'pəʊliən]

Bonaparte ['bɒnə pa:t]

Corsica [kɔ:sika]

at all odds — при всех самых трудных обстоятельствах; во что бы то ни стало

Auxonne [ɔ:ksə'n] — a little town in France

Grenoble [grə'nəʊb(ə)l] — former village; now a part of Paris

Toulon [tu:'lɒn] (Франция)

He soon put the artillery in good order — он скоро привел артиллерию в полный порядок

he took care to assure his ascendancy — он заботился о том, чтобы сделать свое продвижение более надежным

Rivoli ['r(a)ivi] — Риволи, Италия, недалеко от Турина

Malta ['mɔ:ltə] — остров в Средиземном море (Мальта)

under Nelson — под командованием Нельсона

Syria ['si(ə)riə] — Сирия

Acre ['eikə] — Аккра (Палестина)

Lucien [lu:'sjen] — Люсьен

Hohenlinden ['həʊhən 'lɪndə]

Luneville [lu:nə 'vil] — ЛЮНЕВИЛЬ

Copenhagen [,kəʊp(ə)n 'heɪg(ə)n] — КОПЕНГАГЕН

20. NAPOLEON AT THE HEIGHT OF POWER (1801–1805)

The policies in 1801–1805

George III made it plain that the break-up of the Second Coalition was to be laid at Pitt's door, so Pitt had to go, and Addington took over in March 1801. The wits of the time used to crack jokes to the effect that "Pitt was to Addington what London is to Paddington." Addington was a Tory, who sought peace with France. However, at the very same time, the British allied themselves with Turkey and the two armies defeated the French army in Egypt. In 1802, the Amiens peace treaty was signed, under which France retained Holland and Belgium and all the west bank of the Rhine. Egypt was returned to Turkey. England gave up all conquests, except Trinidad and Ceylon.

It was the curious experience of England that while her wealth had nearly doubled during the war, the poor had become still poorer. Manufactures flourished, but the import of foreign, and especially of Russian, corn was of course restricted; bad harvests at home caused famine, high prices and riots.

In 1803 Napoleon planned to invade England, and for this purpose he concentrated his *Armée de l'Angleterre* and his fleet of flat-bottomed boats at Boulogne. But the British were vigilant. Brest and Toulon were rigorously blockaded to prevent the French fleet in them from coming out to clear the English Channel and cover Napoleon's crossing. Cornwallis blockaded Brest; for two years past Nelson had been ceaselessly watching Toulon.

In 1804 the French Senate suggested some change in the constitution, and to introduce the principle of heredity, as the surest means of counteracting the aims of many conspirators, who made plans of kidnapping the first Consul of France. The senate besought Napoleon "to complete his work by rendering it, like his glory, immortal." On the third of May 1804 it was proposed that the imperial dignity should be declared hereditary in the family of Bonaparte. On the 18th of May the same year awarded to Napoleon the title of Emperor, the succession (in case he had no children) devolving in turn upon the descendants of Joseph and Louis Bonaparte (the other two brothers, Jerome and Lucien, were for the present excluded from the succession because they had contracted marriages displeasing to Napoleon).

The changes brought about by this decision were mainly formal and titular. Napoleon's powers as the First Consul for Life were wide enough. Now he was able to dispense with all republican forms (the last to go was the Republican Calendar, which ceased on the first of January, 1806), and the scene at the coronation in Notre Dame on the second of December 1804 was frankly imperial in splendour and in the egotism which led Napoleon to wave aside the pope Pius VII, at the supreme moment and crown himself.

In 1804 William Pitt was restored to power, "having come to a conclusion that Ireland's grievance must give way to England's danger." His experience in forming coalitions again proved invaluable, and he lived up to his reputation by forming a third coalition of England, Austria, Sweden and Russia against France with her new allies, Spain and Holland.

The result of it was that again the danger for Britain was averted at the expense of her Continental allies. Napoleon, foiled in his invasion of England by the blockade of his fleets, decided to attack the Allies, while the Russian and Austrian troops, playing into the British hands, marched, under General Kutuzov, towards the Bavarian border.

In the summer of 1805 Napoleon conquered Holland and appointed his brother Louis her king (Napoleon's control of Holland caused a great vexation in Britain). He also captured the South

German states, created the Confederation of the Rhine and appointed himself as its head. Another of his brothers, Joseph Bonaparte, was given southern Italy, making him the king of Two Sicilies. Thus, almost all of Italy, Germany and the Netherlands were in the actual submission to France, and Napoleon became the ruler of most of Europe. It seemed no one was left in Europe who would die for English gold in the fight against brilliant Bonaparte.

However, as we mentioned above, the Third Coalition was being negotiated and finally formed in autumn 1805. It included Russia, Britain, Austria, Sweden and the Kingdom of Naples. Prussia, though expressed displeasure, was not going to fight. Russia, whose Tsar Alexander I was obliged to the British for his rising to power, actively supported the anti-Napoleonic coalition. According to the plan, Austria pledged to put the army of 250 thousand soldiers, Russia - 180 thousand, Sweden - 16 thousand, and the Kingdom of Naples added 20 thousand people to the cause of the common victory. The British pledged to pay the Allies a year 1,125,000 pounds for every 100 thousand people and, in addition, give a quarter of that amount for small expenses.

Horatio Nelson

Horatio Nelson (1758-1803) was born at the parsonage house in Norfolk, on the 29th of September 1758. His father, Edmund Nelson, who came of a clerical family, was rector of the parish. His mother was the grandniece of Robert Walpole. The introduction of the future Admiral to the navy came from his mother's uncle, an officer of some reputation who at his death held the important post of comptroller of the navy. This uncle, Captain Suckling, was appointed to the "Triumph", the guardship at Chatham, and took his nephew with him. In order that the lad might have more practice than could be obtained on a harbour ship, his uncle sent him to the West Indies on a merchant vessel, and on his return gave him a constant employment in boat work on the river. In a brief sketch of his life, which he wrote in 1799, Nelson says that in this way he became a good pilot for small vessels "from Chatham to the Tower of London, down the Swin, and the North Foreland; and confident of myself among rocks and sands, which has many times since been of great comfort to me..." Between April and October of 1772 he served on the "Carcass", one of the vessels that went on a voyage to the Arctic seas with captain Phipps, better known by his Irish title of Baron Malgrieve. On Nelson's return from the north he was sent to the East Indies in the "Seahorse", on which vessel he made the acquaintance of his lifelong friend Thomas Troubridge.

At the end of two years Nelson was invalided home. Afterwards Nelson spoke of the depression under which he laboured during the return voyage, till "after a long and gloomy reverie, in which I almost wished myself overboard, a sudden glow of patriotism was kindled within me, and presented my king and my country as my patron. My mind exalted in the idea. 'Well, then,' I exclaimed, 'I will be a hero and, confiding in Providence, I will brave any danger.'" On his return home Nelson served during a short cruise on the "Worcester" frigate and passed his examination as lieutenant.

Soon Nelson was promoted to the command of the "Badger" brig, and the "Hinchinbrook" frigate. By this appointment he was placed in the rank of post captain at the age of twenty (1779). In the main he owed his rapid rise to his power of winning the affection of all those he met, comrades as well as superiors. In 1780 Nelson took an active part in an expedition to San Juan de Nicaragua, which was rendered deadly by the climate. He was brought to the death door by fever, and invalided home once more. In 1781 he was appointed to the "Albemarle" frigate and was sent to Newfoundland and to the North American station. Canada gave him good health.

Nelson took part during the French war in many sea battles. During the operation at Calvi, Nelson's right eye was destroyed by gravel driven into it by a cannon shot which stuck the ground close to him. By this time Nelson had already gained that reputation after which follows usually public recognition. His character was fully developed, and his capacity proved. When

Spain, after first making peace with France at Basel, declared war on England, Nelson was sent to Elba to bring off the small garrison and the naval stores. He fulfilled his mission and re-joined the flag of his leader Jervis on the eve of the battle off Cape St. Vincent on the 14th of February 1797. Nelson receiving the swords of the Spanish officers on the deck of the "San Josef" became at once a popular figure. But the triumph was overcovered by a spirit of disaffection in the navy. The men had some very real grievances; low wages, bad food, incompetent officers, harsh discipline; all those provoked a mutiny first in Spithead, and then a more serious one in the Nore (1797).

The first mutiny was pacified by Howe without much difficulty, but the second had a more political character; its leaders were affected by revolutionary ideas and threatened to the government. The mutiny was one more contribution to the wide swing the popular movement was assuming under the influence of the democratic ideas developed by the "Corresponding Societies." Suppression of separate mutinous ships was inconclusive. Soon above forty crews were involved, organization was introduced, and a central committee created with Richard Parker, an able-bodied seaman before the mast, as president. He was soon in command (the sailors called him "the Red Admiral") and red flags were proclaiming from masttops their usual message — signal for action. The officers were arrested and the sailors' demands, economic at first (such as higher pay and better conditions) assumed political tinge as the movement grew in scope. Freedom for all Englishmen and a Parliament reform were among the demands.

Pitt's government suppressed the mutiny only after they resorted to a ruse. Satisfaction of demands was promised, and amnesty was guaranteed to everyone concerned as long as no more action was taken. The sailors believed all the promises and stopped the mutiny in an organized manner. Then the government executed Parker and the other leaders while the sailors were sentenced to long-term imprisonment. Admiral Duncan was blockading Dutch ports at the time, and many of his men sympathized with the mutineers. Still, before the end of the year Duncan managed to beat the Dutch fleet at Camperdown.

During the Napoleonic Wars, from 1798, Nelson commanded the squadron sent to the Mediterranean to counter the Egyptian expedition undertaken by France in 1798-1801. The British squadron was unable to prevent the landing of the French troops in Alexandria, but on 1-2 August 1798 Nelson managed to defeat the French fleet at Aboukir, cutting off the army of Napoleon Bonaparte in Egypt. Nelson himself was wounded in the head. As a reward George III made Nelson Baron of the Nile. In August 1799 he was awarded the Order of Sultan Selim III for the restoration of the Ottoman rule in Egypt.

In Naples, where Nelson was sent to assist the Kingdom of Naples in the fight with France, he began his love affair with the British Ambassador's wife Lady Emma Hamilton, which lasted until his death. However, Nelson failed to help Naples by himself, and the city fell into the hands of the French. Naples was liberated by the Russian squadron under Admiral F.F. Ushakov and the French garrison surrendered. In the wake of this, Nelson tarnished his name by his approval of violence towards the French prisoners of war and Italian republicans, despite the protests of the Russian allies.

The Battle of Trafalgar

Customarily, paying countries to fight against its immediate rival, London itself stood aside of major military battles. But if Britain did fight a battle and happened to win, it was usually exalted to the skies. Such was the Battle of Trafalgar, in which Nelson defeated Napoleon's fleet. It happened off Cape Trafalgar on October 21, 1805. Britain's general preponderance on sea was largely conducive to this victory.

"Let us be masters of the Channel for six hours and we are masters of the world," said Napoleon. However, it did not come to be.

In the spring of 1805, while Napoleon was at Boulogne, Admiral Villeneuve got away from

Toulon and sailed through the Straits of Gibraltar before Nelson knew that he had escaped. Off Cadiz he had been joined by the Spanish fleet, and was ostensibly going to attack the English possessions in the West Indies; really he wanted to draw Nelson in pursuit, elude him in the Atlantic, and return to attack Cornwallis, thus giving the Brest fleet a chance to come out; the two fleets could then command the Channel long enough to cover Napoleon's crossing. Nelson started off in pursuit, although he was delayed a month by contrary winds; when Villeneuve doubled back, Nelson doubled too. Villeneuve had to seek shelter in Vigo Bay; by the time Nelson returned, largely reinforced by Collingwood, he had put into Cadiz. Things were exactly as they had been two years before, only that Nelson was blockading Cadiz instead of Toulon; Cornwallis was still watching Brest.

In autumn the same year Napoleon sent orders to Villeneuve to leave Cadiz and engage the enemy. Nelson, for his part, was ready to meet the Emperor's fleet. He wrote on the 9th of October, 1805: "Thinking it almost impossible to bring a fleet of forty sail into a line of battle in variable winds, thick weather and other circumstances which must occur, without such a loss of time that the opportunity would be probably lost of bringing the enemy to battle in such a manner as to make the battle decisive, I have therefore made up my mind to keep the fleet in that position of sailing (with the exception of the first and second at command) that the order of sailing is to be the order of battle, I must place the fleet in two lines of sixteen ships each, with an advanced squadron of the fastest sailing two-decked ships, which will always make, if wanted, a line of twenty-four sail, on whichever line the commander-in-chief may direct. The second in command will, after my intentions are made known to him, have the entire direction of his line to make the attack upon the enemy and to follow up the blow until they are captured or destroyed.



If the enemy's fleet should seem to be windward in line of battle, and that the two lines and the advanced squadron can fetch them, they will probably be so extended that their van could not succour their rear. I should therefore probably make the second in command's signal to lead through about their twelfth ship from their rear; my line would cut through about the centre, and the advanced squadron to cut through at their commander in chief, which every effort must be made to capture... The divisions of the British fleet will be brought nearly within the gunshot of

the enemy's centre... Some ships may not get through their exact place, but any will always be at hand to assist their friends, and if any are thrown round the rear of the enemy, they will effectually complete the business of twelve sail of the enemy..."

(From Nelson's Memorandum before the Battle of Trafalgar, Nicolas, "Dispatches and Letters of Vice-Admiral Lord Viscount Nelson," VII. 89)

On October 21, 1805, the day after Napoleon had forced the Austrians to capitulate at Ulm in Bavaria, the French and British fleets met off Cape Trafalgar. Villeneuve had almost as many Spanish ships as French, thirty-three in all; they were sailing in a long huddled arc across the English bows. Nelson, in two lines, one headed by himself in the "Victory" and the other by Collingwood in the "Royal Sovereign", pierced through this arc and so divided the allied fleet into two divisions which could not help one another. Twenty-two of the French-Spanish ships were taken or destroyed by Nelson.

The famous signal was to have been worded "Nelson confides that every man will do his duty", and that his name was replaced by that of England on the suggestion of one of his officers. Nelson parted with Captain Blackwood of the "Eurylus" with a prophecy of his approaching fate.

The sight of Collingwood, the friend of his youth, leading the lee line into action in the "Royal Sovereign" drew from him a cry of admiration at the noble example his comrade was showing. When the "Victory" had passed stern of the French "Bucentaure", and was engaged with her and the "Redoubtable", he walked up and down the quarter deck of his flagship by the side of his flag-captain, T. M. Hardy, with the brisk short step customary with him. As they turned, a musket shot from the top of the "Redoubtable" struck him on the upper breast, and, plunging down, broke the spine. "They have done for me at last!" were the words in which he acknowledged the fatal stroke. He lingered for a very few hours of anguish in the fetid cockpit of the "Victory" amid the horrors of darkness relieved only by the dim light of lanterns, and surrounded by men groaning, or raving with unbearable pain. The shock of the broadsides made the whole frame of the "Victory" tremble and extorted a moan from the dying admiral. When Captain Hardy came down to report the progress of the battle, his inherited love for full triumph drew from him a declaration that less than twenty prizes would not satisfy him. He clung to his authority to the end. The suggestion that Collingwood would have to decide which course to take was answered with the eager claim, "Not while I live." His last words were, "I have done my duty, thank God for that!" Nelson's body was brought home in a cask of brandy by his flagship and laid to rest in St. Paul's Cathedral. He is commemorated in London by the monument in Trafalgar Square, completed in 1840 with a statue by E. H. Baily, and surrounded by Landseer's bronze lions, added in 1867. Nelson's old flagship still lies at anchor in Portsmouth Harbour.

However, six weeks after the Trafalgar battle Napoleon's victory over the Russian and Austrian armies at Austerlitz destroyed the coalition and hastened the death of Pitt (January 1806).

Talks for Peace. The Peace of Tilsit

Greenville now formed a government known as the "Ministry of All the Talents"; along with some of Pitt's followers were Whigs like Fox, who had been in opposition since 1783. His office of Foreign Secretary showed Fox that Napoleon's ambition made war inevitable, but he only survived his great rival by eight months. He lived long enough to carry through the House of Commons a resolution against the slave trade, which Wilberforce and Clarkson had been denouncing for years⁶⁶. When after his death the resolution became an Act, the practice of kidnapping Negroes from Africa and selling them as slaves in the American and West Indies plantations was subdued. Greenville's ministry had tried to negotiate with Napoleon for peace; meeting with no success it continued the war, but in so feeble a way and in so many directions at once that there was no really striking or important result.

On the other hand, Napoleon was making himself master of Europe. Prussia, which had stood aloof so long, was driven into war and utterly defeated at Jena in 1806. Russia still resisted, hoping in vain for help from England, but the British in their usual insidious way shrunk away. At the time, Russia was already engaged on two fronts: in a war with Persia, and since 1806 – with Turkey (for the Russian protectorate of Moldavia and Walachia). Remarkably, Russia had to tackle her affairs with Turkey and Persia alone, none of her allies helped her. On the contrary, in the war with Napoleon, all required her assistance. It was a clear case of one-sided game. In June 1807 the Russian army under Bennigsen's command was defeated at Friedland and unable

⁶⁶The British campaign to abolish the slave trade is generally considered to have begun in the 1780s with the establishment of the Quakers antislavery committees, and their presentation to Parliament of the first slave trade petition in 1783. The abolitionists, Thomas Clarkson and William Wilberforce being among their leaders, set in motion Britain's social movement to abolish the slave trade. In 1807, following many years of lobbying by the Abolitionist movement, the British Parliament voted to make the slave trade illegal anywhere in the Empire with the Slave Trade Act 1807. The United States followed suit. Slavery itself was formally abolished in the British Empire with the Slavery Abolition Act 1833. However, slave labour existed in the colonies into the 20th c.

to continue the war.

So far Alexander I's intransigence against Bonaparte had made him refuse to ratify any peace agreements with France. The English gold that had facilitated Alexander I's accession to the throne revealed itself in this. Meanwhile the French troops, after defeating the Fourth Coalition, occupied Berlin and Warsaw and for the first time came on the Russian border. Now Bonaparte only had the river Neman lying before him and further the Russian territory spread out.

But Bonaparte was not going to smash and break the Russian Empire. He had always considered Russia the only possible major ally of France and had long sought her favour. Bonaparte did not need the Russian territory - he had conquered entire Europe. He needed peace and, if not an alliance, then at least the neutrality of Russia. Napoleon's attitude was sympathetic and chivalrous. He was defiantly holding out the hand of friendship to Alexander. He unconditionally released all Russian prisoners of war, permitted the defeated Russian army to cross the Niemen and burn the bridges behind them. He demanded no concessions from Russia.



Eventually, the Peace of Tilsit (1807) brought Russia to the alliance with France. French sappers built a huge raft with an elegant tent in the middle of the Niemen. On this raft, on June 25, 1807, a meeting of the two emperors took place. Once they both boarded the raft, Napoleon embraced Alexander, and they went to the tent, where

they immediately began their nearly two-hour long conversation. Bonaparte received the long-awaited peace and a chance to relax, enjoying all the marvels of his victories. Europe subdued to him and held her breath, only Britain remained defiant.

Having developed a brilliant strategy of destroying competition, the British repeatedly encountered problems generated by their own cunning. The emergence of such a brilliant commander as Napoleon was one of them. In fact, the royal army of Louis XVI, who had met his death on the scaffold, was 160 thousand strong. Having facilitated the revolution in France, the British missed Napoleon's rise to power and rendered themselves a disservice. Their money and direction had launched a process in which the French captured almost all of Europe, and the French army absorbed the soldiers of subjugated nations and exceeded 500 thousand. Now it was necessary to fight the power so suddenly grown. And it was unknown how the cards might have fallen in this dangerous geopolitical game.

The Berlin Decree, English Blockade

England's supremacy at sea had enabled her to restrict the trade of neutral countries with France, while encouraging the trade with herself and deriving great profit from it. To retain the trade of Europe in her own hands, England was determined to break up the Armed Neutrality of Russia, Denmark and Sweden, initiated by the Russian Empire. A fleet under Hyde Parker, a British Admiral, with Nelson as second in command, was sent to the Battle of Copenhagen in April 1801. The defences to the south of Copenhagen, consisting of blockships and floating batteries, were destroyed. Nelson was so engaged that he did not notice the signal for his recall. In this battle the British resorted to the bombardment of the city – a move repeated in 1807, with numerous casualties among civilians. Those were the first in the world history instances of bombardment of civilians with an intention to coerce a neutral country to accept the aggressor's terms. It made the Danes accept a truce. And after Paul I's murder in March 1801 the Swedes also withdrew from the Armed Neutrality and it came to an end.

Not being able to defeat the British fleet to carry out the landing on the English coast,

Napoleon tried to destroy the economic power of the enemy by trade embargo. Realizing that the basic power of Britain rested on its income from trade, Napoleon tried his best to undermine it. He believed that by denying England her major source of her wealth – trade - it was possible to subdue her politically. As Napoleon had control of almost all of Europe, this problem did not seem unsolvable. After Jena Napoleon entered Berlin in triumph, and published from it a decree by which the British Isles were declared to be in a state of blockade, all trade between France and French allies and England was prohibited, and all English property in France or any allied country was confiscated. "The British Isles are declared in a state of blockade, both by land and by sea," - it read. - All trade and all relations with them are forbidden. ... No vessel coming from England or her colonies, ... shall be accepted in any port." This meant declaration of economic war, which went down in history as the Continental blockade (or, English blockade, Continental system). The blockade could be effective only if all the European countries closed their ports to British goods. Consequently, Napoleon extended the area of the blockade to all new allied and conquered countries.

France itself now included Belgium, a large part of Germany, Savoy, and North-West Italy; Napoleon's brothers, Louis, Joseph, and Jerome, were Kings of Holland, Naples, and Westphalia; Saxony, Bavaria, and Wurttemberg had become his dependent kingdoms; Spain had long been his ally. Having become France's ally, Russia herself undertook to join the Continental blockade and completely stop trade with England. The Peace of Tilsit also brought in the Northern Powers for Russia could answer for Sweden and Denmark. England was thus shut out from all the markets of Europe.

It seemed probable enough that the Continental blockade would accomplish its object. Despite the fact that the Bank of England issued money for war, and the predatory East India Company and the British government pillaged the colonies, manufacture decreased; and the British population suffered, as they depended now on trade, and not on agriculture as in the past. Expensive machinery needed a vast output to keep the manufacturers solvent; a diminishing of orders meant starvation to the mass of the people. On the other hand, as the British historians claim, some Continental countries "depended on England for cloth and other manufactured necessities; their armies could not be kept in the field without the goods which England alone was able to supply. The decree was thus almost as damaging to her enemies as to England itself, and Napoleon could not prevent smuggling; he was even driven *by his need for money* to encourage his allies to export corn into England; otherwise, in spite of English government's encouragement of corn-growing at home by letting the landowners enclose commons and wastes, England might have been starved out." Anyway, there were countries who managed to stay out of the blockade of the British Isles - Spain and Portugal, in the first place, as well as Sweden. It was impossible to prevent smuggling, and, as a small hole destroys a large balloon, so a small violation of the embargo nullified all its meaning.

The British government's reply to the Berlin decree was symmetrical: the publication of Orders in Council, which declared that all neutral vessels trading with French or allied port were liable to confiscation. English supremacy on sea gave Britain an advantage over Napoleon; the British were able to control the carrying trade of the world by destroying the shipping of other countries. In other words, British ships stopped vessels of other countries on the high seas and acted on the principle of "whoever is not with us is against us." The British sank ships, burnt coastal cities. In response to these piratic actions, Napoleon declared that any ship, obeying the dictates of Britain, would be considered British with all its consequences. It became simply impossible to be neutral.

Alexander I of Russia worried that the Russian ships and even coasts could also fall prey to the British. Those worries were not altogether ungrounded, considering the British bombings of

Copenhagen, with thousands of civilian casualties.⁶⁷ During all that time the Danish kingdom had been making desperate attempts to stay away from all European wars. Then the British squadron with 20,000 troops came to Copenhagen, and the British ambassador Jackson presented himself to Crown Prince Regent Frederick. Without batting an eye, he said that His Majesty's Government knew the intention of Napoleon to force Denmark to an alliance with France, and England could categorically not allow that. The British demanded that Denmark should transfer to them their entire fleet, and the British forces should be allowed to occupy the island where Copenhagen was located. Amazed at such impudence, the prince refused. Having met with Frederick's refusal, the British and Hanoverians landed on the island of Zealand on August 14 and defeated a detachment of the Danish army near the town of Køge. A few days later General Arthur Wellesley, the future Duke of Wellington, took in the surroundings of Copenhagen. From 2 to 5 September the English fleet carried out the shelling of the Danish capital: 5,000 volleys on the first night, 2,000 on the second night, and 7,000 - on the third. At least 2,000 civilian residents of the Danish capital were killed, every third building was destroyed. When shelling, the British used the flammable Congreve rockets, which is why fires broke out in the besieged city. On September 7 the Danish General Peymann signed the act of capitulation, in which the remains of Copenhagen and the Danish fleet were transferred to the British. On September 21 the English fleet headed to their native shores, taking with them the seized Danish fleet. Besides, the British troops burned the shipyard and the naval arsenal of Copenhagen. Europe simply gasped at the audacity of the British. From now on, it became clear that in the war with Napoleon the British were ready even for annihilation. In October 1807 Russia gave Britain an ultimatum threatening to break up the diplomatic relations until the fleet had been returned to Denmark and her losses compensated for. The British did not react, quite expectedly. So, the embassies were mutually withdrawn, and the sluggish Anglo-Russian war began, which lasted until 1812.

Comprehension questions

1. Domestic and foreign policies in 1801-1805. Britain's tactics of dealing with immediate rival countries.
2. The Battle of Trafalgar.
3. Negotiations for peace. The Peace of Tilsit.
4. The Berlin Decree.
5. The Continental Blockade. Orders in Council. Bombardments of Copenhagen in 1801 and 1807.

Names and expressions

Armée de l'Angleterre – «Английская армия» Наполеона Бонапарта

Aboukir Bay [ə'bukir bei] – Абукирский залив

Toulon [tu: 'lon] (France) — Тулон

Cornwallis, Charles, Marquis [ko:n 'wolis] (1738-1805) — English general and statesman

Amiens [æmi: 'ən] - Амьен

Ceylon [si 'lon] - Цейлон

Villeneuve, Pierre Charles Jean Baptist Silvestre [vil 'no:v] (1763-1806) — French Admiral.

Cadiz ['keidiz, kə'diz] (Spain) — Кадис

to cover Napoleon's crossing— чтобы прикрыть Наполеона, когда тот будет пересекать залив

⁶⁷ The British historians write: "George Canning, now Foreign Secretary, did indeed compel Denmark to surrender its fleet by the bombardment of Copenhagen; but for so slight a break in this Continental system it was hardly worth incurring the unpopularity his action brought on England."

Vigo Bay [vi:gə] — inlet in Atlantic (Spain)
to wave aside the pope, Pius VII — отмахнулся от папы Пия VII (сделал ему знак рукой не подходить)
second in command — помощник командира корабля
if wanted — если понадобится
Ulm [u:lm] (Germany) — Ульм
Trafalgar [trə 'fælga]
Austerlitz [o:stəlɪz] — Аустерлиц
Wilberforce, William ['wɪlbəfo:s] (1759-1833) — English philanthropist and statesman
Clarkson, Thomas ['kla:ksən] (1760-1846) — English slavery abolitionist
Jena ['jeɪnə, -nə:] (Tuhringia, Germany)
Tilsit [ti:l 'zɪt] (Prussia) — Тильзит
Canning, George [kæniŋ] (1770-1827) — English statesman
a diminishing of orders — уменьшение количества заказов
their armies could not be kept in the field — их армии не могли сражаться (долго быть на поле сражения)
the carrying trade — внешняя торговля

21. FRENCH LOUISIANA PURCHASED BY AMERICANS (1803). THE CONTINENTAL WARS

The Louisiana Purchase

Colonial French Louisiana was a part of New France. Beginning in 1682, this region, known in French as la Louisiane française, functioned as an administrative district of New France. It extended from the Gulf of Mexico to Vincennes, now in Indiana.



During the French and Spanish rule, Louisiana had multiracial population with three main components: the white planters from Spain and France, and the Creoles; the “coloured” - free population of mixed European and Native American-African descent, especially born out of the institute of plaçage (common law marriages of Europeans and non-Europeans, of African, Native American and mixed-race descent); the Negro slaves from Africa. Just as in Latin America, the boundaries between these approximately equal three groups were fuzzy, so there was high mobility of the population. In 1769-1803, the society of Louisiana had soft, democratic and

rather patriarchal ways of living, combining the features of the three communities in the region. The main languages in the colonial period were French (especially in the city of New Orleans - the capital at the time) and Spanish (in the municipality of Saint-Bernard).

Besides, the Catholic southwestern part of Louisiana was settled by the Acadians, who formed an ethno-cultural group - the Cajun.⁶⁸ They were descendants of French colonists, including Métis, who had lived in the Canadian provinces of Acadia and Nova Scotia since the 17th and 18th centuries. The Acadians lived there for almost 80 years prior to the British Conquest of Acadia in 1710. In the middle of the 18th century, from 1755 to 1763, the British authorities had deported the French-Acadian settlers during the so-called Great Expulsion. About 11,500 Acadians were deported or transported to prisons in the USA (then a British colony) and to the Malvinas Islands, half of them died in the holds of the ships.

In Napoleon's time, his plan was to create a new empire based on sugar trade in the Caribbean, where Louisiana would serve as a kind of repository for sugar production. But due to lack of funds for the war in Europe, Napoleon had to sell the area in 1803 to the United States. With this money, he mustered an army and quickly began to spread his influence throughout Europe.

Joining in the United States was quite inauspicious for the Neo-Romanesque population of Louisiana. The Catholic and Protestant attitudes to interracial marriages were very different: while the Catholics admitted of them, the Protestants rejected any "miscegenation." At first the Protestants displaced the French and Spanish languages and then dealt with the soft, democratic structure of the local population. A segregation of the races, apartheid, was established in the state, the rule of one drop of blood⁶⁹ was introduced, the Ku Klux Klan spread its influence, Jim Crow laws were established. In the 19th century the bulk of free people of colour moved in Mexico, the remaining representatives were downgraded to the status of slaves.^{70 71}

The Peninsular War

To complete the effect of the blockade, Napoleon needed to isolate the British Isles. And, as we have seen, although Europe came under the rule of Napoleon, there were countries whose governments turned a blind eye on the trade with England. Bonaparte asked Russia to persuade Sweden to join the blockade, while he would be engaged in the Iberian Peninsula. The logic of the Continental Blockade of Napoleon started to get him farther and farther.

The economies of Spain and Portugal largely depended on importing merino wool to Britain and exporting cheap British machine fabrics. These countries depended on Britain and did not hasten to break relations with it. It was obviously the effect of the "free trade" that destroyed their national industries for the sake of the alleged efficiency of the open market. In fact, it reduced national independence of some countries dependent on the import of technological production of other countries. It is worth recalling David Ricardo, who lived exactly in the time of the Napoleonic wars, and who insisted in his "Principles of Political Economy and Taxation"

⁶⁸ Around 3,000 French-Acadians found refuge off the coast of France on the island of Belle-Ile. Many also fled to remote and marshy northern regions of modern New Brunswick, which is now home to more than 200 thousand of their descendants, speaking French.

⁶⁹The "one-drop rule" is a sociological and legal principle of racial classification that was historically prominent in the United States asserting that any person with even one ancestor of sub-Saharan-African ancestry ("one drop" of black blood) is considered to be black (Negro in historical terms).

⁷⁰ Remarkably, the United States retained traditional Louisiana law (the Francophone codes of law were translated into English). Currently, Louisiana is the only US state where the continental civil law, which goes back to Roman law, is in effect, while the Anglo-Saxon common law, based on precedent, has penetrated here only to a very slight extent.

⁷¹ Gayarré, Ch. History of Louisiana. URL.: http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Gazetteer/Places/America/United_States/Louisiana/home.html

(1817) that even though Portugal could produce cloth more efficiently than England, it paid for it to import English cloth rather than produce it. It is likely that while the free trade impelled British trade partners to phase down certain industries, Britain obtained important levers to control them.

In October 1807 a 27,000-strong French army under General Jean-Andoche Junot set out to Portugal through Spain and in late November the French already entered Lisbon. Then, taking advantage of dynastic disputes at the Spanish court, Napoleon deposed the Spanish king and "appointed" his brother Joseph in his place. This was done as follows: the Spanish throne was occupied by Charles IV, a weak and small-minded man, completely influenced by his wife and her favourite, Don Godoy. The king, the queen and Godoy harboured implacable enmity against Ferdinand, the heir to the throne. Spain was France's ally and the idea of Ferdinand's marriage to any relative of Napoleon's was very popular among the Spaniards. However, Bonaparte had other plans. Marshal Murat with the French army of 80,000 people marched to Madrid. At first, Charles IV, his wife and Godoy decided to flee the capital, but were detained by the rioting people. The king was forced to abdicate in favour of his son Ferdinand. But Napoleon did not recognize that fact and summoned the whole family of the Spanish Bourbons to France, to Bayonne. He assumed the role of a chief judge, whose word was final, and ordered his brother Joseph, King of Naples, to move to Madrid and become Spanish king, whereas Napoleon's Marshal Murat would be king of Naples, respectively. It might seem that now the blockade of England would be complete. But Napoleon did not foresee one thing – the response of Spaniards to such permutations. Now it was clear to them that Bonaparte was going to annex Spain to France.

In response, a revolt broke out in Madrid. Napoleon later admitted that his whole Spanish policy was a mistake. The population rose to fight with the French, the popular guerrilla war began. This war surpassed in its fierceness everything that had been earlier. Both sides did not take prisoners, killing the captured with extreme cruelty. The Guerrilla War in Spain lasted until the end of the Napoleonic Empire, turning Spain into a "graveyard of reputations."

Napoleon's misadventure with Spain was strange. The King of Spain had been his faithful ally. Having lost her colonial grandeur, beaten at a time by the British, Spain gladly sided with Napoleonic France. Suffice it to recall that in the famous Battle of Trafalgar, Admiral Nelson defeated not only the French squadron, but the joint Franco-Spanish fleet. And thereafter the loyalty of the Spanish king to Napoleon was absolute and unquestioning.

The reaction of Britain to the invasion of the Napoleonic troops in Spain and Portugal was remarkable. Britain usually watched impassively the permanent victories of Bonaparte in Europe, never sending her troops to the continent to help her unfortunate allies. But it was enough for the French to enter the Pyrenees, and the British immediately sent an expeditionary force to the Continent. They feared that if they had remained simple observers, the Continental blockade would have been really pan-European.

The same tactics was employed by the British till the end of their struggle with Bonaparte: they would make war with minor French forces and in the theatres of war paramount for themselves. The other countries opposing Napoleon would be given the "honour" to bear the brunt of the fight with the French, pouring the blood of their soldiers at the edifice of the future British greatness.

So, Canning lost no time in sending help to the Peninsula. In early August 1808, General Arthur Wellesley landed with 9 thousand British soldiers in the Gulf of Mondego in Portugal and advanced upon Lisbon, from which Junot marched out to meet him at Vimiero. As the British historians write, "the English victory would have been decisive if Wellesley's seniors had not stopped the pursuit." As it was, the Convention of Cintra allowed Junot to retire with his army to France in British ships. Lisbon was entered, but Wellesley and his seniors were recalled. John Moore was left in command.

When Napoleon invaded Spain and set Joseph once more on his throne in Madrid, John Moore permitted Spaniards to reorganise themselves by drawing off the French armies in pursuit of his own small forces of 25,000 men. Soult, Ney were all pressing in upon him as he retreated to the north-west coast, where he hoped to find ships to embark his army for England. Napoleon was recalled to deal with Austria, but Soult dogged his rear throughout his winter march. In the engagement that ensued Soult was repulsed, and Moore's army was safely embarked, but without its leader, who had fallen in the battle (January 1809). Byron travelled in Spain and in Portugal very soon after those events, he chanced to see with his own eyes the fresh scars of war which was finished just before his coming here. In Lisbon the poet saw an unusual woman who used to walk on the Prado in her war uniform and with medals on her breast, he was told that she was the famous Maid of Saragoza who took part in the fighting. Byron wrote about her several stanzas in his poem "Child Harold."

The Russo-Swedish War

As we remember, in the summer of 1807, Alexander I and Napoleon I concluded the Peace of Tilsit, completing the Russian-Prussian-French war. At the conclusion of the Peace of Tilsit, Alexander I suggested his mediation to reconcile the Swedish king Gustav IV with Napoleon. He also planned to persuade the Danish kingdom to join the blockade. In response, in August 1807 the United Kingdom launched an attack on the capital of the kingdom of Copenhagen and captured the whole Danish navy. The Russian Imperial House (Holstein-Gottorp dynasty) had family ties with the Danish Holsteins, so Russia supported Denmark. The British and Russian embassies were mutually withdrawn, and a creeping war began.

The King of Sweden, Gustav IV, for his part, continued on the course of rapprochement with Britain and hostility towards Napoleon. The Russian government twice appealed to him with a request for his assistance in ensuring that, under agreements of 1780 and 1800, the Baltic Sea fleets should be closed to the Western powers. After a long time, Gustav IV replied that the agreements of 1780 and 1800 could not be put into effect until the French occupied the Baltic Sea harbour. No Alexander I's admonitions could get him to listen to reason. The source of such "commendable loyalty" of Gustav IV to London lay in the basements of the British banks.

Then it became known that the Swedish king was ready to help Britain in the war with Denmark, trying to win back Norway. The Russian capital, St. Petersburg, was now in dangerous proximity of hostile powers. In February 1808, Britain concluded a treaty with Sweden, under which she should pay Sweden one million pounds for each month of her war with Russia, however long it lasted. In addition, the British promised to provide 14 thousand soldiers to protect the Swedish western borders and ports, while all Swedish troops were to fight against Russia in the eastern front. For his part, Napoleon said to the Russian Ambassador in Paris Count Tolstoy on February 5, 1808, that he wouldn't even mind if Russia took in all of Sweden, including Stockholm.

According to Sprengporten's⁷² plan, the Russian army was divided into three separate groups. The fifth division, led by General Lt. Nikolai Tuchkov, was to march through eastern Finland. The 21st division, led by Pyotr Ivanovich Bagration, was to march along Salpausselkä to Hämeenlinna, and from there to Turku. The 17th division, led by Alexey Ivanovich Gorchakov, was to march along the southern coast of Finland, and take Sveaborg, Helsinki and then Turku.

On February 9, 1808, the Russian troops crossed the border and moved into the Swedish lands. Officially, the war was declared only on March 16. On April 26, Sveaborg, the largest naval base in the Gulf of Sweden, capitulated. At sea, Russian troops occupied the Aland Islands

⁷²Götan Magnus Sprengporten was a Swedish-Finnish and Russian politician, proponent of Finland's independence under the protection of Russia.

and the island of Gotland. However, in early May, the British, together with the Swedish, freed all the captured islands. Russia's war against the Sweden was becoming protracted. The victorious fleet of Admiral Senyavin, returning from the Mediterranean to the Baltic, was blocked and then interned by the British in the port of Lisbon. Surprisingly, Senyavin surrendered without a fight all his ships to the British for storage until the end of the war! As a result, the Russian Baltic fleet was left without reinforcement and blocked by the British on the coast of Estonia. By August, the Russian troops in the Finnish theatre of war were brought to 55 thousand people against 36 thousand Swedes. In September, at the request of the Swedish, armistice was concluded. But the Russian Emperor demanded that the generals liberate the whole of Finland. In October, the Russian troops launched a general offensive and took in a large part of it. However, Sweden was not going to surrender.

Then, in 1809, the unprecedented in world history winter campaign was conducted by the Russians under Count Shuvalov to invade the Sweden Gulf of Bothnia on the ice. In winter, the ice-bound gulf was free of the English fleet. The Ice March of the Russian army took place in difficult conditions. Not wanting to reveal themselves, the soldiers did not make fires and slept in the snow. The Ice March went off brilliantly and may be justly considered one of the glorious pages of the Russian military history. The Russian entry in the territory of Sweden caused consternation there, and, as a result, a coup occurred. Gustav IV was overthrown, and the Swedes again negotiated for the truce. It took another six months, and the Peace Treaty of Hamina was signed between Russia and Sweden. By its terms, the whole Finland and the Aland Islands passed to Russia. Sweden terminated her alliance with Britain and joined the Continental Blockade. One could say that Napoleon and Alexander reached all their goals in this war.

Initially, Russia's intention was to force Sweden to join a naval embargo against Britain, and after this, Russia intended to halt her operations in Finland. However, by March 1808, Alexander I thought it the best solution to cede Finland to the Russian Empire and thus create a buffer zone at the approaches to the Russian capital Saint Petersburg, which was dangerously close to the Swedish border. By conquering Finland, Saint Petersburg was better protected, and Russia got better connections to the Baltic Sea. So, Finland was ceded and became part of the Russian Empire. At the same time, it was granted vast autonomy, which became the foundation for her eventual independence. This autonomy, coupled with the clever national policy of the Russian Empire, led to absence of discontent in the Grand Duchy of Finland and a steady cultural ascent there. Progressive forces of the local intelligentsia sought to make Finnish the state language, which was finally effected by Alexander II.

Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of Wellington



Arthur Wellesley (1735-1852) was born in Ireland. He was sent to Eton, and then to a military college at Angers. He entered the army as Arthur Wellesley, as it was his family name, in the Highlands in 1787, passed rapidly through the lower ranks in five different regiments, became major, and purchased the lieutenant-colonelcy in 1793. But neither in boyhood nor in youth did he appear to have made any mark among his contemporaries. His first experience of active service was in the campaign of 1794-1795, when the British force under the duke of York was driven out of Holland. In 1796 he was sent with his regiment to India, about the same time he became a colonel. There he mastered the details of regimental duty thoroughly, had an acquaintance with every detail of the soldier's life, learned the precise amount of food required for every mouth, the exact weight that could be carried, the distances that could be traversed without tiredness and exhaustion, — in short, all the conditions

which govern the military activity of man and beast. Wellington's later success was due to the completeness of his practical knowledge. At this time, he made a serious study of the science and history of war.

Only in 1805, in spring, he quitted India. On his return home, he was immediately sent to the expedition to Hannover. After a short period when he served in Ireland he was employed in the expedition against Copenhagen, in which he defeated the Danes. In 1808, the Peninsular War began in which Wellesley's military renown was fully established. In April he was promoted lieutenant-general and placed in a command of a division of the troops to operate against the French in Spain and Portugal.

In after years men called him the Iron Duke. He had a fine, firm face, with the great nose and the strong mouth: a man who could never be shaken out of his stern self-control. Hard and cold he seemed, but altogether just, and with never a hint of self-seeking. It was no easy task that Wellington — then only Wellesley still — had in the Peninsular War, when Napoleon's most skilful marshals came to fight him, one after another — Victor, and Massena, and Marmont, and Jourdan, and Soult; “when he could trust nothing to the Spanish soldiery, but had to depend for all real work on his British regiments”; when one defeat would almost certainly lead to his recall.

When Wellesley landed in Portugal in the spring of 1809 Soult was already in possession of Oporto; but when the English general crossed the Douro the French were driven out of the town. Wellesley now turned south, and by way of the Tagus threatened Madrid, followed by Soult. He had the support of a Spanish army; but his movements were delayed by the neglect of the Spanish government, and Soult was able to collect a large force to fall upon the English line of communication. Wellesley did not know of Soult's presence in force of his flank, advanced against Madrid, and defeated his immediate opponent, King Joseph, at Talavera de la Reina (27th and 28th of July 1809). The victory at Talavera brought him, however, nothing but prestige. He could make little use of his victory; a retreat into Portugal was imperative if he was not to be caught between the two armies of the enemy. Besides, a systematic defence of Portugal did not involve the sacrifice of Spain.

However, a peerage, with the title of Viscount Wellington and Baron Douro, was conferred upon him for Talavera. He was also made marshal-general of the Portuguese army and a Spanish captain-general. His conduct after the battle, however, was sharply criticized in England, and its negative results were used as a weapon against the ministry. So, Wellington rested on the Portuguese frontier, while he ordered his allies to raise the triple lines of Torres Vedras round Lisbon — an impregnable fortification twenty-five miles in extent to which he could retreat in case of need. The English army wintered about Almeida. As summer approached Wellington's anticipations were realised. Massena's forces moved against Portugal with 70,000 men. Wellington retreated down the valley of Mondego, and at length halted at Busaco and gave battle. The French attack was repelled, but other roads were open to the invader, and Wellington continued his retreats. Massena followed, but was checked completely in front of the lines. He sought in vain for unprotected points. It was with great difficulty that he could keep his army from starving. In the spring of 1811 Wellington received reinforcements and moved forward. Massena retreated, when the French army retreated Spain, they had lost 30,000 men. Public opinion in England, lately so hostile, now became confident, and Wellington begun to gain extraordinary popularity.

In the meantime, Soult, who was besieging Cadiz, had moved to support Massena. But soon Soult learnt that Massena was in retreat, and also that his own forces at Cadiz had been beaten. He then returned to the south. Wellington, freed from pressure on this side, and believing Massena to be thoroughly disabled, considered that the time had come for an advance into Spain. Wellington was preparing to attack the fortresses that barred the roads when Massena again took the field. The battle of Fuentes d'Onoro followed wild Wellington's victory as a result, but it was a doubtful victory, which, however, led to evacuation of Almeida. The garrison of Almeida

simply escaped after blowing up part of the fortress.

Meanwhile an English force was besieging Badajoz, Soult, hastening to succour the town, was met by Beresford and defeated in a desperately contested battle at Albuera; but the victory was worthless, for the siege of Badajoz had to be eventually abandoned. At the beginning of 1811 the position in the Peninsula was disheartening; but the Continental System was causing resentment in the north of Europe and was creating a national movement in Prussia. When Napoleon entered on his fatal campaign against Russia, he withdrew 60,000 of his best troops from Spain.

Wellington had from the first seen that, whatever number of men Napoleon might send against him, it was impossible, owing to the poverty of the country, that any great mass of troops could long be held together, and that the French, used to "making war support war", would be worse in this conditions than his own troops with their organized supply service. It was so at the end of 1811. Soult had to move southwards to live, and the English were again more than a match for the enemy in front of them.

At the opening of 1812 Wellington, by a sudden attack, captured Ciudad Rodrigo, and a little later in the spring he stormed Badajoz. The way was now open once more for the invasion of Spain; the defeat of Marmont at Salamanca, the battle in which 40,000 men were beaten in forty minutes, disposed of the only obstacle between Wellington and Madrid. His triumphant entry into that city sent Joseph Bonaparte to join Soult in Valencia — a movement which relieved Wellington from immediate anxiety, but which left him exposed to the future danger of an attack from a united force three times larger than his own, Wellington at once advanced northward to invest Burgos; but here, as at Badajos, he was ill equipped for a siege, and the attack failed. When the remnants of Marmont's army pressed in from the north and Soult from Valencia, the English army had to retreat on Ciudad Rodrigo, leaving the French once more in nominal possession of Spain.

But the needs of the Russian campaign and the ceaseless attacks of the Spanish irregulars and partisans were already producing their effects. In England, where Robert Jenkinson, Lord Liverpool, was now Premier and Castlereagh again Foreign Secretary, the policy of starving the war had given way to enthusiasm. Thus, in the spring of 1813 Wellington crossed the frontier with better omens of permanent success than ever before. Advancing along the valley of Duero, he took Burgos, and then, passing the Ebro, he pushed the French under Joseph and Jourdan, back as far as Vitoria. Here a great victory resulted in the French evacuation of all Spain south of the Ebro, and it seemed as if Wellington would invade France without resistance. To prevent this Napoleon sent Soult to the frontier, and a desperate struggle, in which the English finally won, took place in the battle of the Pyrenees. At the beginning of October Wellington entered France. Soult, however, from his base at Bayonne, still resisted, and the Peninsular War was not really concluded till he was finally defeated at Toulouse in 1814.

Comprehension questions

1. The Louisiana Purchase.
2. The Peninsular War.
3. The Russo-Swedish War.
4. Arthur Wellesley.

Names and expressions

Junot, Andoche (1771-1813) — Marshal of France

to force Joseph Bonaparte upon them as their king — силой навязать им Жозефа Бонапарта в качестве короля

Peninsula [pi' ninsjʊlə] — означает вообще "полуостров", в данном случае — Пиренейский полуостров

Wellesley ['welsli] — Уэлсли

Wellington ['welɪŋtən] (1769-1852) — Веллингтон (традиционно)
Lisbon ['lɪzbən] — Лиссабон
Wellesley's seniors — начальники Веллингтона (Уэлсли)
Cintra [ˌsiːntrə] — (Синтра) a town in central Portugal, in the district of Lisbon
Soult, Nicolas [suːlt] (1769-1851) — Marshal of France (Сульта)
Ney, Michel (1769-1815) — Marshal of France (Нэй)
Castlereagh, Robert Stewart ['kɑːs(ə)l 'reɪ] (1769-1822)
Wagram [wæg 'rɑːm] — village, Lower Austria
Corunna [kəʊ 'rʌnə]
Walcheren ['wɒlkerən]
Ill-timed tear — слеза, пролитая не вовремя
She feels his post — она занимает его место (заменяет на посту)
The flying Gaul — убегающий галл
passed rapidly through the lower ranks — быстро прошел все нижние чины
a man who could never be shaken out of his stem self-control — человек, которого невозможно вывести из себя
Victor, Claude Perrin (1764-1841) — Marshal of France
Massena, Andre [mæ 'senaː] (1758-1817) — Marshal of France
De Marmont, Auguste Frederic [dəːmaː'mɒn] (1774— 1852) — Marshal of France
Jourdan, Jean Baptist [ˌʒʊr 'dɑːn] (1762-1833) -Marshal of France
Oporto [ə(u)'pɔːtəʊ] — in Portugal
Douro [dɒ'uruː] **Spanish** — Duero [du'əro]
Tagus [teɪgəs] — **Spanish** — Tajo ['taːho]
Talavera [ˌtaelə 'vera] - (Spain, near Toledo)
Torres Vedras, ['tɔrəʒh 'vedreʒh] - Portugal
Almeida [æl'məɪde] (**Portugal**)
Mondego river [mɒn 'deɪɡuː] — in Portugal
Busaco [bʊsɑːkə] — in Portugal
To take the field — начинать компанию (боевые действия)
Fuentes d'Onoro [fju(ə)rə] (**Spain**)
Badajoz [bæ 'dahɒs] — in Spain
Beresford [bɪəs'fɔːd] **William Carr** (1768-1854) — British general
whatever number of men Napoleon might send — какое бы количество войск ни послал Наполеон
Albuera, [ælb'wa'rə] Badajos province, **Spain**
Ciudad Rodrigo [sjuː 'ðɑːð rɒd 'rɪɡə] (**Spain**)
Salamanca ['sælə 'mænkə] (**Spain**)
Valencia [væ 'lænsiə] (**Spain**)
were producing their effects — производили свое действие
the policy of starving the war — политика затухания войны
Pyrenees [ˌpɪrɪ 'niːz]
Bayonne [bei 'əʊn] — Байонна
Toulouse [tuː 'luːz]

22. THE RUSSIAN CAMPAIGN OF 1812

The origin and causes of Napoleon's invasion of Russia

Napoleon's reverse came to him in Russia, which he invaded in 1812 with an army of half a million men. Below we will expound the background of Napoleon's Russian Campaign, or the

Patriotic War of 1812, as this war is called in Russia.

In the year 1809 the War of the Fifth Coalition was fought by a coalition of the Austrian Empire and Britain against Napoleon's French Empire and Bavaria. After much campaigning in Bavaria and across the Danube valley, the war ended favourably for the French after the bloody struggle at Wagram in early July. After his triumph, Napoleon began to redraw borders (the policy of "the moving border"), with a stroke of his pen annexing new areas to France. He now seemed unreliable and unpredictable to Alexander I. The Russian Emperor looked the same in the eyes of Napoleon, especially when the Russian monarch began to shy away from strict abidance by the terms of the Continental blockade against Britain and even signed a neutral position on trade, actually reducing the blockade to nothing. But in fact, Alexander, being in cahoots with Britain through the murder of his father Paul I, could not seriously provide the continental blockade of Britain, which prevented Napoleon from overwhelming the British. The wheel of mutual suspicion began to spin. And the main objective of the British diplomacy was to push Russia and France in a new war. Austria and Prussia, in informal diplomatic talks, backed this development. Indeed, except for Russia, no one could ensure victory in the protracted confrontation with Bonaparte.

Finally, the estrangement of Napoleon and Alexander was caused by one more circumstance. In an effort to establish his dynasty and have an heir, Napoleon asked Alexander I for the hands of his sisters, first, Catherine, and then – Anne, but both times he was refused. So, he asked an Austrian princess in marriage and met with the most cordial welcome. And on March 20, 1811 one hundred and one salvoes informed the world that the Empress Marie-Louise gave birth to a son, the heir to the Empire, who received the title of King of Rome. Bonaparte was overjoyed. While earlier the idea of a war with Russia never occurred to Napoleon, now he was pushed towards an attack against his ally. Alexander, whose army had saved Austria and Prussia from subjugation, of course, expected that in the case of conflict with France, Austria and Prussia would perform at his side. But when the war with Napoleon became a reality, Alexander I saw that Austria and Prussia were in alliance with Bonaparte, rather than with him.



Napoleon's Proclamation to the Grand Army (June 22, 1812) "Soldiers! The second Polish war has begun; the first ended at Friedland and Tilsit. At Tilsit Russia pledged an eternal alliance with France, and war on England! To-day her oath is broken. She refuses all explanations of her strange conduct unless the French eagles re-cross the Rhine. Fate draws Russia on; her destiny must be accomplished! Does she then think us degenerate? Are we no longer the soldiers of Austerlitz? She places us between dis- honour and war; can our choice be in doubt? Forward, then, across the Niemen, and let us carry the war on to her own soil!"

...

Alexander I's Order to the Armies (June 25, 1812): "From the old time we have noticed the hostile actions of the French Emperor against Russia, but through gentle and peace-loving ways we were hoping to reject these. Finally, seeing the perpetual renewal of obvious abuse, with all our desire to keep peace, we have been forced to take up arms and muster our troops; but even then, cherishing our reconciliation, we remained within our Empire without disturbing the peace, only ready for defence...".

Napoleon understood that the idea of war against Russia was unpopular in France, and, at the same time, he wanted to show himself the master of Europe. So, he tried to find the men in other countries. In Paris, a Franco-Austrian agreement had been signed by which Austria was obliged to marshal 30 thousand soldiers to help Napoleon. Napoleon guaranteed the "withdrawal" of Moldavia and Wallachia from Russia, and either the Austrian possession of Galicia or territorial compensation for it. The King of Prussia, too, was not hard to persuade. All in all, no less than two-thirds of Napoleon's army were Germans, Austrians, Poles or Italians.

Yet, in spite of hundreds and thousands of books, studies and monographs devoted to them, the origin and causes of Napoleon's invasion of Russia are still insufficiently understood. The official political aim of Napoleon's campaign was to rescue Poland from the Russian threat. But there are many oddities here. We know that Napoleon expected the Russian troops to invade the Duchy of Warsaw (the part of Poland subjected to him) and concentrated his forces there in view of a possible Russian aggression. That aggression never happened, and Napoleon, surprisingly enough, invaded the Russian territory himself, as his army crossed the Niemen on the 24th of June 1812. Alexander's first reaction to the Napoleonic invasion was an attempt at reconciliation with his unfaithful ally. He sent to Napoleon Adjutant General Balashov, who was to declare that the Russian Ambassador Prince Kurakin who had decided to leave France, which was interpreted as the severance of the diplomatic relations and declaration of war, had acted on his own, not under orders, that he had just overreacted. Therefore, if the French army retreated behind the Niemen, the invasion should not be considered accomplished. Napoleon did not take the chance of reconciliation and the war began.

Evidently, Russia and France were pitted against one another in 1812 through bribery and careful instigation of mutual mistrust. In European political scenarios, it often fell to Russia to play the role of a stone wall, against which strong powers of the continent successively broke themselves. And it had been repeated from century to century. The Russian Patriotic War of 1812 is one of the bright examples of this. Napoleon was worried for nothing - Russia had never betrayed her allies and never attacked them. But who put the information about a Russian threat into the head of Bonaparte? Who caused him to doubt the sincerity of the Russian Tsar? These questions, which are still unanswered unambiguously, are much more important than it might seem at first glance, because the situation was largely repeated in the First and Second World Wars.


The course of the War of 1812

Let us get down to the course of the war. We will describe it through the eyes of the authors of *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1911)⁷³, however prejudiced, incomplete or inaccurate this description may be.

Though the battlefield discipline of Napoleon's men was good, the discipline in camp and on the march was much worse, for the troops were no longer eager to reach the battlefield and marched only because they were compelled, and not of their goodwill. On the other hand, as the above-mentioned encyclopaedia puts it, "the Russians, once their fatherland was invaded, became dominated by an ever-growing spirit of fanaticism, and they were by nature too obedient to their natural leaders, and too well inured to the hardships of campaigning, to lose their courage in a retreat." The information about the Russian forces "was very indefinite"; it was known that

⁷³ Vol. 19, Napoleonic Campaigns.

Prince Bagration with about 33,000 men lay grouped about Wolkowysk (Poland); Barclay de Tolly with 40,000 about Vilna; and on the Austrian frontier lay a small corps under Tormassov in process of formation, while far away on the Turkish frontiers hostilities with the sultan retained Tschischagov with 50,000 more. Napoleon knew nothing of the enemy's plans, but, in accordance with his usual practice, he selected a definite position.



“On the 24th of June, the passing of the Niemen began in torrid heat which lasted for a few days. The main army, with the Emperor in person, covered by Murat and the cavalry, moved on to Vilna, while Jerome on his right rear at once threatened Bagration and covered the emperor's outer flank. From the very first, however, the inherent weakness of the army, and the vicious choice of time for the beginning of the advance, began to sate itself felt.

The crops were still green, and there was nothing else available for forage for the horses, an epidemic of colic broke out amongst them; and in ten days the mounted arms had lost about one-third of their strength, men died of sunstrokes in numbers, and serious struggling began. Still everything pointed to the concentration of Russians at Vilna, and Jerome, who on the 5th of July had reached Grodno, was ordered to push on. But Jerome proved quite inadequate to his position, he listened to the complaints of his subordinates as to want of supplies and even to pay; he spent four whole days in absolute inertias. Meanwhile, the Russians made good their retreat. The Russians retreated carefully, avoiding an engagement; and it was seen by Napoleon that he was fighting the country which could not support his vast army at such a distance from his base.

The army resumed its march, this time in the hope of surrounding the overwhelming Barclay, while Davout dealt with Bagration. The want of mobility, particularly in the cavalry, now began to tell against the French. With horses just recovering from an epidemic, they proved quite unequal to the task of catching the Cossacks, who swarmed round them in every direction and never accepted the engagement but compelled a constant watchfulness for which nothing in their previous experience had prepared the French.

The Russian armies continued their retreat, Barclay from Vilna to Vitebsk, Bagration from Wolkowysk to Mohilev. Napoleon made his arrangements for the battle; behind Murat's cavalry came the guard to attack and hold the enemy. Napoleon, however, could not understand the psychology of his opponents, who, indifferent to the sacrifice of life, refused to be drawn into engagements, and steadily withdrew from every position when the French gained touch with them.

So, Napoleon found himself in a far worse position than in any other campaign. Now he had

missed three great opportunities of destroying his enemy, and in five weeks during which time he had only traversed 200 miles, he had seen his troops reduced at least one-third, and, worse still, his army was now far from being the fighting machine it had been before.

Now the French advanced towards Smolensk, and the Russian generals at the head of a united force marched forward to meet them.

The Russians marched in two columns, which lost touch with one another. Murat and Ney attacked the town in the morning of the 16th of August. The whole of the 17th was required to complete the movement, and the Russians decided to retreat under the cover of night. Their manoeuvre was carried out with complete success, and then began a series of rear-guard actions and retreats which accomplished their purpose of wearing down the French army. The Russian government, however, failed to see the matter in its true light, and Marshal Kutusov (1745-1813) was sent to the front to assume the chief command. His intention was to occupy a strong position and fight one general action for the possession of Moscow.

On the great Moscow road, he was overtaken by Murat and Ney, but the French columns straggled so badly that whole four days passed before the emperor was able to concentrate his army for battle and then could only oppose 128,000 men to the Russian 110,000. About six hours a. m. on the 16th of August of 1812 the battle at Borodino began. Napoleon is said to have been suffering from one of those attacks of illness and depression which henceforth became such an important factor in his fate. Till about midday he followed the course of the action with his usual alertness; then he was overcome by a kind of stupor and allowed his marshals to fight by themselves. Ultimately the sun went down on an undecided field on which 25,000 French and 38,000 Russians had fallen⁷⁴, but the moral reaction of the former was far greater than on the latter.



Kutusov continued his retreat, and Murat with his now exhausted horsemen followed as best as he might. The Russians began to evacuate Moscow, and the French agreed to observe a seven hours' armistice to allow the enemy to clear the town, for experience had shown that street fighting in the wooden Russian towns always meant fire and destruction of much-needed shelter and provisions. Towards nightfall Napoleon reached the scene, and, as the Russians were now put of the town, the French troops began to enter the capital, but fires were already observed in the farther part of the city. Napoleon passed the night in a house in the western suburb and next morning rode to the Kremlin, and his troops moved to the quarters assigned to them, but in the afternoon a great fire began and, continuing for two days, drove the French out into the country again.

Then the celebrated retreat began. It had generally been forgotten that the utter want of march

⁷⁴The data of losses adduced by the author of 1911 *Encyclopaedia Britannica* article are inaccurate; the initially reported figures have been revised several times by historians. Later calculations reveal the death toll of about 38.5 thousand French troops and 38-44 thousand Russian troops and militia.

discipline in the French and the resistance of the Russians were responsible for the appalling disasters which ensued, but not the climatic conditions. Actually, the frost came later than usual that year, on the 27th of October, and the weather was dry and bracing; not until the 8th of November did the cold at night become sharp. Even when the Beresina was reached on the 26th of November, the cold was far from severe, for the slow and sluggish stream was not frozen over. But the French army was already out of hand, and the degree to which the panic of a crowd can master even the strongest instinct of the individual is shown by the conduct of the fugitives who crowded over the bridges, treading hundreds under foot, while all the time the river was easily fordable and mounted men rode backwards and forwards across it.

From Moscow to the Niemen was 550 miles. Only on the 5th of December the Emperor handed over the command of what remained to Murat and left for Paris allegedly to organize a fresh army for the following year.

As a result of the resistance shown by the heroic Russian people the Great Army of Napoleon was utterly routed. A retreat through devastated country left only 60,000 men out of the half-million to re-cross the frontier. Russia dealt the decisive blow to Napoleon's empire; its fate was decided on the limitless Russian fields.

This disaster emboldened Austria and Prussia to join in the attack, and in 1813 Napoleon was defeated in a three days' battle at Leipzig, with the result that the French were driven out of Central Europe. The following year the allies invaded France and occupied Paris. On the 19 (30) March 1814 the Allied Armies, mainly Russian corps, attacked, and after fierce fighting, captured the approaches to Paris. The capital of France capitulated the following day, before Napoleon was able to transfer troops for its rescue.

The battle for Paris ended the era of the Napoleonic Wars, the Patriotic War and the foreign campaigns of the Russian Army were also victoriously finished. Emperor Alexander issued a proclamation, in which he gave the French the right to elect a government, which they liked. On March 19, Don Cossacks put up a military camp on the Champs Elysees in Paris.



The Bourbons set in against Napoleon, and he had to abdicate unconditionally. He was exiled to the island of Elba as an independent principality and sailed away from France on April 28, 1814.

The War with the United States

The Anglo-American war of 1812-1814 (the Second American War of Independence) began on June 18, 1812, a week before Napoleon's attack of Russia on June 24, 1812. Despite an alliance against France signed in St. Petersburg, Britain did not help Russia. The pretext was the war on the American continent. But one may be surprised to read in American history books that the United States took advantage of the propitious circumstances and attacked British Canada precisely because the British army was busy with the war with Napoleon. What happened in reality was something different: the British main enemy of the time, France, was pitted against another strong power, Russia, while Britain was taking time for respite and reinforcement in a much less intense campaign with America. As it appeared, all countries except Russia and

France were interested in the war between them, but the biggest contribution to the warfare was made by the prim and proper British gentlemen. Before Napoleon's invasion, the British struggled to impress upon Napoleon the confidence that in the forthcoming war Russia would not have allies. And so it happened. On the eve of the French invasion the United States declared war on Britain, so that the British forces became "contained."

It should be said, that Americans' resolution to attack their former mother country stiffened after a series of provocations - the US maritime trade was impeded, her territorial waters invaded, ships under the Stars and Stripes were arrested and their crews were forced to swear allegiance to the British Crown. At the same time, the remaining British forces in North America which were stationed in Canada were ridiculously small: two infantry regiments totalling about 4.5 thousand people. To Americans with their 7,000 strong army the forthcoming campaign could seem pretty easy.

The biggest military clash of the campaign took place in January 1815. In the bloodiest battle of that war, the Battle of New Orleans, the British losses amounted to 2,036 killed, wounded and missing. Americans on that day had 71 people put out of action. Compare the losses at the Battle of Borodino or the Battle of Leipzig (the Battle of the Nations) of 1813 - in the latter about 100 thousand men were killed, representing all Europe - French, Germans, Poles, Russians, Austrians, Croats, Czechs, Swedes and Italians.

As for "A History of England for Schools" version of this war, it reads as follows: "The United States had been the chief sufferers from the Berlin decree and the Orders in Council.⁷⁵ It was possible for them to have their shipping confiscated by both partners of the blockade. Besides that, the States found that England not only claimed a right of search, but actually impressed sailors serving on American ships on the ground that they were really of British nationality. On the other hand, there was no doubt that British deserters were attracted by higher pay to serve with the Americans.

This irritation brought about another war, which was fought out largely on sea by encounters between single frigates; the best of them which are remembered, is that between the English "Shannon" and the American "Chesapeake", the latter was captured off Boston. An attempted invasion of Canada was defeated, and Washington was almost destroyed; but elsewhere, as, for example, at Lake Champlain and New Orleans, the Americans were victorious. A peace concluded at Ghent in the last days of 1814 did not mention the status of neutrals or the right of search, which had occasioned the war."

Comprehension questions

1. The origin and causes of Napoleon's invasion of Russia.
2. The course of the Russian Patriotic War of 1812. What were the tactics of the French and the Russians?
3. How do the authors of Encyclopaedia Britannica portray the psychology of the Russian people?
4. What is implied by the phrase: "The Russian government, however, failed to see the matter in its true light, and Marshal Kutusov... was sent to the front to assume the chief command"? Is this statement true in the light of the subsequent Russian victory?
5. Describe the Battle of Borodino (August 16, 1812).
6. Napoleon's occupation of Moscow as represented by Britannica. The retreat of Napoleon's army.
7. Napoleon's abdication and exile to Elba.

⁷⁵Although, of course, the United States suffered predominantly from the British Orders in Council - a series of decrees made by the United Kingdom in the course of the wars with Napoleonic France which instituted its policy of commercial warfare.

8. What was unusual about the British War with the United States? How did the war begin? What was the outcome of this war?

Names and expressions

the Niemen ['nemən] — Неман

Murat Joachim [mu:'ra:t] (1771-1815) — Marshal of France and King of Naples (1808-1815)

began to make itself felt — начинали ощущаться

in numbers — в больших количествах

want of supplies — нужда в продовольствии (в снабжении)

avoiding an engagement — избегая военных действий

Davout, Louis Nicolas [da:'vu:] (1770-1823) — Marshal of France

the want of mobility — невозможность маневрировать

began to tell — начали сказываться

refused to be drawn into engagements — отказывались быть втянутыми в сражения

when the French gained touch with them, — когда французам удавалось вступать с ними в соприкосновение

undecided field — неопределенный результат сражения **was out of hand** — вышли из повиновения

Ghent [gent] — city in Flanders, Belgium

23. END OF NAPOLEON (1815)

The Role of Banks in the Napoleonic Wars

When in 1800 in Paris the Bank of France was established, modelled on the Bank of England, it began to issue paper money and credit the government. However, Napoleon did not trust the bankers and decided that France should completely get rid of her debt. He reasonably believed that “When a government is dependent upon bankers for money, they and not the leaders of the government control the situation, since the hand that gives is above the hand that takes... Money has no motherland; financiers are without patriotism and without decency; their sole object is gain.” Meanwhile, the French received unexpected help from the Bank of America. In 1800, Thomas Jefferson defeated John Adams and became the third president of the United States. In 1803, Jefferson and Napoleon had a deal. The United States provided Napoleon with three million dollars in exchange for French Louisiana, a huge chunk of American territory west of the Mississippi River. The deal became known as the Louisiana Purchase. With this money, Napoleon mustered an army and quickly began to spread his influence throughout Europe. However, the Bank of England immediately decided to prevent it. It provided loans for almost every country in the camp of Napoleon's opponents and gained fantastic profits by the war. Prussia, Austria and Russia ran into huge debts in an attempt to stop Napoleon.⁷⁶

Nathan Rothschild, head of the London office of the Rothschild family bank, provided 800 million worth of gold needed to finance an attack on Napoleon in Spain by Arthur Wellesley, Duke of Wellington. He made no less than four profits: on the sale of Wellington's paper which he bought for 50 cents on the dollar and collected at par; on the sale of gold to Wellington; on its

⁷⁶ Nathan Rothschild's greatest principle of expertise was of buying government bonds that were defaulted, or about to be defaulted, at huge discounts. After a suitable time, great pressure was exerted on the governments concerned to redeem the bonds at face value, netting Nathan incredible profits. In this way he became the financial agent for more than half the governments of Europe.

re-purchase and on forwarding it to Portugal. Later, at a business dinner in London Rothschild boasted that it was the best deal of his life.

In 1814, he also financed Wellington's onslaught from the south. In March 1815, Napoleon assembled an army, which the Duke of Wellington was able to defeat within less than 19 days at Waterloo. Some researchers believe that for the rearmament of his army Napoleon had to borrow five million pounds from the Bank of England, via the banking house of Hubert in Paris. The banks lent Napoleon just enough to keep up the hope of victory, while the British - as much as was necessary to win.

With this historic milestone, it has become common practice for private central banks to finance opposing sides during the war, with guarantees that the winner would pay the debt of the loser. Wars have become the best in the world generators of debt. To win a war, a country was ready to borrow any amount. But the banks were discriminate as to what amount to lend to which side. They varied the amounts of loans and bribed commanders of the opposing side into betrayal. They knew the winner and the loser.

Waterloo

In 1814 Louis XVIII Bourbon became King of France, and his kingdom's boundaries were given a somewhat wider extent by the Allies in Paris than they were in 1792. But the wars of the last twenty years had entirely altered the political map of Europe, and many delicate negotiations were required before a satisfactory settlement could be reached. The conference held for this purpose in Vienna was suddenly interrupted by the news that Napoleon had left Elba and landed in France (March 1815). He had been welcomed with enthusiasm and was soon at the head of 200,000 men.

Wellington was given the command of all the available troops the Allies could collect, chiefly British and Prussian, and was ready to meet Napoleon when he crossed the Belgian frontier on June 15. Two battles were fought, one on that very day and one on the next: at Quatre Bras, which Wellington was holding. Ney, the commander of the French left, was beaten back; but at Ligny their right, under Grouchy and their centre, under Napoleon himself, defeated Blucher and his Prussians.

Yet, as he confessed himself, at the Battle of Waterloo Napoleon was betrayed by his marshals. Soult, whom he had appointed Marshal of the Army, failed to take and hold Jemappes, an important village to anchor the flank of Napoleon's army. Worse yet, Marshal Grouchy who was supposed to provide reinforcements arrived 24 hours too late, even though he heard the guns and knew that the battle had been joined.

Napoleon sent Grouchy to pursue a part of the retreating Prussian army under the command of General Johann von Thielmann. On 17 June, Grouchy was unable to close with the Prussians. Despite hearing the cannon sound from nearby Waterloo, he decided to follow the Prussians along the route literally specified in his orders, in the meantime the Prussian and British-Dutch armies united to crush Napoleon. As Las Cases relates in his Memorial, at St. Helena Napoleon would have said, "Marshal Grouchy with 34,000 men and 108 pieces of artillery found the secret that seemed not to be found in the 18th c. or on the battlefield of Mont-Saint-Jean or on Wavre... The conduct of Marshal Grouchy was as unpredictable as if on his way, his army had experienced an earthquake which would have engulfed it." At noon on June 18, Grouchy is said to have had lunch at Walhain at the table of Hollert notary and finished eating a plate of strawberries despite repeated calls from Gerard to "march to the sound of canons."

The absence of the Grouchy's men deprived Napoleon of his right flank and turned his victory into a rout. The marshal arrived at Wavre in the evening, at about the time Blücher managed to arrive at Waterloo. In Wavre, Grouchy defeated the Prussian corps which occupied this city. He was preparing to march on Brussels, when he received the message of the Emperor. The marshal withdrew to Namur, running his retirement throughout Anglo-Prussian army and arrived at

Reims, without making any losses. When he learned that the Emperor was forced to abdicate in favour of the King of Rome, he gave his soldiers a proclamation in which he urged them to defend, under the command of the new head of the Empire, "the interests of the homeland and freedom."

Grouchy later took refuge in the United States, in Philadelphia, where he stayed for five years, and then he returned to France. Unlike his counterparts, Grouchy was not executed or punished in any way, but lived quite a well-to-do life all that time (cf. Marshal Ney and Murat who were shot), which indirectly confirms that he had probably been bribed for his treachery.

For his part, Wellington wrote about these events in his letter to Earl Bathurst on the 19th of June: "Bonaparte, having collected the First, Second, Third, Fourth and Sixth corps of the French army, and the Imperial Guards, and nearly all the cavalry between the 10th and the 14th, advanced on the 15th and attacked the Prussian posts at daylight in the morning.

I did not hear of these events until the evening of the 15th, and I immediately ordered the troops to prepare to march, and afterwards to march to their left, as soon as I had intelligence from other quarters to prove that enemy's movements was the real attack...

The enemy continued his march along the road from Charleroi towards Bruxelles; and, on the same evening, the 15th, attacked a brigade of the army of the Netherlands under the Prince of Wismar, and forced it back to the farmhouse on the same road.

...At this time the enemy commenced an attack upon Prince Blucher with his whole force, and a corps of cavalry under General Kellerman.

The Prussian army maintained their position with their usual gallantry and perseverance against a great disparity of numbers; as the 4th corps of their army, under General Bullow, had not joined; and I was not to assist them, as I wished, as I was attacked myself, and the troops, the cavalry in particular, which had a Long distance to march, had not arrived.

We maintained our position also; and completely defeated and repulsed all the enemy's attempts to get possession of it. The enemy repeatedly attacked us with a large body of infantry and cavalry, supported by a numerous and powerful artillery. He made several charges with the cavalry upon our infantry, but all were repulsed in the steadiest manner.

Our loss was great, as your Lordship will perceive by the enclosed return; and I have particularly to regret the Duke of Brunswick, who fell lighting gallantly at the head of his troops.

Although Marshal Blücher had maintained his position at Sombref, he still found himself much weakened by the severity of the contest in which he had been engaged; and, as the 4th corps had not arrived, he determined to fall back and to concentrate his army upon Wavre; and he marched in the night, after the action was over.

The enemy made no effort to pursue Marshal Blücher. On the contrary a patrol which I sent to Sombref in the morning found all quiet... The position which I took up in front of Waterloo crossed the high roads from Charleroi and Nivelles... By our left we communicated with Marshal Prince Blücher at Wavre; and the Marshal had promised me that, in case we should be attacked, he would support me with one or more corps, as might be necessary.

The enemy collected his army, with the exception of the 3rd corps, which had been sent to observe Marshal Blücher, on a range of heights in our front, in the course of the night of the 17th and yesterday morning, and at about 10 o'clock he commenced a furious attack upon our post."

On that day, Sunday, June 18, the last fight was fought near Waterloo, a village on which Wellington had fallen back, some fifteen miles south of Brussels. Blücher, as we have read in Wellington's letter, had retired by an almost parallel march to Wavre, so that he was almost in touch with the English army, although the roads were so heavy that he could only move very slowly. But till he should arrive Wellington stood on the defensive.

Napoleon attacked about midday, and the fight raged hottest round the manor-house of Hougomont and the farm-building of La Haye Sainte, both of which were held strongly by the British. Here we continue Wellington's letter to Earl Bathurst: "This attack upon the right of our

centre was accomplished by a very heavy cannonade upon our whole line, which was destined to support the repeated attacks of cavalry and infantry, occasionally mixed, but sometimes separate, which were made upon it. In one of these the enemy carried the farmhouse of La Haye Sainte, as the detachment of the light battalion of the German Legion, which occupied it, had expended all its ammunition; and the enemy occupied the only communication that was with them.

The enemy repeatedly charged our infantry with his cavalry, but these attacks were unsuccessful; and they afforded opportunities to our cavalry to charge."

About four in the afternoon the first Prussian division arrived on the field; but the capture of La Haye Sainte a couple of hours later showed that the French were more than holding their own. More and more Prussians came up and took Napoleon on the flank; a charge of the Old Guard failed to break the British squares; attacked in their turn the French veterans broke and fled.

"As I could perceive the fire of the cannon, and as Marshal Prince Blücher had joined in person with a corpse of his army to the left of our line, I determined to attack the enemy, and immediately advanced the whole line of infantry, supported by the cavalry and artillery. The attack succeeded in every point; the enemy was forced from his positions on the heights, and fled in the utmost confusion, leaving behind him, as I could judge, 150 pieces of cannon, with their ammunition, which fell into our hands.

I continued the pursuit till long after dark, and then discontinued it only on account of the fatigue of our troops, who had been engaged during twelve hours, and because I found myself on the same road with Marshal Blücher, who assured me of his intention to follow the enemy throughout the nights. He has sent me word this morning that he had taken 60 pieces of cannon belonging to Bonaparte.

Your Lordship will observe that such a desperate action could not be fought, and such advantages could not be gained without great loss; and I am sorry to add that ours has been immense."

That was the end of Napoleon. The Allies advanced into France, and Napoleon surrendered to the commander of the British ship Bellerophon.

From "The Times", July 25, 1815

"Our paper of this day will satisfy the sceptics, as to the capture of that bloody miscreant, who had so long tortured Europe, Napoleon Bonaparte. Savages are always found to unite the greatest degree of cunning to the ferocious part of their nature. The cruelty of this person is written in characters of blood almost in every European country, and in Asia and Africa which he visited; and nothing can more strongly evince the universal conviction of his low, perfidious craft, than the opinion, which was beginning to get abroad, that, even after his capture had been officially announced both in France and England, he might yet have found means to escape.

However all doubts upon this point are at the end, by his arrival off the British coast, and, if he be not now placed beyond the possibility of again outraging the peace of Europe, England will certainly never again deserve to have heroes such as those who have fought and bled at Waterloo, for this his present overthrow. The lives of the brave men who fell on that memorable day will have been absolutely thrown away by a thoughtless country, the grand object obtained by their valour will have been frustrated, and we shall do little less than insult over their remains, almost before they have ceased to bleed. But Fortune seconding their efforts has put it in our power to do far otherwise.

This wretch has really lived so long in the commission of every crime that he has lost all sight and knowledge of the difference between good and evil, and hardly knows when he is wrong... He had at first wanted to have some conditions with Captain Maitland, as to his treatment, but the British officer very properly declared that he must refer him upon this subject to his Government...

By the way, we should not have been surprised if he had come into an action with the two frigates, and then endeavoured to escape in his own, and leave the other to her fate. It has been the constant trick of this villain, whenever he has got his companions into a scrape, to leave them in it and seek his own safety by flight. In Egypt, in the Moscow expedition, and at Waterloo, such was his conduct."

Exile and Death of Napoleon

Napoleon landed at St. Helena on the 17th of October 1815, guarded by the troops of the East India Company. The island admitted a certain freedom of movement for the captive. The title of emperor, which he enjoyed at Elba, had been forfeited and he was now treated officially as a general. Nevertheless, during his last voyage he enjoyed excellent health even in the tropics and seemed less depressed than his associates. He found his chief business and consolation in the dictation of his memoirs and the compilation of monographs on military and political topics.

Napoleon died of cancer on the 5th of May 1821. There was a suspicion that he was poisoned with arsenic, since the amount of poison in his hair was from seven to thirty-eight times higher than normal, but it was not proved.

Encyclopaedia Britannica (1911) writes: "all that Napoleon had done for France in the days of the Consulate was remembered, and his subsequent proceedings — his tyranny, his shocking waste of human life, his deliberate persistence in war when France and Europe called for a reasonable and lasting peace — all this was forgotten, and a great warrior was thereafter enshrouded in mists of legend through which his form loomed as that of a Prometheus condemned to a lingering agony for his devotion to the cause of humanity."

Comprehension questions

1. The role of banks in the Napoleonic Wars.
2. Waterloo.
3. How did "The Times" of 1815 describe Napoleon and his fall?
4. The exile and death of Napoleon.

Names and expressions

Vienna [vi'enə] (Austria)

Quatre Bras ['kætr'bræ] (Brabant province, Belgium)

Ligny (Belgium)

Blücher (Blücher), von, Gebhard Leberecht (1742-1819), Prussian field Marshal

I had intelligence... to prove... — Я получил известия... доказывающие...

Charleroi [ʃa:l(ə) 'ruɑ]

to get possession — овладеть

Grouchy, de, Emmanuel (1766-1847) — French general

Nivelles [ni'vəl'] — Brabant, Belgium

in case we should be attacked — в случае, если нас атакуют

as might be necessary — сколько будет необходимо

the roads were so heavy — дороги были так труднопроходимы...

on the defensive — в оборонительной позиции

Hougoumont [u:gu'mon] — Chateau, battlefield of Waterloo

La Haye Saints [la hei'esein]

the French were more than holding their own — французы делали больше, чем просто держали оборону

pieces of cannon — орудия

who had been engaged — которые сражались

he has sent me word — он прислал мне известие (дал мне знать)

24. AFTER THE WARS WITH NAPOLEON (1816–1829). LUDDITES, THE PETERLOO MASSACRE (1820)

Aftermath of War

The congress at Vienna, which had been interrupted by the adventure of the Hundred Days, was renewed as soon as Louis XVIII had been re-established in France. The new arrangement was not quite so favourable to that country, but otherwise the European settlement as it was agreed upon in the following year was carried out with very slight modification. Prussia regained her provinces on the left bank of the Rhine, secured the northern part of Saxony and Swedish Pomerania, and retained her share of Poland; the larger part of Poland went to Russia; Russia gained Finland from Sweden, Sweden captured Norway from Denmark; a German confederacy of thirty-eight states under the presidency of Austria, now enriched by Lombardy, Venetia, and part of Poland, replaced in a sense the old Holy Roman Empire dissolved in 1806; the Belgian Netherlands were united to Holland, and the two became the kingdom of the Netherlands; in Italy the King of Sardinia was given Genoa, as well as Savoy and Piedmont; the Pope had the States of the Church restored to him. These were the leading features of a settlement in which, as the British historian M.W. Keatinge writes, “the peoples concerned had no voice at all.” The English gains, “were considerable”: Britain retained Ceylon, the Cape of Good Hope, Mauritius, St. Lucia, Tobago, and Malta.

But the peace which ratified this extension of territory also brought suffering to the workers of England. The inflated war prices immediately fell, and as a consequence wages were reduced, and unemployment ensued. The Continental demand for British manufactures of course fell off as the domestic industries of the different nations revived. So, it came about that there was less work to offer just at the time when the labour market was reinforced by large masses of disbanded soldiers. It was a curious time for the government to choose for the abolition of the income-tax, which would naturally benefit the rich rather than the poor. The unrest produced by destitution and famine — there had been unusually bad harvest in 1816 — was associated with a demand for political reforms. Hence rickburning, which really arose from the depression in agriculture, and machine-breaking, which was due to a natural, if short-sighted, belief that labour-saving appliances were responsible for unemployment, were set down by the government as the results of the new political demands. Luddite's movement was spreading through the country.

Luddites and Social Poetry

Domestic workers suffered the severe competition of factories in stocking making and knitting; the majority of them were ruined by the introduction of new stocking frame. Secret organizations of Luddites appeared who made mass attacks on factories to destroy the machines. They were prejudiced against machinery because of its use produced a scarcity in the demand of labour. The riots began already in 1811 with destroying the stocking and lace frames, and, continuing through the winter and the following spring, spread into Yorkshire, Lancashire, Derbyshire, and Leicestershire. They were met by severe repressive legislation, introduced by Lord Liverpool's government, as in 1812 Parliament passed a law to punish machine wrecking with death.

The leader of the rioters took the name of "General Ludd". According to Encyclopaedia Britannica, the origin of the name appears to be as following. In 1779 there lived in a village of Leicestershire a person called Ned Ludd, who was a usual target for the boys at the village. On one occasion Ludd pursued one of his tormentors into a house where were two of the frames used in stocking manufacture, and, as he could not catch the boy, he vented his anger on the

frames. Afterwards, whenever any frames were broken, people used to say that Ludd had done it. Romantic stories were born about King Ludd who protected all the poor and fought for their good. There had been much talking of King Ned Ludd in 1811 and 1812, and the English Parliament even was going to pass the Bill about the breakers of the machines who were to be executed and hanged for their riots.

Young Byron went to Nottinghamshire and watched life of the weavers there, after which trip he, who had just taken his seat at the House of Lords, made an ardent "maiden speech" at the Parliament against the lords who had written that Bill (February, 27, 1812): "But suppose it passed; suppose one of these men, as I have seen them,— meagre with famine, sullen with despair, careless of a life which your Lordships are perhaps about to value at something less than the price of a stocking-frame: — suppose this man surrounded by the children for whom he is unable to procure bread at the hazard of his existence, about to be torn for ever from a family which he lately supported in peaceful industry, and which it is not his fault that he can no longer so support; — suppose this man, and there are ten thousand such from whom you may select your victims, dragged into court, to be tried for this new offence, by this new law; still there are two things wanting to convict and condemn him; and these are, in my opinion,— twelve butchers for a jury, and a Jeffreys for a judge!"

And on the 2nd of March of the same year the "Morning Chronicle" published Byron's "An Ode to the Framers of the Frame Bill":

Those villains; the Weavers, are all grown refractory,
Asking some succour for Charity's sake —
So hang them in clusters round each Manufactory,
That will at once put an end to mistake.
The rascals, perhaps, may betake them to robbing,
The dogs to be sure have got nothing to eat —
So if we can hang them for breaking a bobbin,
'T will save all the Government's money and meat:
Men are more easily made than machinery —
Stockings fetch better prices than lives — ..."

The Tory party in power at the moment took vigorous action against the movement. Castlereagh and the Duke of Wellington were not only firmly opposed to every reform but were bent on punishing insurrection with severity that would testify to the firmness of their stand. Castlereagh and reaction came to be closely allied in the people's conception of government at the time, and both Byron and Shelley used that name as a symbol of tyranny. In 1817, for instance, Habeas Corpus (adopted in 1679, which made anyone liable to be arrested and imprisoned without a definite accusation or any cause shown) was suspended and the right to hold public meetings was restricted by an Act of Parliament. The people called it "the Gagging Bill". The Act suppressed the radical clubs and the publication and distribution of radical pamphlets. As a protest against the Gagging Bill and the suspension of Habeas Corpus, a Hunger March was attempted, the participants bearing a petition to Parliament. The organizers recommended the participants to take blankets so as to be able to pitch camp and rest on the way from Manchester to London. The Establishment fought the marchers both ways, by sending troops to attack and stop them and by employing spies to break up the movement from inside.

Surveillance and repressions

Britain of 1790-1820 was characterized by the literary historian David Worrall as "a spying culture — in which even the surveillers were surveilled". To speak critically — even covertly — was dangerous on account of a network of informers. For talking about a revolt, an Anglo-Irish Colonel Marcus Edward Despard was executed in 1803. In that year came the indictment of

William Blake (1803), the great mystic-chiliastic lyricist (for attempting "to seduce... subjects to resist... our king"); the imprisonment of William Cobbett for protesting against floggings in the Army (1810); the flogging of two distributors of his pamphlet (1812); the disgracing and imprisonment of Daniel Isaac Eaton, the "radical" bookseller (1812); and the setting up a spy network across the country by Lord Sidmouth, State Secretary. Well known is the massacre at Peterloo of those demanding parliamentary reform (Manchester 1819, immortalised by Percy Shelley); the massacre of 500 victims by dragoons in Bristol (1831); the police firing at demonstrating Chartists who were demanding universal suffrage (1839); and the indictment of 1,500 strikers (1852)

The full force of the capitalist state was employed to crush the spirit of revolt within the working class and eradicate this "evil" of trade unionism, to use the words of William Pitt. At this time, troops were used frequently to put down local disturbances. "The whole country", wrote A.L. Morton, "was covered with a network of barracks built so as to prevent contact between the people and the soldiers who had formally been billeted in houses and inns." A system of government spies, agents and informers were used to infiltrate and terrorise the workers' groups and radical societies. Informants' so-called evidence was then used to frame, imprison and prosecute their organisers and leaders. Indeed, prosecution was a lucrative business, a kind of piecework, as a price was placed on the head of every "conspirator" found guilty.



The Massacre of Peterloo. A caricature by George Cruikshank depicting the charge upon the rally; text reads: "Down with 'em! Chop 'em down, my brave boys: give them no quarter they want to take our Beef & Pudding from us! ---- & remember the more you kill the less poor rates you'll have to pay so go at it, Lads, show your courage & your Loyalty!"

The Peterloo Massacre

On 16 August 1819 at St Peter's Field, Manchester, England, an event occurred that is widely known as the Peterloo Massacre (or Battle of Peterloo). The causes of it were that the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815 had resulted in periods of famine and chronic unemployment, exacerbated by the introduction of the first of the Corn Laws. By the beginning of 1819, the pressure generated by poor economic conditions, coupled with the relative lack of suffrage in Northern England, had enhanced the appeal of political radicalism. In response, the Manchester Patriotic Union, a group agitating for parliamentary reform, organised a demonstration to be addressed by the well-known radical orator Henry Hunt. The Manchester men — known from the coverings or overcoats they wore as the Blanketeers — marched to London with a petition to the Prince Regent. A crowd of 60,000–80,000 gathered to demand the reform of parliamentary

representation. Shortly after the meeting began local magistrates called on the military authorities to arrest Hunt and several others on the hustings with him, and to disperse the crowd. Cavalry charged into the crowd with sabres drawn, and in the ensuing confusion, 15 people were killed and 400–700 were injured. The massacre was given the name Peterloo in an ironic comparison to the Battle of Waterloo, which had taken place four years earlier.

Following the Peterloo Massacre, Percy Bysshe Shelley wrote his famous poem “The Masque of Anarchy” to call upon the people on England to understand and do something about their state of oppression. The speaker is speaking directly to the men of England in what today we recognize as Marxist tones: the “men of England” are a vast proletariat.

Men of England, heirs of Glory,
Heroes of unwritten story,
Nurslings of one mighty Mother,
Hopes of her, and one another!

What is Freedom? Ye can tell
That which Slavery is too well,
For its very name has grown
To an echo of your own

Let a vast assembly be,
And with great solemnity
Declare with measured words, that ye
Are, as God has made ye, free.

The old laws of England— they
Whose reverend heads with age are grey,
Children of a wiser day;
And whose solemn voice must be
Thine own echo— Liberty!

Rise, like lions after slumber
In unvanquishable number!
Shake your chains to earth like dew
Which in sleep had fallen on you:
Ye are many— they are few.

After the Peterloo Massacre, British government acted to prevent any future disturbances. Henry Addington, Lord Sidmouth - the Addington of Pitt's time, passed a series of six Acts, most of which might certainly be justified after the recent horrors of the French Revolution, but which included one, nominally directed against seditious meetings and assemblies, that became in practice a serious obstacle to public meetings of any kind (1819). Despite these harsh measures, M. W. Keatinge, as most British historians, points an accusing finger at the British rivals: “This spirit of reaction was unfortunately only too easy to criticise as being part of the deliberate attempt to bolster up despotism which had been inaugurated on the Continent by the Holy Alliance — an understanding between the rulers of Russia, Austria and Prussia to counteract any reform movements among their subjects...”

Owing to his father's insanity, George IV (1762-1830), had been practically king for ten years before his accession. The period of reaction may be said to have ended in 1822 when Castlereagh committed suicide and was succeeded by Canning as Foreign Secretary, for Canning was not

opposed to the policy of the Holy Alliance, which, as the British historians write, “approved of the intervention of foreign Powers in the domestic affairs of other countries”, but “was prepared to support oppressed nationalities and to cultivate international friendships by removing restrictions on trade.” So, there came a different period of the English history.

The people's effort, the Peterloo blood and suffering, the Blanketeers' misery, the deaths and transportation of hundreds of Luddites and rioters, Cobbett's "Political Register" appeals, mass meetings and petitions signed by thousands — all those signs of the people's growing wrath frightened the ruling classes and the more farsighted of them understood that open undisguised reaction would not do; more subtle measures were wanted to let those at the top enjoy unmolested the fruit of colonial gains and other benefits that their "upper dog" position offered.

Political situation

In 1821 the reformers won their first victory in Parliament. A Bill was passed concerning a certain change for distributing seats in the Parliament. But after this no further steps were made for several years. John Russell, Earl Gray, and others, tried in vain to break down the resistance of the Tory majority, led by Lord Liverpool, who had been Prime Minister ever since 1812.

But the ministry itself was gradually becoming more liberal. Robert Peel's work also, as Home Secretary, was an important part of the sound progress, he succeeded in carrying out much-needed criminal reform.

In 1823 when Canning recognised the independence of Spain's revolted colonies in South Africa. Huskisson, President of the Board of Trade, encouraged commerce by the Reciprocity of Duties Bill, which practically repealed the Navigation Acts. A year later another step was taken in the direction of Free Trade by the reduction of duties on silk and wool. At the same time trade combinations, either of workmen or masters, were legalised, and thus the more violent features of strikes disappeared.

Trade gradually recovered; and though there was a period of great depression and distress, accompanied by riots and machine-breaking in 1825 and 1826, the temper of the people was no longer so alarming as before. The middle classes began to see that reform was the best safeguard against revolution, while the writings of reformers gradually converted public opinion. At the same time, the claims of the great industrial centres, such as Birmingham and Manchester, to a share of political power became stronger every year as their wealth and population increased.

In 1827 Liverpool fell ill and resigned, and great hopes were connected with Canning as a liberal statesman. The new leader was in favour of Catholic emancipation and a reduction in the import duties of corn; he therefore found that most of his late colleagues refused to serve under him. But his ministry was hardly formed when he was stricken by a serious illness and died, about three months before the Russo-Franco-British squadrons under the command of Admirals Login Petrovich Heyden, Edward Codrington and Henri de Renyi won a victory over the Turkish-Egyptian fleet at Navarino, which secured the eventual independence of Greece.⁷⁷

At the beginning of 1828 the Duke of Wellington became Prime Minister. The duke was a strong Tory, and the hopes of the reformers sank very low. Nevertheless, it was in his time that the first steps towards reforms were made. Wellington headed for confrontation with Russia and demanded playing off Persia against Russia. In the middle of 1828, a real hysteria started in London related to the fact that the Russians had reached the Arax and were ostensibly about to make a throw at the Indus. On January 30, 1829 in Tehran the so-called Teheran Massacre occurred, as the Russian Embassy was routed. This massacre claimed the lives of 40 of its

⁷⁷ M. W. Keatinge, who ascribes this victory entirely to the British, gives a curious comment on the event: “Canning's sympathy with Greeks illustrates his opposition to the spirit of the Holy Alliance and his championship of the smaller oppressed nationalities.” This comment, given what we know about the British foreign and colonial policies, splendidly manifests the double-faced interpretation of events in British historiography.

employees and the Cossacks, including the outstanding Russian poet and diplomat Alexander Griboyedov.

Comprehension questions

1. Aftermath of war.
2. Luddites and social poetry.
3. Surveillance and repressions.
4. The Peterloo Massacre.
5. What did the social unrest teach the British elites?
6. Political situation in 1821-1829.

Names and expressions

- upon this point** — относительно этого пункта, по этому поводу
we shall do little less than insult over their remains — мы сделаем несколько меньше, чем оскорблять их останки (т. е., не станем оскорблять)
he has lost all sight and knowledge — он потерял всякое представление и понимание...
as to his treatment — относительно обращения с ним
if he had come into an action with the two frigates — если бы он начал действовать при помощи этих двух фрегатов...
to her fate — **her** — относится к слову "фрегат", т. к. в английском языке "корабль" и любое судно — женского рода
Sardinia [sa:'diniə]
Genoa ['dʒenəʊ] — Генуя
Piemont [pjɛ'mont] — Пьемонт
the peoples concerned — народы, которых это касалось...
Ceylon [si'lɒn] — Цейлон
Mauritius [mo:'ri:(i)əs] — о-в Маврикия
St. Lucia [seint lu:ʃie] — остров в Вест-Индии
Tobago [tə'beigəʊ] — остров в Вест-Индии
Navarino [nə'vairinə] — S W Morea, Greece; the naval battle in 1827
domestic industries — местная промышленность
"maiden speech" — «девственная речь», так называли первую речь, произнесенную новичком в парламенте
'T will — it will
The Habeas Corpus Act [,heibiəs'kɔ:pəs] — Хабеас Корпус (лат.), английский закон о неприкосновенности личности, принятый в 1679 г.
domestic affairs — внутренние дела



25. PARLIAMENTARY REFORM OF 1832. WORKHOUSE 1834 ACT. SITUATION OF THE WORKING PEOPLE. CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION

In June 1830 George IV died. He was succeeded by his brother, William IV, who was believed to be in favour of reform. When war was declared against the French Republic, William strongly supported it, but he was condemned to inactivity, and he joined the Prince of Wales and the Duke of York in their opposition to the king George IV. Then he took his seat in the House of Lords, where he spoke of the Divorce Bill, vehemently opposed the

emancipation of slaves and defended slavery on the ground of his experience in the West Indies. The death of Princess Charlotte in 1817 brought him to a line of succession of the crown. In 1818 he married Adelaide of Saxe-Meiningen. Shortly after the accession of William IV, a revolution, known as the "Revolution of July", took place in Paris. King Charles the Tenth of France, who had tried to clamp down on the French press and Parliament, was dethroned, and Louis Philippe was set up in his place. There was some fighting in the streets of the French capital, but the revolution was much less violent than that of 1789. The reformers established a limited monarchy with parliamentary government.

The success of the French Revolution strengthened the reforming party in England. Parliamentary reform became more than ever a burning question. The first Parliament of William IV met in November 1830, and it was under this impression. The omission of all reference to it from the king's speech in opening Parliament, and Wellington's emphatic declaration against it, only exasperated popular discontent. Defeated on a minor question, Wellington's government gave way to one headed by Lord Grey, a friend of Fox, who put the question of the abolition of the slave trade in the House of Commons. For at least a hundred years the Parliamentary system had been criticised and attacked. The movement for the reforms had been rapidly gaining strength, in spite of the persistent opposition.

The Reform Bill, which envisaged wide-ranging changes to the electoral system of England and Wales, was introduced by John Russell in 1831. It included the right to vote to middle class adult males and the improvement of the situation with the so called "rotten boroughs", which had Parliamentary representation even though the town no longer existed (due to things like migration or coastal erosion) and candidates could buy their votes. The Reform Bill, carried by the Commons, was thrown out by the Lords. After Tories in the House of Lords blocked the third Reform Bill, a very dangerous crisis broke out.

In 1831, protests began in Bristol, where only 6,000 people had the vote out of a population of 104,000. The people of Bristol took to the street. The government used regular cavalry to disperse the rioters, Colonel Brereton led the Dragoons into Queen Square and commanded them to draw their swords on the crowd. The death toll of the Bristol riot was up to 500, hundreds were wounded. Riots also took place in Bath, Worcester, Coventry and Warwick, but nothing on the scale of destruction and casualties in Bristol.⁷⁸

It soon became evident that workers were excluded from the list of those who reaped the benefit of the Reform. In 1832, social unrest and political tension known as the Days of May broke out in several parts of the country. Pro-reform organisations such as the Birmingham Political Union played a major part in the protests; their membership swelled, causing politicians to fear an armed riot. In other parts of the country, armed mobs attacked the homes of prominent members of the peerage who had opposed reform. Petitions were also presented from around the country, the cry was raised for "the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill!" A revolution seemed to approach. The political unions in Birmingham and other large towns prepared to march on London. The Duke of Wellington, a Tory, undertook, at the king's command, to form a new ministry, and was ready to stop popular gatherings by military force. But he found that he could not rely upon the soldiers, and he shrank from the horrors of civil war. On 15 May, Wellington resigned, and Grey was invited to return to form a government. The House of Lords subsequently agreed to the Bill.

Thus in 1832 the Reform Bill was passed and became law. It was formally known as the Representation of the People Act 1832, and informally - as the 1832 Reform Bill, Reform Act, Great Reform Act. Out of the population of 14 million Britishers 670 thousand now had the vote, compared to the figure of 220 thousand of pre-reform voters, it looked increased threefold. The

⁷⁸ <http://www.bbc.co.uk/bristol/content/madeinbristol/2004/04/riot/riot.shtml>

new industrial centres were enfranchised of the English Midlands and the North of England. Fifty-six rotten boroughs were abolished. The county franchise was given to those who paid an annual rent of 50 pounds, and it was 10 pounds for those who lived in towns. Ireland, Scotland and Wales got eighteen seats. The Reform Bill of 1832 and similar Acts passed for Scotland and Ireland. Also, the reformed Parliament formally abolished slavery in all British possessions. This looked progressive enough, but the Parliament voted a huge sum as compensation to the slaveowners (20 million pounds) and the expenses were as usual transferred to the shoulders of the wide masses of ordinary indirect taxpayers.

Besides, under the pressure of the people's indignation a Factory Act was passed, limiting the working day to no more than sixty-nine hours a week (previously 14-16 hours a day), the hours worked by children in cotton factories to nine a day, prohibiting the employment of children younger than 9 years old (previously they were employed from 7 years of age), and appointing inspectors to see to it that the law was observed. Ashley, more famous under his title of Lord Shaftesbury, was chiefly responsible for this measure, which was passed, in spite of a strong opposition of the northern manufacturers.

In 1834, the Poor Law Amendment Act (also known as Poor Workhouse 1834 Act, New Poor Law) was introduced. In fact, the Poor Laws had been enacted in the Tudors time, when the enclosures of common lands were rampant, and peasants were evicted from their lands. Thousands of people had become beggars and vagabonds and been whipped, branded and hanged; the total number of those executed under Henry VIII comes up to 72,000, under Elizabeth I - 89,000. However, apart from severe sanctions, Elizabeth I also passed laws aimed at providing relief for the poor. The first complete code of poor relief was made in the Act for the Relief of the Poor 1597 and some provision for the "deserving poor" was eventually made in the Elizabethan Poor Law of 1601. The Poor Laws obliged parishioners to pay a special tax, poor rates, out of which the poor were given relief. Besides, it had thrown upon the community the responsibility for finding work for the unemployed.




Illustration of scavengers and piecers at work that appeared in Trollope's Michael Armstrong (1840)

But in the 19th c. there was a change of heart, reflected in philosopher Thomas Malthus' theory of population, which made a strong impact on British social policy. This theory claimed that the Poor Laws with their doles encouraged fecundity and large families, limited the mobility of labour and should be abolished. It was deemed that for the most unfortunate it was reasonable to keep workhouses — not “comfortable asylums” but places in which “fare should be hard” and “severe distress ... find some alleviation.” There is perhaps a direct link between this concept and the adoption of the Poor Law Amendment Act (also known as Poor Workhouse 1834 Act, New Poor Law) in 1834. The pauper had to go to the workhouse if he chose to continue as recipient of


relief. The new Act formed groups of parishes into poor-law unions, cut down the number of workhouses and the amount of out-door relief, and so far diminished the number of the paupers. If there were any vestiges of belief in the Whig democratic intensions, they were irrevocably lost after the Poor Law Act.



The new mid-nineteenth-century interest in the living conditions of the poor, shown by this rather too wholesome contemporary illustration of a London slum. Note the patched clothing on the line.



A Punch cartoon showing the urban poor in a typical courtyard. A woman picks for food in a rubbish heap where boys have found a dead rat.



Millbank workhouse

Families were to be separated, wives living separately from their husbands so that, in accordance with Malthus, the poor would not multiply, and children were to be placed in the care of individuals and under conditions described with scathing realism by Dickens in his "Oliver Twist" (1838).

“When little Oliver was brought to a workhouse by Mr. Bumble, he was told by a

gentleman with a red face:

"You have come here to be educated and taught a useful trade".

And Oliver "bowed low by the direction of the beadle and was then hurried away to a large room: where, on a rough, hard bed, he sobbed himself to sleep. What a noble illustration of the tender laws of England! They let the paupers go to sleep!

Poor Oliver! He did not know that the board had that very day come to a decision which had a great influence over all his future fortune. But they had. And this was it:

The members of this board were very sage and philosophical men; and when they turned their attention to the workhouse, they found at once that the poor people liked it! It was a regular place of public entertainment for the poorer classes; a tavern where there was nothing to pay; a public breakfast, dinner, tea, and supper all the year round; an elysium, where it was all play and no work. 'Oho!' said the board, looking very knowing; 'we are the fellows to set this to rights! We'll stop it all in no time'. So, they established the rule, that all the poor people should have the alternative of being starved gradually on the house, or very quickly got out of it. They contracted with the watercompany to give to the house an unlimited supply of water; and with a corn-factory to supply periodically small quantities of oatmeal; and prepared three meals of thin gruel a day, with an onion twice a week, and half a roll on Sundays. They made a great many other wise and human regulations; they kindly divorced poor married people; and instead of compelling a man to support his family, as they had therefore done, took his family from him, and made him a bachelor!



For the first six months after Oliver Twist came here, the system was in full operation. It was rather expensive at first, because the undertaker's bills increased, but the number of the inhabitants of workhouse got thin as well as the paupers; and the board was pleased.

The room in which the boys were fed, was a large stone hall, with a copper at one end: out of which the master dressed on an apron for the purpose, and assisted by one or two women, distributed the gruel at meal-times. Each boy had one porringer, and no more - except occasions of great public rejoicing. The bowls never wanted washing. The boys polished them

with their spoons till they shone in; and when they had performed the operation (which never took very long, the spoons being nearly as large as the bowls), they would sit staring at the copper, with such eager eyes, as if they could have devoured the very bricks of which it was composed, employing themselves, meanwhile, in sucking their fingers, with the view of catching up any stray splashes of gruel that might have been cast thereon. Boys have generally excellent appetites. Oliver Twist and his companions suffered the tortures of slow starvation for three months; at last they got so wild with hunger, that one boy, who was tall for his age, and hadn't been used to that sort of things (for his father had kept a small cook-shop), hinted darkly to his companions, that unless he had another basin of gruel, he might some night happen to eat the boy who slept next him, who happened to be a weakly youth of tender age. He had a wild, hungry eye; and the boys believed him."("The Adventures of Oliver Twist" by Charles Dickens, page 28-30, from the "Fireside Dickens", London).



Daniel O'Connell (1775-1847), known as the Liberator, worked for two decades to repeal British laws that barred Roman Catholics from Parliament. He established the Catholic Association in 1823 and, six years later, saw his goals accomplished with passage of the Catholic Emancipation Act, which removed most civil restrictions on Roman Catholics. He was the first Prime Minister of Ireland.

The next important change was then made in local government by the Municipal Reform Act (1835). The "corporations" — mayor and aldermen — which had hitherto governed the towns had been chosen by small bodies of citizens. The mass of the inhabitants, including many who had votes for Parliament, had no share in the government of their own borough. The corporations were often corrupt, and generally careless or incompetent. The new Act put local affairs under the control of a town council elected by all the inhabitants who contributed to the rates, and the government of the towns was thereby much improved. This was the last important piece of legislation which had passed in the reign of William IV.

Dissensions on Irish affairs broke up Grey's government; he was succeeded for a time by Lord Melbourne, who in 1835 gave way to Robert Peel. But the new premier was really the king's nominee and was actually in minority in the House of Commons, and such a state of things could not possibly last. Melbourne soon returned to office at the head of the Whig ministry, and he was the person who carried a Municipal Reform (see above).

Catholic emancipation

Catholic emancipation, as a matter of fact, was the most pressing problem of the day, and although the duke was its most determined opponent, it could not possibly be ignored. In the 18th century, attempts were made to obtain full political and civil liberties to British and Irish Roman Catholics. In Ireland, where the majority of the population were Catholics, the Relief Act of 1793 gave them the right to vote in elections, but not to sit in Parliament. In England, the leading campaigners for Catholic emancipation were the Radical members of the House of Commons, Francis Burdett and Joseph Hume.

Among the wrongs from which Ireland suffered the following should be mentioned. In the first place, the Roman Catholics, who numbered five-sixth of the population, were excluded from Parliament and the higher official positions. The Protestant Church — the church of a small minority — was supported by tithes drawn from believers in another creed. Along with this religious inequality went many social troubles. There was little trade; agriculture was almost the only industry of the people, and agriculture was very backward. There was great competition for land, and rents were so high that it was impossible for most tenants to pay for them. Miserable poverty was general throughout the west Ireland. Only the linen trade flourished, and the people were better off here. As the landlords did not make anything to improve their estates and were often heavily in debt. The inhabitants of Dublin were cultivated and some of them were even brilliantly educated, but the people in general throughout the whole country were utterly ignorant. The government of Dublin Castle, presided by the Lord Lieutenant and his Chief Secretary, was careless and inefficient, and the evils of aristocratic influence and patronage were numerous.

Such a state of things could not but produce widespread discontent. The great war on the Continent distracted the attention of the British Government and encouraged the more violent elements in Ireland to band together. Though the rebellion of 1798 had been suppressed, its spirit was not dead. Many revolutionary and secret societies — the Whiteboys and others — were set up, which alarmed the government, and the latter ran to the measures of repression. The Habeas

Corpus Act was suspended six times between 1800 and 1824.

By the beginning of the 19th century, William Pitt, the leader of Tories, became converted to the idea of Catholic emancipation. Pitt and his Irish Secretary, Castlereagh, promised the Irish Parliament that Catholics would have equality with Protestants when it agreed to the Act of Union of Ireland with Great Britain in 1800.⁷⁹ When King George III refused to accept the idea of religious equality, Pitt and Castlereagh resigned from office.

After the Act of Union was defeated in the British Parliament in 1801 by a margin of three votes, the Emerald Isle was left hanging in the balance. In 1810, a second attempt to install the Act of Union failed, only further enhancing the problem.

In 1828 Daniel O'Connell won a seat in a by-election for Clare against an Anglican. Under the then extant penal law, O'Connell as a Roman Catholic, was forbidden to take his seat in Parliament, but he led his group into the British parliament, which passed the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829. The Act permitted members of the Catholic Church to sit in the parliament at Westminster. It was the culmination of the process of Catholic Emancipation throughout Britain. In Ireland it repealed the Test Act 1672 and the Penal Laws which had been in force since the passing of the Disenfranchising Act of the Irish Parliament of 1728. O'Connell, however, was not satisfied with these concessions and began to agitate for the repeal of the Act of Union of 1801, which united Britain and Ireland.

The Catholic Association was now revived under the name of the "Friends of Ireland". The agitation for refusing the Union soon became universal throughout Ireland, and O'Connell's influence on the Irish peasantry seemed very strong. But the discontent was as much religious and social as political. A general resistance to the English began, and agrarian outrages became more and more frequent.

Grey's government felt it necessary to obtain special powers to enforce order. A Coercion Act for Ireland was one of the first measures passed by the Parliament (1833); but it was immediately followed by an Act which reformed the Irish Church. This Act reduced the number of bishoprics and freed the Roman Catholics to pay "cess" — a tax which was taken to maintain the parish protestant churches.

In late April 1834, a proposal was put forth in parliament to grant the Irish a great deal of autonomy. In the proposal was the charter for what would later become the British Commonwealth Economic Union. The legislation wandered through parliament until it was finally approved on November 2, 1835. The date has been handed down as Irish Independence Day forever after. On January 1, 1836 the new law took effect and the Autonomous State of Ireland sprung into existence, with the government still a monarchy, with the British Monarch William IV and his successors as the Heads of State. The government of Ireland would consist of a bicameral parliament that would have one representative for every 100,000 citizens of their legislative district. Every four years an election for the Irish parliament, where the winning party or coalition would choose a new Prime Minister. In addition to this, there were governors of the four States: Munster, Leinster, Connaught, and Ulster. The governors would have the power similar to the governors in the United States. The reference of the Irish to the United States so frequently annoyed their supposed British masters greatly.

⁷⁹In 1801 the Kingdom of Ireland joined to create the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The British monarch became nominal head of the vast British Empire, which covered a quarter of the world's surface at its greatest extent in 1921. In the 1920s, five-sixths of Ireland seceded from the Union as the Irish Free State, and the Balfour Declaration recognised the evolution of the dominions of the empire into separate, self-governing countries within a Commonwealth of Nations. After the Second World War, the vast majority of British colonies and territories became independent, effectively bringing the empire to an end. George VI and his successor, Elizabeth II, adopted the title Head of the Commonwealth as a symbol of the free association of its independent member states.

In the first election, held early on December 30th, 1835, Daniel O'Connell's Conservative Party won handily over the other two parties, the Whigs and Repealers. With an even 52% majority, the conservatives ruled alone and selected Daniel O'Connell as the obvious choice for Prime Minister.

In 1843 a great meeting at Clontarf, near Dublin, was prohibited; and shortly afterwards Daniel O'Connell, with several other leaders, were on the charge of "conspiracy to intimidate the government, and to bring contempt upon the law". The trial that followed (1844) ended in the condemnation of O'Connell and his fellows. He was arrested, charged with conspiracy and sentenced to a year's imprisonment and a fine of £2,000, although he was released after three months by the House of Lords, which quashed the conviction and severely criticised the unfairness of the trial. Having deprived himself of his most potent weapon, the monster meeting, O'Connell with his health failing had no plan and dissension broke out in the Repeal Association.

The Irish movement for the repeal of the Union collapsed for the time, but the social evils which were the chief cause of the disturbances still remained undiminished. Naturally, agrarian crime continued to increase, and the government had passed another Act, but at once the fruit of such a measure was disclosed by the frightful famine that spread throughout the country in 1845.

There was a brilliant body of young followers of Daniel O'Connell, who came to be known as the Young Ireland Party, with the famous personalities such as William Smith O'Brien, Thomas Francis Meagher, Michael Doheny and others. Among them were men of letters and scholars, poets and musicians, who wrote deep-felt and hope-inspiring poems and songs. The famous poem *The Memory of the Dead* ("Who fears to speak of Ninety-Eight?"), dedicated to the events of the Irish Mutiny of 1796-1798, which you have already read, was written in 1843 by John Kells Ingram and set to music by W. Elliot Hudson.

Comprehension questions

1. Give an evaluation of William IV.
2. The essence of the Reform Bill.
3. The House of Lords reject the Reform Bill (1831). The riots in Bristol and other towns.
4. The Days of May (1832).
5. The enactment of the Reform Bill (June 1832).
6. What were the advantages of the Bill? What were its limitations?
7. The abolition of slavery act.
8. The Factory Act.
9. Thomas Malthus' theory. The Poor Law Amendment Act. Workhouses.
10. The Municipal Reform Act.
11. The Catholic Emancipation Act (1828). Daniel O'Connell and the Irish struggle for equal rights for Catholics and independence.
12. Read and learn J. K. Ingram's poem *The Memory of the Dead*.

Names and expressions

the young prince saw plenty of service — юный принц довольно долго был на военной службе

was anxious for active employment — так и рвался в бой

Saxe-Meiningen ['sæks 'mainingen] — Сакс-Майнинген, провинция в Тюрингии, Германия

half his age — вдвое моложе

the revolution of July — Июльская революция 1830 года

gave way to one — gave way to a government

"rotten boroughs" — «гнилые местечки», т. е. населенные пункты, давно существующие лишь формально, но имеющие право выставить своих кандидатов в

парламент

to put it shortly — короче говоря

the middle class throughout the kingdom was admitted to a fair share of political power

— средний класс в королевстве получил свою долю политической власти

Shaftesbury [ʃa:fts'beri]

under nine years of age — не достигшие девятилетнего возраста

which had been thrown on community... — которые были возложены на общину

out-door relief — пособие беднякам, находящимся вне стен работных домов

you have come here to be educated and taught a useful trade — ты пришел сюда, чтобы тебе дали образование и полезную профессию

was then hurried away — затем его поспешно увели

he sobbed himself to sleep — он плакал, пока не уснул

the board — комитет (зд. — управляющий делами работного дома)

a public breakfast — завтрак за счет общества

looking very knowing — с очень понимающим видом

to set this to right — привести все в порядок

in no time — в короткое время, быстро, живо

the system was in full operation — система действовала вовсю

the number... got thin — число... становилось совсем небольшим

for the purpose - ради этой цели

the bowls never wanted washing — миски никогда не требовалось мыть

a wild, hungry eye — дикий голодный взгляд

26. THE BEGINNING OF THE VICTORIAN AGE (1837)



In May 1837 the king began to show signs of debility, and died from an affection of the heart on the 10th of June, leaving behind him the memory of a genial, frank, warm-hearted man, but a blundering, though well-intentioned prince. He was succeeded by his niece Queen Victoria.

Alexandrina Victoria, Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Empress of India (1819-1901) was the only child of Edward, duke of Kent, fourth son of king George III, and of princess Victoria Mary Louisa of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha. She was born in Kensington Palace on the 24th of May 1819.

A lot of lackadaisical narrative has been created about some members of the British Royal Family; Queen Victoria might well be the most tell-tale example. For instance, she was not very attractive, rather short, with bulging eyes and a tendency to be overweight, but she had been portrayed as a delicate beauty. The stories about her were similarly too romantic and abundant in affectional details.

The duke and duchess of Kent lived in Franconia, but they returned to England in purpose that their child should be born in England. The question as to what name the child should bear was not settled without difficulties. The duke of Kent wanted his daughter christened Elisabeth, and the prince regent wanted Georgiana, while the Russian Tsar Alexander I, who had promised to stand sponsor, wished her to be Alexandrina. The baptism was made in the drawing-room of Kensington Palace. The prince regent, who was present, called her Alexandrina, the duke of Kent, her father, requested to give his daughter second name, and the prince regent said, rather abruptly, "Let her be called Victoria, after her mother, but this name must come after the other". The question of her name, as that of the lady who was to be queen, remained even up to her

accession to the throne a much debated one. In August 1831, in a discussion in parliament, M. W. Ridley suggested changing it to Elizabeth as "more according to the feelings of the people". In 1836 William IV proposed it to be Charlotte; but, to the princess's own delight, it was given up.

In January 1820 the duke of Kent died, five days before his brother George succeeded to the throne as George IV. The widowed duchess of Kent was now a woman of thirty-four, handsome, homely, a German in heart, and with very little liking for English ways. But she was a woman with experience, and shrewd; and fortunately, she had a good adviser in her brother Prince Leopold of Coburg, afterwards king of Belgians. His former doctor and private secretary Baron Stockmar, a man of encyclopaedic information and remarkable judgement, who had given special attention to the problems of a sovereign's position in England, was afterwards to play an important role in Queen Victoria's life; and Leopold himself took a fatherly interest in the young princess's education. Between the king and the duchess of Kent, his sister-in-law, there was little love, and she preferred travelling and spending several months in a year in watering-places.

The little princess received a good, if shallow, education under Prince Leopold's direction. Her uncle considered that she ought to be kept as long as possible from the knowledge of her position, which might raise a large growth of pride and vanity in her; so, Victoria was twelve years old before she knew she was to wear a crown. Until she became a queen she never slept a night out of her mother's room, and she was not allowed to speak to any grown-up person, friend, tutor or servant, without the duchess of Kent or her private governess present.

When Princess Victoria became the direct heiress to the throne, her uncle, William IV, cherished affectionate feelings towards his niece; unfortunately, he took offence at the duchess of Kent because she did not want to let her child come and live at his court for several months of each year; and through all his reign there was strife between these two. William's thoughts often dwelt on his niece, and he repeatedly said that he was sure she would be "a good woman and a good queen. It would touch every sailor's heart to have a girl queen to fight for. They'll tattoo her name on their arms, and they'll all think she was christened after Nelson's ship".

On the 20th of June 1837, in the early hours William IV died. Dr. Howley, archbishop of Canterbury, and the marquis of Conyngham, brought the news to the heiress, they started in a landau with four horses for Kensington, which they reached at five in the morning. Their servants rang, knocked and thumped; and when at last the door was opened, the marquis and the archbishop were shown into a lower room and there left to wait. Presently a maid appeared and said that the Princess Victoria was "in a sweet sleep and could not be disturbed". Dr. Howley answered that he had come on state business, to which everything, even sleep, must give place. The princess was accordingly roused, and quickly came downstairs in a dressing-gown, her fair hair flowing loose on her shoulders. Afterwards she wrote about this unusual interview in her journal — she heard the news and immediately answered that she was ready to become the English Queen.

The Privy Council assembled at Kensington in the morning; and the usual oaths were spoken to the new queen by Lord Chancellor, after which all present did homage. There was a touching incident when the queen's uncles, the dukes of Cumberland and Sussex, two old men, came forward to perform their obeisance. The queen blushed, and descending from her throne, kissed them both, without allowing them to kneel.

Victoria, of course, retained the late king's ministers in their offices, and it was under Melbourne's direction that the private council drew up their declaration to the kingdom. This document described the queen as Alexandrina Victoria, and all the peers swore allegiance to her under those names. It was not till the following day that the sovereign's style was altered to Victoria simply, and it was necessary to issue a new declaration. The public proclamation of the queen took place on the 21st at St. James's Palace with great pomp.

The queen opened her first parliament in person, and in a well-written speech, which she read

with much feeling, adverted to her youth and to the necessity of enlightened advisers for her.

The duchess of Kent and her brothers had always hoped to arrange the marriage of Victoria with her cousin, Albert of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, and the prince himself had been acquainted with this plan from his earliest years. He was born in the same year as his future wife, and in 1836 Prince Albert had come on a visit to England, and his handsome face, gentle disposition and playful humour had impressed a favourable impression on the princess.

The coronation took place on the 28th of June 1838. No more touching ceremony had been ever performed in Westminster Abbey. Queen Anne was a middle-aged married woman at the time of her coronation, she waddled, and had no majestic appearance upon her throne. Mary was odious to her Protestant subjects, Elizabeth to those of the unreformed religion; and both these queens succeeded to the crown in times of general sadness; but the youthful queen Victoria had no enemies except a few number.

It was arranged that the queen's procession to the abbey through the streets should be made a finer show than on previous occasions; and 400,000 country visitors came to London to see it. There were many honourable guests, some ambassadors from other countries. The Turkish ambassador was so wonder-struck that he could not walk to his place, but stood as if he had lost his senses, and kept muttering, "All this for a woman!"

Meanwhile, the queen's attitude to her cousin, Prince Albert, was unchanged, and he arrived with his brother to a visit to Windsor. The queen wrote to her uncle Leopold: "Albert's beauty is most striking, and he is so amiable and unaffected — in short, very fascinating". "I love him more than I can say". The marriage took place on the 10th of February 1840 in the Chapel Royal, St James'. It is interesting to note that already then the queen was dressed entirely in articles of English manufacture.

Comprehension questions

1. The descent of Queen Victoria.
2. Victoria's entourage.
3. Victoria's coronation.
4. The marriage of Victoria to her cousin Prince Albert.

Names and expressions

Saxe-Coburg-Gotha ['zaksə-'kæburg-'gotə] — герцогство в Германии, главным образом в Тюрингии, в настоящее время – правящая династия в Великобритании (сменила название на Виндзор)

Franconia [fræn'kəuniə] — Франкония, древнее германское герцогство, главным образом в Баварии

as that of the lady = as the name of the lady

it was given up — (от этой мысли) отказались

watering-places — курорты

she ought to be kept as long as possible from the knowledge of her position — нужно как можно дольше скрывать от нее ее положение

he took offence — он обижался

to have a girl queen to fight for — что у них есть королева — девочка, за которую нужно драться

they were shown in a lower room — их провели в одну из комнат на нижнем этаже

give place — уступить, отступить

the late king — покойный король

in person — лично

wonder-struck — потрясен

27. MELBOURNE. PRINCE ALBERT. DURHAM IN CANADA, LA RÉBELLION DES PATRIOTES (1837-1838)

From the time of the queen's marriage the crown played an active part in the affairs of state. Previously, the ministers had tried to spare the queen all disagreeable and fatiguing details. Melbourne saw her every day, whether she was in London or at Windsor and he used to explain all current business in a benevolent, chatty manner, which was a pleasant contrast to the style of his principal colleagues, John Russell and Palmerston. A statesman of firmer mind than Melbourne would hardly have succeeded so well as he did in making rough places smooth for prince Albert. John Russell and Palmerston were naturally jealous of the prince's interference in state affairs, and also of Prince Leopold's and Baron Stockmar's — but Melbourne took the common-sense view that a husband should control his wife whether people wish it or not. The prince soon took the place *de facto* of the sovereign's private secretary, though he had no official status as such. To centre on prince Albert every honour that the crown could bestow, and to let him make his way gradually into public favour by his own tact, was the advice which Melbourne gave; and the prince acted upon it so well, avoiding the least intrusion, and treating the men of all parties and degrees with urbanity, that within five months of his marriage he was liked by the people.

A crazy pot-boy, Edward Oxford, suddenly tried to take the queen's life. On 10th June 1840, the Queen and Prince Albert were driving up Constitution Hill in an open carriage, when Oxford fired two pistols, the bullets from which flew, it is said, close by the prince's head. He was arrested on the spot, and when his lodgings were searched a quantity of powder and shot was found, with the rules of a secret society named "Young England", whose members gave an oath to meet, "carrying swords and pistols and wearing crape masks". These discoveries rose the suspicion that Oxford was the tool of a widespread Chartist conspiracy — or of a conspiracy of Orangemen whose alleged aim was to set the duke of Cumberland on the throne; and while those delusions were fresh they threw many persons into paroxysm of loyalty. It was said in those days that even the street dogs barked "God save the Queen." The jury who tried Oxford made a conclusion that he was insane, at the trial he pretended to be mad, but during the forty years of his being kept in Bedlam he talked and acted like quite a rational being. At length he was released and sent to Australia, and there he earned his living as a house painter and used to declare that he was never mad at all.



Albert, prince consort of Great Britain and Ireland

It was always Prince Albert's opinion that if Oxford had been flogged the attempt of Francis on the queen in 1842 and of Bean in the same year would never have taken place. After the attempt of Bean — who was a hunchback, really insane — parliament passed a bill saying that the judges must order whipping as a punishment of those who molested the queen; but somehow that act was never enforced. In 1850 a half-pay officer, named Pate, assaulted the queen by striking her with a stick, and crushed her bonnet. He was sentenced to seven years' transportation. In 1869 an Irish lad, O'Connor, was sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment and a whipping for presenting a pistol at the queen, with a petition, in St James's Park; but this time it was the queen herself who privately remitted the corporal punishment; and she even pushed clemency to the length of sending her aggressor to Australia at her own expense. The series of attempts on the queen was closed in 1882 by Maclean, who fired a pistol at her majesty as she was leaving the Great Western Railway station

at Windsor. He, like Bean, was a genuine madman.

A curious accident was occasioned at Buckingham Palace in 1840 — a boy named Jones was discovered under a bed of a royal nursery— the new-born princess was a fortnight. Jones had a mania of breaking to the palace. Three times he succeeded in finding an entry to the queen's residence, and twice he managed to spend several days there. By day he concealed himself under a bed or in the cupboards, and by night he groped his way to the royal kitchen to eat whatever he could find. In March 1841 he coolly boasted that he had lain under a sofa and listened to a private conversation between the queen and prince Albert. This time he was not punished, but sent to sea, and turned out very well.

At the general election of 1842 the Whigs returned in a minority of seventy-six, and Melbourne resigned. The queen was affected to tears to part with him; but the crisis had been fully expected and prepared for. Robert Peel now became prime minister, and Tory appointments were made, which were agreeable both to the queen and to Robert Peel. The queen continued private correspondence with Melbourne, but he used his influence sensibly. Prince Albert was nominated as president.

It took Prince Albert four years of firmness and diplomacy before in 1845 he was able to bring the queen's house under the efficient control of a master of the household. He died of typhoid fever quite early, in 1861.

The Rebellions in Canada (1837-1838). La Rébellion des Patriotes

In 1837-1838 two rebellions broke out in Canada, leaving 325 people dead, hundreds sent to Australia and court-martialled. The Lower province (Lower Canada), the most populous colony remained predominantly Francophone and Catholic, while the Upper province (Upper Canada) - Anglophone and Protestant. The Montreal area was a buffer zone where the two nations met. The idea of “responsible government” made its way, and the two colonies eventually got each a legislative assembly by the Constitutional Act of 1791. By 1830, the population of Lower Canada consisted of approximately 75,000 English and 500,000 French Canadians. While the Legislative Assembly of Lower Canada got the power to legislate, the British colonial governor remained the chief executive who pulled the strings there. It made the laws passed by the majority of Canadian Assembly totally ineffective. As the governor was part of the British merchant oligarchy and served their interests, to maintain their dominant position, he used his discretionary powers to nominate favourites in positions of legislative and executive councils, influence elections and block reforms. Not only did this inequality affect the number of officials, 54 French Canadians against 126 English in the list of officials for 1835, but the salary paid to the English was 58,000 pounds, while French Canadians received 13,500. English judges got 28,000 pounds against 8,000 that French Canadian judges were paid. So, the causes of the rebellions were the oppression of the French-Canadian population and the inequitable system of governance where the real power was placed in the hands of legislative assemblies nominated and controlled by the governor.

The rebellions occurred in the colonies of Lower Canada and Upper Canada, in the southern part of the current Canadian provinces of Quebec and Ontario. The rebellion in Lower Canada began in November 1837. This rebellion (also known as Patriot Rebellion) was a wider conflict, supported by both French Canadians and English Canadians against the British colonial government with its military regime and the merchant oligarchy. It was led by Louis-Joseph Papineau, Wolfred Nelson and Robert Nelson. This rebellion inspired a rebellion, much shorter, in Upper Canada led by William Lyon Mackenzie in December. In both cases, the number of insurgents was much less than that of the British troops, supported by the loyal Orangemen militia from Upper Canada. They had restricted weapons and knowledge of military tactics. The few battles were therefore rather one-sided, and the rebellions were quickly suppressed.

To clear the causes of the rebellion the English government sent out Lord Durham, with

powers so large that he regarded himself as a kind of dictator, and he thought his duty was to bring about a thorough settlement of the country. Durham recommended that Upper and Lower Canada be united into one province. He also encouraged immigration to Canada from Britain, to overwhelm the existing numbers of French Canadians with the hope of assimilating them into British culture. The freedoms granted to the French Canadians under the Royal Proclamation of 1763 and the Quebec Act of 1774 should also be rescinded; according to Durham, this would eliminate the possibility of future rebellions. The French Canadians did not necessarily have to give up their religion and language entirely, but their culture could not be protected at the expense of what Durham considered “a more progressive British culture.”

Eventually his action brought about a settlement, but the home government considered that he had exceeded his powers and interfered. However, it agreed to Durham's recommendation in his report for the future government of Canada. In accordance with them the two Canadas were united, and a single government was given to them. This would diminish the influence of France in Canada, which the British had come to regard as their rightful demesne.

Following the military defeat of the Patriotes, Lower Canada was merged with Upper Canada under the Union Act in 1840. The Canadiens had a narrow majority in the new political entity, but with continued emigration of English speakers to Ontario, this dominance was short-lived.

Although both rebellions were finally crushed, the more moderate reformers such as Robert Baldwin and Louis-Hippolyte Lafontaine gained credibility as an alternative way for radicals. In 1848, they managed to convince the British governor to grant a responsible government to Canada, so the purpose of the rebellion was indirectly reached despite the defeat. So, eight years after the Union Act, in 1848, a responsible elected government was set up in the united Province of Canada. Yet this new regime was unstable – six governments collapsed in six years. This instability eventually led to the formation of the Great coalition in 1864. And in 1867, there was another major constitutional change and the formation of the Canadian Confederation.

In Quebec, the rebellion (as well as the parliamentary and popular struggle) is now commemorated as the Journée nationale des Patriotes (National Patriotes Day) on the Canadian Statutory Holiday, Victoria Day. Since the late 20th century, it has become a symbol for the contemporary Quebec independence movement (and to a lesser extent a symbol of Canada's small republican movement).

Comprehension questions

1. The early reign of Albert and Victoria.
2. Attempts at Victoria's life.
3. An incident with breaking into the palace.
4. The rebellions in Canada. Causes of the rebellions. The oppression under the imperial British government.
5. Durham and the British policy in Canada. The idea of evading debt payment. The solution of the national question.
6. The Union Act, the responsible government, the formation of the Great coalition, the Canadian Confederation.
7. The evaluation of the Canadian rebellions of 1837-1838.

Names and expressions

to spare the queen all disagreeable and fatiguing details — избавить королеву от всех неприятных и утомительных подробностей

in making rough places smooth — смягчать острые углы, буквально — делать шероховатости гладкими

make his way — поступать по-своему

on the spot — на месте (преступления)

Chartist conspiracy — чартистский заговор
Bedlam — a madhouse in London
a half-pay officer — офицер на половинном жалованья
transportation — высылка, ссылка
a mania of breaking to the palace — мания проникать во дворец
he was sent to sea — его отдали в морскую службу (отправили на море)
Durham [dʌr(ə)m]

28. BRITISH ECONOMY IN THE 1820s-1840s

The Industrial Revolution

The Industrial Revolution was the transition to new manufacturing processes in the period from about 1760 to sometime between 1820 and 1840. This transition included going from hand production methods to machines, new chemical manufacturing and iron production processes, improved efficiency of waterpower, the increasing use of steam power, the development of machine tools and the rise of the factory system.

The thirties and the forties of the 19th c. were the decades of industrial revolution in its last stage. Now the machine industry was in full swing, the industrial might of the country was rapidly growing. England was no longer the predominantly agricultural country it used to have been by the middle of the century: about half of the population lived in towns and only about 35 per cent of the able-bodied population were occupied in agriculture.

Industrial monopoly proved to be a tremendous asset. The profits created by the toil of the exploited masses of the colonies and the exploited masses at home were invested again in new mills and mines and factories, California and Australia provided the medium for the turnover and investment to the largest gold-using economy of the smallest-looking island. Hundreds and thousands rushed to the gold fields to seek their fortune and the number of unfortunates in England decreased for the time being.

Textile industry as usual took the lead constituting the main item of British exports. In the middle of the thirties thousands of workers were occupied in textile industry; their number was to increase almost twofold in the next twenty years. A new feature was the heavy industries, metallurgy, machine-building, railway building. The 1800 figures of iron and pig-iron production were left far behind: by the middle of the century the country produced ten times as much.

Steamships were used on the Clyde in 1812, and the Atlantic was first crossed by a steamer in 1819. The commercial importance of this improvement in the means of communication was great.

The first railway, on which Stephenson's steam locomotive was used, was that between Stockton and Darlington, and it was opened in 1825. Huskisson, the champion of Free Trade laws, met his death by an accident at the first public trial of George Stephenson's engine, called the "Rocket", at the opening of the line between Manchester and Liverpool (September 1830).

It should be noted that the locomotive is the invention built by a whole generation of engineers and mechanics from different countries. In the Russian Empire, beginning in 1820, Yefim and Miron Cherepanov, father and son, built about 20 steam engines with capacity from 2 to 60 h.p. In 1834, they constructed a steam locomotive at the Vyisky Plant (Nizhny Tagil). It was then called "land steamship", and the famous Mikhail Glinka's "Travelling Song" (1840) is dedicated to it.

After 1840 the "railway craze" set in and a network of lines was built. The unprecedented rate

of railway building gave an added impetus to metallurgy. By the middle of the century Britain had six and a half thousand kilometres of railway lines. Britain was on its way to becoming "the workshop of the world" as Marx said.

The workers and peasants' conditions

The condition of peasants was not at all benign. In spite of the protection of the government, agriculture was not flourishing. An enormous quantity of land was enclosed, and the agricultural labourer often suffered much by this process, for he had no land of his own, and the common land was no longer available for feeding a cow.

The condition of the manufacturing classes between 1815 and 1840 was even worse than that



of the rural labourer during this period. Wages fell continuously, while population rapidly increased, and emigration did not relieve the strain of competition. The hours of work were very long, and work was irregular. Women and children were employed to mines and factories. The results, both on health and morality, were bad.

These facts were little spoken about in Parliament, for the labouring class was unrepresented. Some laws had been passed, but the condition of the working classes had not been improved, and no improvement seemed likely without a possession of political power.

We already know that in 1833 an Act was passed limiting the employment of children in factories, if they were not nine years old. Shortly afterwards a commission of inquiry disclosed a state of things in coal mines. Girls and women, cheaper to employ than pit-ponies, carried coal in the mines. Conditions in the mines were horrifying. As many as three thousand young girls hauled coal on their backs for twelve hours a day, in circumstances of brutality and debauchery. At the end of the working day there was little to do but fall exhausted into a filthy, crowded bed or on to the floor, to sleep until it was time to return to work. Wages were paid once a week and because of the lack of small coin in circulation they were often paid from the cash funds of local pubs and inns, whose proprietors agreed to the arrangement because of the tendency among the

wage-earners to spend most of their money on drink. Even if the poor had wanted to spend their brief free time in other pursuits, there was little opportunity to do so. With no clubs or organised sport, drink was the only pastime for the illiterate, urban masses. Most of their income was spent on alcohol and funeral insurance [Burke 1985].

A special Act in 1842 prohibited the employment in coal mines of children under thirteen years of age, and of women altogether. The hours of work for women and children were still further limited by Acts in 1844 and 1847. The Chartist movement was greatly conducive to these reforms.

Representation of life of industrial workers in 19th c. English literature

Elizabeth Gaskell (born Stevenson) was an English novelist and short stories author (1810-1865). She lived in Manchester, the large industry centre, and saw life of the working people. In her novel "Mary Barton" (1848) she described hard conditions of life of the factory labourers and their strife against the capitalism.

John Barton was a weaver and lived with his family in Manchester. He had a daughter, Mary, and a son, Henry. The boy was not strong. When he was ill, John Barton was out of work and could not buy good food for the child, and Henry died. John Barton's wife did not live long after the boy's death.

Years passed. Mary Barton worked as a dressmaker and helped her father. John Barton was an active member of the Trade Union. One evening Mary was coming home from work with her friend Margaret.

The girls saw many people running in the street, they heard people said that Carton's mill was on fire. The girls ran to see the fire. On their way they met John Barton and told him about the fire. Barton said that Carton would not be sorry. The mill was insured and the machines there were very old.

The girls came to the mill which was on fire. Suddenly the people saw two men at the window of the fourth floor. They could not descend the wooden staircase being on fire. One of the men was George Wilson, John Barton's friend. In the windows of the house opposite to the mill Jim Wilson and a fireman were placing a long ladder across the narrow street into the window of the mill.

The ladder was too short, and the fire was coming nearer and nearer. Then several more men ran to help Jim. When the ladder was fixed, Jim stepped on it and walked slowly to the mill. At last he got to the window of the mill, took one of the men in his arms and carried him to the house opposite. After that he returned for the other man. They both were saved.

John Barton was right when he said the Carsons would not be sorry that the fire destroyed the mill. The mill-owners decided to buy new equipment and machines. The reconstruction was to take a long time and meanwhile many workers were to be out of work. Some mills shortened their work hours, others stopped work at all. Barton worked short hours; his friend Wilson had no work.

People demanded the mill-owners to raise their wages which were very low but were refused. Then the workers declared the strike and stopped their work. John Barton was at the head of the strike for he had a talent for organizing people. Many Trade Unions in the British cities supported the Manchester weavers with money.

The prices of food grew higher and higher. There were families who had nothing to eat for many days. The workers supposed the government not to know of their sufferings. They decided to go to Parliament. In 1839 a petition was written and signed by thousands of workers. They demanded the Parliament to hear their delegates. John Barton's friends came to his house one evening because he was one of the delegates and asked him to tell the Parliament about the children who had no clothes to go to school, about people lying down to die in the streets.

In London the Manchester delegates walked in a procession carrying the Charter in a big box.

The delegates with thin and pale faces and in ragged clothes were slowly walking along the streets.

When they reached near the Queen's palace the policemen pushed the crowd back and prevented them to cross the street. The people were struck with sticks. The delegates were not able to reach the Houses of Parliament. They had to return to their homes and could not hope any more to get help from the government.

Charles Dickens described the situation of the workers in his novel "Hard Times" (1854). There is a portrait of a worker Stephen Blackpool in Chapter 10.

"In the hardest working part of Coketown; in the innermost fortifications of that ugly citadel, where Nature was as strongly bricked out as killing airs and gases were bricked in; at the heart of labyrinth of narrow yards upon yards, and close streets upon streets, which appeared here piece after piece in a violent hurry for some one man's purpose, and the population was an unnatural family, shouldering, and trampling, and pressing one another to death; where the chimneys, for want of air to make a draught, were built in stunted and crooked shapes, as if every house put a sign on the kind of people who might be born in it; among the crowd of those who were generally called 'the Hands', a race who seemed to have only hands; or, like the lower creatures of the seashore, only hands and stomachs — lived a certain Stephen Blackpool, forty years of age.

Stephen looked older, but he had had a hard life. It is said that every life has its roses and its thorns; there seemed, however, to have been some mistake in Stephen's cause, while somebody else had become possessed of his roses, and he had become possessed of the same somebody's thorns in addition to his own. He had known much trouble. He was usually called Old Stephen.

A rather stooping man, with a knitted brow, a pondering expression of face, and a hard-looking head, on which his iron-grey hair lay long and thin, Old Stephen might have passed for a particularly intelligent man in his condition. Yet he was not. He took no place among those remarkable 'Hands', who had mastered difficult sciences, and acquired some knowledge. He had no place among the Hands who could make speeches and carry on debates. He was a good weaver, and a man of perfect integrity.

The lights of great factories, which looked, when they were illuminated, like Fairy palaces — or the travellers by express-train said so — were all extinguished; and the bells had rung for knocking off for the night, and had ceased again; and the Hands, men and women, boy and girl, were clattering home. Old Stephen was standing in the street, with the old sensation upon him which he always had when the machines stopped — the sensation as if they had worked and stopped in his own head." ("Hard Times", p. 71-72, The Fireside Dickens, London)

In another novel, "Bleak House", Dickens describes the little beggar boy's fate. Jo was a crossing-sweeper. Jo is "the outlaw with the broom, who had a great pleasure when he swept the churchyard-step".

Jo sweeps the crossing all day long, unconscious of the links with the other things. He sums up his mental condition, when somebody asked him a question, with a reply "Don't know nothink". He knows that it's hard to keep the mud off the crossing in dirty weather, and harder still to live by doing it. Nobody taught him of these things; he found it out himself.

Jo lives — that is to say, Jo has not yet died — in a ruinous place, known to the people like him by the name of Tom-all-Alone's. It is a black street avoided by all decent people. The houses in this street were seized by decay, and nobody can live there but very bold vagabonds. Twice, lately, there has been a crash and a cloud of dust, like the explosion of a mine, in Tom-all-Alone's; and, each time, a house has fallen. These accidents have made a paragraph in the newspaper and have filled a bed or two in the nearest hospital. The gaps remained, and there are not bad lodgings among the ruins. As several more houses are nearly ready to go, the next crash in Tom-all-Alone's may be expected any time.

It must be a strange state to be like Jo! To shuffle through the streets, unfamiliar with the

shapes, and in utter darkness as to the meaning, of those mysterious symbols, over the shops, and at the corners of streets, and on the doors, and in the windows! To see people read, and to see people write, and to see the postmen deliver letters! To see the horses, dogs, and cattle, go by me, and to know that in ignorance I belong to them!

Jo comes out of Tom-all-Alone's, meeting the tardy morning, which is always late in getting down there, and eats his dirty piece of bread as he comes along.

He goes to his crossing and begins to lay it out for the day. The town awakes.

And when Jo dies, Dickens says: "Dead, your Majesty. Dead, my lords and gentlemen. Dead, men and women, born with Heavenly compassion in your heart. And dying thus around us every day". (The Fireside Dickens, "Bleak House", p. 259-260, p. 736).

Such was the world of social contrasts in the times of Queen Victoria.

Comprehension questions

1. The Industrial Revolution: its essence, causes, what industries dominated in the economy of Britain.
2. The workers and peasants' conditions.
3. How do Elizabeth Gaskell and Charles Dickens depict the life of the workers?

Names and expressions

Coketown ['kɔ:k'ɔ:un] — название вымышленного города

where Nature was as strongly bricked out as killing airs and gases were bricked in — где люди с такой же энергией отгораживались от природы кирпичами, с какой убивающий воздух и газы скапливались внутри этих кирпичных стен

for want of air — потребность в воздухе

put a sigh of the kind of people who might be born in it — вздыхали о той разновидности людей, которые могли тут родиться

while somebody else had become possessed of his roses, and he had possessed of the same somebody's thorns — в то время как кто-то другой владел розами, ему достались шипы

a crossing-sweeper — уличный подметала

"nothink" = nothing

to keep off — убирать, удалять

and harder still to live doing it — и еще тяжелее этим жить (жить на это)

the gaps remained — эти промежутки (между домами) оставались

as several more houses are nearly ready to go — так как еще несколько домов были готовы развалиться

it must be a strange state to be like Jo! — должно быть, странно быть похожим на Джо

and dying thus around us every day — и так умирает (умирают) вокруг нас каждый день

29. SOCIAL MOVEMENTS. CHARTISM (1836-1848)

Trade union and left movements

An opposition to the wretched conditions of workers was forming. From 1825 onward trade-unions grew and became powerful. The first attempts at setting up a national general union were made in the 1820s and 30s; the National Association for the Protection of Labour was established in 1830 by John Doherty, after an apparently unsuccessful attempt to create a similar national presence with the National Union of Cotton-spinners. The Association quickly enrolled approximately 150 unions, consisting mostly of textile related unions, but also including

mechanics, blacksmiths, and various others. A new rank-and-file leadership emerged from the midst of shop-stewards who were to take credit for the growing activity of Trade Unions.

The left forces of the English working movement concentrated around the shop-stewards. This newly born leadership was a far more effective body elected by the workers in each section of a factory whose duty was to collect dues, take care of safe engineering, look into the conflicts between the masters and the workers, etc. Membership rose to between 10,000 and 20,000 individuals spread across the five counties of Lancashire, Cheshire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire within a year. To establish awareness and legitimacy, the union started the weekly *Voice of the People* publication, having the declared intention "to unite the productive classes of the community in one common bond of union."

In 1834, the socialist Robert Owen (1771-1858) established the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union. The organization attracted a range of socialists from Owenites to revolutionaries and played a part in the protests after the Tolpuddle Martyrs' case, but soon collapsed.

Opposed to Malthus's theory, Owen considered that instead of killing the poor by starving them, Nature could be made to yield enough for all and to spare, with organization. Owen was a dreamer, a Utopian socialist who could not understand that the very nature of capitalism excluded altruism, for capitalist competition was based on the universal laws of "Homo homini lupus est" and "Devil take the hindmost". The weaker were not to be given a helping hand, they were to go to the wall. Owen visualized the future "rational" society as a free federation of the future socialist self-governing communities. In 1824, he travelled to America to invest the bulk of his fortune in an experimental 1,000-member colony on the banks of Indiana's Wabash River, called New Harmony. Though the idea did not spread throughout the USA, New Harmony still exists in Indiana today, it became known as a centre for advances in education and scientific research. New Harmony's residents established the first free library, a civic drama club, and a public school system open to men and women.

More permanent trade unions were established from the 1850s, better resourced but often less radical. The London Trades Council was founded in 1860, and the Sheffield Outrages spurred the establishment of the Trades Union Congress in 1868, the first long-lived national trade union centre. By this time, the existence and the demands of the trade unions were becoming accepted by liberal middle class opinion. The Chartist movement arose in 1836 and functioned till around 1848. The movement known as "co-operation" began from 1842.

Chartism – political reform movement in Britain from 1838 to 1848

Within ten years of the Reform Act, the reforms seemed to be exhausted. But a movement was growing up among the working classes in the large towns which went far beyond that of the Days of May of 1832. This was the Chartist movement, which appeared in 1837-1838.

The Six Points OF THE PEOPLE'S CHARTER.

1. A VOTE for every man twenty-one years of age, of sound mind, and not undergoing punishment for crime.
2. THE BALLOT.—To protect the elector in the exercise of his vote.
3. NO PROPERTY QUALIFICATION for Members of Parliament—thus enabling the constituencies to return the man of their choice, be he rich or poor.
4. PAYMENT OF MEMBERS, thus enabling an honest tradesman, working man, or other person, to serve a constituency, when taken from his business to attend to the interests of the country.
5. EQUAL CONSTITUENCIES, securing the same amount of representation for the same number of electors, instead of allowing small constituencies to swamp the votes of large ones.
6. ANNUAL PARLIAMENTS, thus presenting the most effectual check to bribery and intimidation, since though a constituency might be bought once in seven years (even with the ballot), no purse could buy a constituency (under a system of universal suffrage) in each ensuing twelve-month; and since members, when elected for a year only, would not be able to defy and betray their constituents as now.



Chartist meeting

The word is derived from the People's Charter, the name applied to a legislative programme of the movement, sponsored in 1837-1848 by the London Working Men's Association. The Chartist movement, which the association sponsored, resulted from widespread dissatisfaction with the Reform Bill of 1832 and the Poor Law of 1834, legislation that workingmen considered discriminatory. It was evident that the long-awaited Reform Bill had not satisfied popular demands. The masses were suffering from the high prices for food and want of employment.

The People's Charter contained six specific demands, including manhood suffrage (that is, universal suffrage for all grown-up men; in the very first draft this looked different, "adult suffrage" was the phrase, that is, women, as well as men, were supposed to be given the vote); equal electoral districts, that is complete eradication of the old borough abuses; abolition of the

property qualification for members of Parliament; payment of members, so that the low-income layers of the population should not be kept from participating by impossibility of attending the sessions; vote by ballot, so that there could be no intimidation of voters; annual Parliaments. The phrasing of the Charter also implied equality for the people of Ireland.

An important part of the Chartist campaign was to hold large public meetings. These meetings gave great orators such as Feargus O'Connor and George Julian Harney the opportunity to persuade people to join the campaign for the Charter. It was also a way of showing the government the scale of the support that there was for Chartism. The focus point of the Chartist movement shifted to the new industrial centres of the North. It was in Leeds that the "Northern Star" was published.

A petition in favour of the Chartists' demands, signed by more than a million (1,250,000) persons, was presented to Parliament in June 1839, but it was at once rejected. After the petition was handed in, the National Convention met in Birmingham. There were three trends represented there. The right wing or the "moral force" Chartists included Lovett and his adherents in London, Atwood and his adherents in Birmingham. Education and peaceful persuasion were their methods, which was only natural, since they represented the artisans and petty producers who were comfortably well off, were chiefly interested in Chartism as politics, and relied upon an alliance with the bourgeoisie.

The second trend, "physical force" wing was headed by Feargus O'Connor, an Irishman, a descendant of a family of Irish 1798 revolutionaries. A dynamic personality, he must have been every inch the leader of the industrial workers, the miners and the starving handworkers of the north ruined by the machine age. O'Connor adhered to radical views, but he always fought against the bourgeois radicals and free traders' attempts to influence the Chartist movement. He talked of revolutionary struggle and his followers considered an armed uprising to be the last resort in the struggle. At the Chartist convention of 1839 the "physical force" trend representatives, opposed to Lovett, spoke in favour of the revolutionary methods of fighting for the Charter. In O'Connor's contradictory system of views anti-capitalistic speeches and defence of the working class interests did not exclude petty-bourgeois propaganda of Utopian "back to land" slogans.

The third wing, the left wing, was formed somewhat later. O'Brien and later George Julian Harney and Ernest Jones had a much clearer idea of class struggle. They wanted socialism to replace the system which they condemned in their agitation. Class struggle with them was an indispensable condition of achieving it. They were under the influence of the ideas of Robert Owen.

Political radicalism found support among the people. So, a man of the people, the son of a small farmer, William Cobbett who managed by sheer force of will and wonderful perseverance to snatch an education and become a journalist founded a paper, "Weekly Political Register" in 1802. He was equally opposed to the frankly reactionary Tories and to the hypocritically liberal Whigs. His paper, soon to become a centre of British radicalism, appealed to the government to take urgent measures improving the workers' living standards. But the farmer in him always got the better of the thinker: his ideal was in the countryside, away from the ruthless civilization, the factories, where cooped up in airless workshops the workers pine and waste their lives. Not that he underestimated the importance of political struggle; he thought it was absolutely necessary in the form of a struggle for a reform of Parliament, for universal suffrage, for a truly democratic Parliament.

James Bronterre O'Brien was intent on land nationalization. He was editor of the Chartist organs, "National Reformer" and "Operative". He tried to give theoretical and historical grounds to the Chartist movement. In his views ideas of popular revolutions and class contradictions were combined with petty-bourgeois radical Utopian dreams.

Another petition, demanding various revolutionary changes, was signed and presented to Parliament in 1842. Early in 1848 there was a revolution in France. France was proclaimed a

Republic with a bourgeois provisional government in power. The Chartists in England welcomed the revolution as an instance of an armed uprising overthrowing a monarch. In London a National Chartist Convention drafted a new, even larger, Petition to Parliament unequivocally raising the question of proclaiming Britain a republic. The Petition was to be presented in the atmosphere of mass demonstrations. Well aware of it, the government mustered a formidable army and police force in London and stopped a great procession, which had assembled on Kensington Common, from proceeding to Westminster with their petition.



Ernest Jones

Still, the Petition was presented, and the Parliament clerks did their best to discredit it and the Chartists by finding signatures that they said were not genuine. Anyway, the nearly two million signatures that were genuine were disregarded without scruples. The Petition was rejected, and O'Connor persuaded the workers to disperse making no further trouble.

After 1848, Chartism gradually ceased to be an active movement. Consistent left-wingers went on agitating and lecturing but as a mass movement it was no more, its burning spirit went out. Reaction was victorious not only in England but in Europe as well. There were many poets among the Chartists, and many poems and songs remain anonymous, e.g.

"Swearing death to tyrant king,
Heaven guards the patriot heart;
Join'd in hand and heart we'll sing,
Vive la Charte, vive la Charte!"

Perhaps the most remarkable Chartist poet was Ernest Jones (1819 – 1869), who wrote such poems as "Prison Bars" (1848), "The Silent Cell" (1851), "Liberty" (1851), "Bread" (1851), etc. Here is one of his great poems.

The Song of the Lower Classes

We plough and sow— we're so very, very low
That we delve in the dirty clay,
Till we bless the plain— with the golden grain,
And the vale with the fragrant hay.
Our place we know, — we're so very low,
'Tis down at the landlord's feet:
We're not too low— the bread to grow,
But too low the bread to eat.

Down, down we go, — we're so very low,
To the hell of the deep sunk mines,
But we gather the proudest gems that glow,
When the crown of a despot shines.
And whenever he lacks— upon our backs
Fresh loads he deigns to lay:
We're far too low to vote the tax,
But not too low to pay. <...>

We're low— we're low— we're very very low,
 And yet when the trumpets ring,
 The thrust of a poor man's arm will go
 Thro' the heart of the proudest King.
 We're low— we're low— our place we know,
 We're only the rank and file,
 We're not too low — to kill the foe,
 But too low to touch the spoil."

Other Chartist poets were William James Linton, Allen Davenport, Thomas Cooper and some more. There were also many anonymous poems. They all spoke of life of poor people, of strife for a better existence. Most of the poems by Chartists were published in their newspaper.

Comprehension questions

1. The social movements in the 1830s-1840s.
2. The beginning of Chartism.
3. The content of the People's Charter.
4. The three trends within Chartism.
5. Presenting the petitions in 1839, 1842, 1848.
6. The crush of Chartism.
7. The Chartist poets.

Names and expressions

Tory appointments were made — т. е. на все должности были назначены члены партии тори

far beyond that = far beyond the movement

no improvement seemed likely — похоже было, что никакие перемены к лучшему невозможны

the People's Charter - народная хартия

abolition of property qualification - отмена имущественного ценза

no intimidation of voters - запрет запугивания избирателей

showing the government the scale of the support that there was for Chartism - показывая правительству масштабы поддержки, которая была у чартизма

comfortably well off - в достатке

he must have been every inch the leader of the industrial workers - он каждой своей клеткой был лидером промышленных рабочих

did not exclude petty-bourgeois propaganda of Utopian "back to land" slogans - не исключала мелкобуржуазной пропаганды утопических лозунгов типа «обратно к земле»

The weaker were not to be given a helping hand; they are to go to the wall - более слабым не нужно давать руку помощи, они должны погибнуть

But the farmer in him always got the better of the thinker - Но фермер в нем всегда преобладал над мыслителем

cooped up in airless workshops the workers pine and waste their lives - запертые в душных мастерских, рабочие чахнут и губят свою жизнь

Not that he underestimated the importance of political struggle - нельзя сказать, что он недооценивал важность политической борьбы

vive la Charte — long live the Charte (French)

for your sport — для вашего удовольствия

'mid = amidst

30. ANTI-CORN LAW LEAGUE (1838). FREE TRADE CONCEPT GAINS GROUND

The British bourgeoisie was fighting for influence over the working masses. Their ideals and tactics were subtly, with perseverance and growing skill introduced into the minds of the "dangerous multitudes." The handling of the Corn Laws, supported by Tory landowners and opposed by Whig industrialists and workers, was an example, where the industrialists were able to enlist many proletarians on their cause. The Corn Laws were measures of protectionism, including bounties to local producers and tariffs on imported grain starting in 1689 and throughout the 1800s, designed to keep grain prices high to favour producers in Britain. The laws did indeed raise food prices; exorbitant prices for bread caused starvation among manufacture workers and urban proletarians. On the other hand, the Corn Laws imposed steep import duties, making it too expensive to import grain from abroad, even when food supplies were short. These laws became the focus of opposition from urban groups who had far less political power than rural Britain.

In 1838, a movement in favour of a repeal of the Corn Laws began with the formation of the Anti-Corn-Law League by two Manchester factory owners Richard Cobden and John Bright. The members of this League said that the greatest obstacle to commercial progress was the high price of food. If trade were free, they argued, food would be cheaper, workers would be able to live on lower wages; thus, the manufactures would be cheapened, and would have an advantage in the competition with foreign wares. And the consequence would be an increase of British trade.

Naturally this movement was opposed by the landlords and other persons connected with agriculture. They received the name of "Protectionists", because they wished to protect British agriculture from the damage which could be done to it by the importation of cheap food from abroad. The Chartists, on their side, were also hostile to the Anti-Corn-Law League, because they rightly believed that the Anti-Corn Laws would only enrich the factory owners, while the working men would be no better off than before.

One of the first measures of Robert Peel when he took office in 1841 was to modify the Corn Laws: the duty on foreign corn was made to rise as the price of British corn fell, and to fall as the British prices rose. The object of this measure was to prevent bread from becoming too dear, but at the same time to keep the price up to a height at which it would pay the farmers to grow corn. Seeing that that scheme worked, Peel became convinced of the advantages of free trade. In 1843 he abolished at one stroke the duties on about four hundred and fifty kinds of import goods. All British goods could now be exported free, and almost all sorts of raw materials could be imported without paying any duty.

For Peel the "free trade" meant a subtle way of regulating the economy. It permitted to manage local agricultural producers of the metropolis and simultaneously to have a grip on foreign exporters. The former were made to see reason and keep prices low enough, the latter had fluctuating tariffs imposed on them to enable the local producers to make profits (or no profits in case of putting up prices).

Free trade was presented as a must for industrial development, for the extension of trade ties, for conquering the world markets, for enrichment. The ideologists of free trade made it a sort of panacea that would save humanity from all evils and there were evils enough in the capitalist world by this time. It was free trade that was to solve all the social and political problems, that was sure to change the outlook of the whole world, as Richard Cobden represented it, doing away with wars and standing armies and fusing the hostile peoples into one friendly family, joyfully and gratefully exchanging the fruit of happy labour.

No wonder the workers took the bait; the League orators, now that the railways made British distances quite small and with vast funds at their disposal, travelled far and wide expounding the

Free Trade doctrine and killing whole swarms of birds with one stone each time: fighting against the aristocratic privileges with which they singularly connected protectionism, and conquering the workers' hearts with a vision of lowered bread prices and soaring living standards that the Free Trade policy was sure to bring about. The seeds thus sown took firm root, the workers' education in bourgeois ideology and the philistinism of the present gain, no matter what, was progressing.

If you look at the core of it, the free trade concept on the global scale is highly controversial. In fact, in the world where colonialist powers have previously robbed colonies or subjugated other powers, the free trade cannot give an equal start to all the participants of the free market. The global economic system comprises wealthy countries at the centre, and poor countries at the periphery. It implies the extraction of human and natural resources from peripheral (poor) countries to flow to the economies of the wealthy countries at the centre of the global economic system. It also implies the de-industrialization and poverty of peripheral countries, as wealthy countries' companies enter the poor countries and ruin local industries and agriculture, imposing their prices and currencies on them. Finally, it implies the heavy debt burden of peripheral countries as metropolis' banks give them loans at large interest. So, free trade under capitalism denies equality of the start and fairness of competition – success or failure depends on how countries were integrated in the global economic system. Free trade invariably transforms into neo-colonialism. True, it can give some handsome allowances to the middle and working class of the metropolis, but they live off the robbed peoples of its colonies and the countries, unjustly integrated in the system. This division of humankind into successful and always lagging behind persists in the capitalist world. Actually, the lag of the latter is the prerequisite for the success of the former. But this state of affairs cannot last forever, as imperialist metropolis itself can only live off patriarchal non-industrialized zones by an extensive type of economic development and new and new markets seizure. Given that the markets cannot expand ad infinitum, there will soon be no markets on Earth for capitalist centre to expand for the sale of their production. This order is also doomed because other countries, colonies and vassals, will sooner or later resent⁸⁰.

The Anti-Corn Law League and its heritage should not be underestimated. The experience and skill of the League favourably contrasted with the confusion of the incipient working-class movement hampered by lack of adequate leadership. The Anti-Corn Law Leaguers had the advantage of education and self-possession born of comfort and assurance while incessant and fierce personal quarrels were undermining the unity of the Chartist leadership and membership. The immediate practical aim of the League, reachable and feasible, made their arguments seem

⁸⁰ There are also other reasons against free trade in the unipolar world as it stands now. 1) Free trade deals are made between unequal economic partners and designed for the benefit of the powerful master who accurately estimates who will derive greater benefits. The inferior partner looks at the bigger market of the master but fails to take into account the inferiority of his status. 2) The master has superior capital resources and can buy up competition in the inferior trade partner. He begins to dominate the smaller economy and then demands political concessions. He forces the inferior host into debt and gradually ends up controlling his economy by forcing him to borrow money at higher interest. The master also blackmails a smaller partner to elect governments which profess allegiance to the master and is forced to enter into additional deals like granting military bases and buying armaments. The master gradually infiltrates all institutions in the smaller country and buys up media. It then trains military and intelligence operatives and runs that country from its embassy. 3) The relationship is unequal even when the rules apply equally to both partners because one is in a dominant position and the other in the inferior. With passage of time this becomes worse and worse. The master has many such trade partners and lets them compete for favours. It rewards those who are most willing to prostitute themselves and shifts attention and resources accordingly giving advantages and punishment to chosen states. 4) The master has economic and monetary advantage because all trade is done in the currency which the master prints and controls the interest rates. The master also controls a large portion of global energy supplies to other's economies and requires that all transactions be in his currency. No other free trade partner has any such or similar powers. 5) The master is as much against free trade as it is for free trade. It not only refuses to trade with countries it wants to destroy but it forbids its puppets to trade with them. It imposes trade embargoes and boycotts to punish and subvert and overthrow independent minded governments. For example, at present Cuba, Venezuela, N. Korea, Zimbabwe, Belarus, Burma and Iran are or were all at one time on the American economic destruction list. They are denied capital or markets and the IMF and World Bank are used to blackmail countries to enact self-destructive policies.

practicable and common-sensical, while the immensity of the aims and tasks set by the Chartists made their argumentation more difficult for the worker to grasp and absorb, and the chances of realization seemed so small. The League commanded immense financial resources facilitating propaganda and inducing adherence while Chartism had absolutely no resources to fall back upon.

The Chartists were torn between doubts and hesitations, as to which methods should be used, the constitutional ones of persuasion and education and petitioning or the violent ones of attacking, arming, rebelling. The ruling classes had no such doubts, but they had their ever-growing experience of dealing with potential insurrection of masses: sending spies and buying up the buyable part with bribes and promises; goading the others into violence and then repressing ruthlessly, stamping out every attempt at rising.

Meanwhile, the Free-Trade slogans were gaining popularity with the government against the background of the Chartist scare. The Chartists might not realize it, but their heroic fight was an asset for the Free Traders as an impetus to make the government "hear reason." In 1843 restrictions for exportation of coal and machinery were removed which gave immense vistas to the British industrialists, for other countries wanted machinery badly, Britain being the first to have developed its machine-making industry. Finally, in 1846 the demands of Free-Traders were satisfied, and the introduction of Free Trade gave an impetus to British industry.

Since the 1880s this new spate of British imperial expansion - "the imperialism of free trade" - became common practice. It could be best characterised as a continuation of a long-term policy of colonial expansion and exploitation, in which formal imperial control was replaced by "informal empire", based on the principles of free trade. Even though local governments created impediments to foreign inroads and local manufacturing was resilient, the economic penetration of Britain, the USA and other aggressive capitalist countries did take place. The broader goal was to create backward regions tied as tributaries to the interests of the developed Western economies. Globally, it meant reshaping the world through free trade and extending all over the world.

Comprehension questions

1. The Corn Laws, who supported and who opposed them.
2. The Anti-Corn Law League, their views.
3. Robert Peel as prime minister and his measures.
4. The essence of free trade. Summarize its pluses and minuses. Do you think it is a workable model in the present world? How can it be improved?
5. Why did the League win the workers round? What advantages did its representatives have over the working class leaders?
6. The introduction of free trade in Britain (1846).
7. "The imperialism of free trade."

Names and expressions

Corn Laws — хлебные законы

would be no better off — не станут обеспечены лучше

could be exported free — могли быть экспортированы беспошлинно

subtly, with perseverance and growing skill - тонко, с упорством и растущим мастерством

the industrialists were able to enlist many proletarians on their cause - промышленники смогли заручиться поддержкой многих пролетариев

bounties to local producers and tariffs on imported grain - субсидии местным производителям и тарифы на импортное зерно

exorbitant prices for bread caused starvation among industrial workers and urban proletarians - непомерные цены на хлеб вызвали голод среди промышленных рабочих и городских пролетариев

a repeal of the Corn Laws - отмена хлебных законов

with vast funds at their disposal - имея в своем распоряжении огромные средства

travelled far and wide expounding the Free Trade doctrine and killing whole swarms of birds with one stone each time - много путешествовал, излагая доктрину свободной торговли и каждый раз убивая множество зайцев одним выстрелом

heavy debt burden - тяжелое долговое бремя

new spate of British imperial expansion - новая волна британской имперской экспансии

created impediments to foreign inroads - создавали препятствия для иностранных компаний

local manufacturing was resilient - местное производство было устойчивым

tied as tributaries to the interests of the developed Western economies - привязанные в качестве придатков к развитым западным экономикам

31. IRISH FAMINE OF 1845-1849



The Memorial to the Great Famine in Ireland, 1845-1849

In 1845 Ireland was visited with a great famine, consequent upon a bad harvest. It was brought about by the old destructive policy of the British government of requisitioning the lands from the native Irish and selling or granting them to the British, who, having become landlords and often living in Britain, regularly levied huge taxes on the Irish peasants for the use of these lands. Thousands of small farmers, or cotters (about 6/7 of the population of Ireland), lived in extreme poverty. Growing potatoes for many of them was a real

rescue from hunger. In 1845 the potato crop was devastated by a blight and rotted in the ground. The ensuing failure of the potato harvest led to the death from starvation and disease of over one million out of a population of eight million and emigration of another million during four years. So, the population fell from over eight million to about six million and continued falling off.



The scene at Skibbereen, west Cork, in 1847. From a series of illustrations by Cork artist James Mahony (1810-1879), commissioned by Illustrated London News 1847

When the blight destroyed three-quarters of the 1845 crop, a huge majority of the Irish population owned no land, earned no wages and paid everything they earned as rent. As mentioned above, most Irish were feudal tenants of British landlords. Nearly two million did not even get to sell their own produce. Many just handed it all over in exchange for being allowed to grow potatoes for their own consumption on small plots of land. Subsistence-level Irish farmers found the crops they relied on to pay the rent to their British Protestant landlords destroyed.

Potatoes were the staple diet of most peasants, but Irish farms also produced large quantities of corn, wheat, barley, oats, butter, cream, beef, pork and bacon. However, these were cash crops used for export, and even as a million Irish people starved, huge amounts were loaded into export ships, often under heavy guard by armed British troops. On just one day in November 1848, for instance, exports of food from Cork, were

147 bales of bacon, 255 barrels of pork, five casks of hams, 3,000 sacks and barrels of oats, 300 bags of flour, 300 head of cattle, 239 sheep, 542 boxes of eggs, 9,300 firkins of butter and 150 casks of other foodstuffs. Such was the policy of the government and the mainly British absentee landlords who owned most of the farmland in Ireland.

This is not to say that the government did not do anything to relieve the starvation. During the winter of 1845-1846 Peel's government spent £100,000 on American maize, which, however, was sold to the destitute. The Irish called the maize "Peel's brimstone". The government also initiated such relief schemes as canal-building and road building to provide employment. The workers were paid at the end of the week, but often men had died of starvation before their wages arrived. Even worse, many of the schemes were of little use: men filled in valleys and flattened hills just so the government could justify the cash payments.

The Irish crisis was used as an excuse by Peel in order for him to repeal the Corn Laws in 1846, but their removal brought Ireland little benefit. The major problem was not that there was no food in Ireland - there was plenty of wheat, meat and dairy produce, much of which was being exported to England - but that the Irish peasants had no money with which to buy the food. The repeal of the Corn Laws had no effect on Ireland because however cheap grain was, without money the Irish peasants could not buy it.



"The Pig and the Peer". This cartoon shows a life-size pig with an Irish appearance pleading with the English Prime Minister. During the Famine thousands of Irish peasants were evicted to make way for animals that could "pay rent".

In 1846 the major disaster ensued. This was due to a number of factors. In 1845 the crop only partially failed. It totally failed in 1846. Peel's government was defeated in England and John Russell became Prime Minister of a Conservative Government. He had a different attitude to that of Peel: "It must be quite clear that we cannot feed the people... We can at best keep down prices." The starving people had no money, however, to buy food at any price, so keeping the

prices down was useless. The Assistant Secretary of Ireland at this time was Charles Trevelyan, who believed in *laissez faire*, the policy of “leaving well alone.” To give anything to the people for nothing would, he said, result in “having the country on us for an indefinite number of years.” He stopped the public works and sent back a boat load of Indian Corn which had arrived from the USA. The death toll mounted, due to starvation and to the spread of typhus and cholera. Thousands flocked to the overcrowded workhouses and into towns – spreading disease and causing more deaths.

In 1847 the Government realised that their policies were not working and made money available for loan and established soup kitchens. Russell’s Government ended what little relief it had made available in late 1847 and demanded that the Poor Law rate, a tax on property to fund relief in Ireland, be collected before any further money be made available by the Treasury. The collection of these taxes in a period of considerable hardship was predictably accompanied by widespread unrest and violence. Some 16,000 extra troops were sent to Ireland and troubled parts of the country were put under martial law.

The famine was followed by diseases and entire villages were consumed with cholera and typhus. Parish priests, desperate to provide for their congregations, were forced to forsake buying coffins in order to feed starving families, with the dead going unburied or buried only in the clothes they wore when they died.

However, the British Tory and Whig Parties congratulated themselves on the way they had dealt with the starving Irish. Many were decorated by Queen Victoria who actually visited famine-ravished Ireland in 1849. She went not to see the results of the famine for herself, but for an expensive series of galas in Dublin, Belfast and Cork aimed at drumming up Irish support for the Queen. It was the 1848 armed rebellion by the Young Ireland movement⁸¹ and fears that the spirit the French Revolution might cross the channel or the Irish Sea, rather than the death by starvation of millions of her subject, that lured Victoria to John Bull’s other island.

At that time the Whigs formed the Westminster government and proceeded to cut the Tories meagre relief. Whig minister Charles Trevelyan wrote, “It is my opinion that too much has been done for the (Irish) people...” He even invoked God in his argument that “... the problem of Irish overpopulation being altogether beyond the power of man, the cure had been supplied by the direct stroke of an all-wise providence.”⁸²

Some local landlords had to lower rents, some are even said to have distributed clothes and food to their tenants and gone bankrupt. The Quakers (The Society of Friends) also helped.⁸³ However, a very large number of tenants were evicted in order to reduce the excessive population. Hundreds of thousands of peasants crowded into disease-infested workhouses.

⁸¹ The Young Irelander Rebellion was an Irish national uprising led by the Young Ireland movement. It took place on 29 July 1848 in the village of Ballingarry, South Tipperary. The Paris revolution of February 1848 raised unrealistic expectations in famine-ravaged Ireland. Irish nationalists were led to believe that the Union could be repealed with similar ease. The romantic nationalists of Young Ireland were particularly heartened by events in France. It quickly became clear, however, that the French Republic, valuing good relations with Britain, would not openly support Irish nationalism. In April, a Young Ireland delegation led by William Smith O’Brien and Thomas Francis Meagher presented a fraternal address to Lamartine; his reply was non-committal. After reports of a demonstration on Slievenamon, County Tipperary, attended by 50,000 people and addressed by Meagher and Michael Doheny, the British government suspended the Habeas Corpus Act. After being chased by a force of Young Irelanders and their supporters, an Irish Constabulary unit raided a house and took those inside as hostages. A several-hour gunfight followed, but the rebels fled after a large group of police reinforcements arrived. Eventually the rebellion failed and many people, including such leaders as Mitchel, O’Brien, Meagher, Terence Bellew MacManus and O’Donohue, were captured, sentenced to death but eventually transported to Van Diemen’s Land.

⁸²Frost, Peter. A most cold-blooded crushing of a nation <http://morningstaronline.co.uk/a-8727-A-most-cold-blooded-crushing-of-a-nation#.VScq29GJJIU> Retrieved: 10.04.2015. Interpreting The Irish Famine, 1846-1850 <http://xroads.virginia.edu/~hyper/sadlier/irish/Famine.htm> Retrieved: 10.04.2015.

⁸³The Great Famine in Ireland, 1845-1849. <https://www.ireland-information.com/famine.txt>

Others were sent to emigrate to America and other English-speaking countries. In many cases, the ships (sarcastically called “coffin-ships”) reached port only after losing a third of their passengers to disease, hunger and other causes. Besides, many middlemen used sub-standard vessels and carried too many people, with a view to making a quick profit. So, emigrants perished in rotten ships that sank on the hazardous crossing to the new world. Many Irish who reached their destination died, usually of typhus, in quarantine camps in Canada and New England.

The misery of the people during the years 1846-1848 was appalling. Large numbers emigrated, and the population fell, in a few years, from over eight million to six and a half million. By 1871 the 26-county population had almost halved to four million, by 1926 it had reduced further to three million. The population held firm around three million until the early 1970s when it began to rise again. Even today Ireland’s population has not returned to those pre-famine levels.

The domination of the population was in itself a material gain to those who remained; but the emigrants carried away with them a bitter sense of wrong which has been the source of many troubles. Moreover, the racist attitudes in the USA elite caused the discrimination against the arriving Irish who were denied jobs or offered low-key vacancies. The Irish fitness for American democracy was questioned, which found large evidence in the political cartoons of the 19th c. This attitude was perhaps the echo of the widespread indentured servitude, the practice which had affected hundreds of thousands of Irish, many of whom children. They had been sold as white slaves to the New World from 1625 till 1839, when Britain decided to end slavery and stopped transporting slaves.

Comprehension questions

1. The Great Famine in Ireland, background.
2. The economic situation of the Irish agricultural workers.
3. The policy of the government and the landlords who owned farms in Ireland.
4. What was the essence of the Corn Laws? Did the repeal of them initiated by Liberal Robert Peel bring a relief in Ireland? Why?
5. The Conservative reaction since 1846.
6. The unrest in Ireland in 1847. The armed rebellion of the Young Ireland of 1848.
7. Victoria’s visit in Ireland in 1849.
8. The testimonies of the Great Famine.
9. The eviction of the Irish peasants by the landlords and their fate. The 1845-1849 Irish Famine consequences.

Names and expressions

consequent upon a bad harvest - следствием плохого урожая

continued falling off - продолжал падать

blight - болезнь растений, характеризующаяся завяданием, прекращением роста, опаданием листьев без гниения

subsistence-level Irish farmers - ирландские фермеры

staple diet - основная диета

relief schemes - схемы помощи

leaving well alone — оставить все как есть (букв. «в покое»)

famine-ravished Ireland - голодающая Ирландия

a series of laws — ряд законов

turned a deaf ear to — не желали слышать (буквально — поворачивали глухое ухо к...)

believers in another creed — последователи другой веры

was backward — отставало

could not but produce — не могло не породить (вызвать)


The Habeas Corpus Act (лат.) — закон о неприкосновенности личности

a material gain — материальные выгоды

a bitter sense of wrong — горькое ощущение несправедливости

32. LORD PALMERSTON'S FOREIGN POLICY (1809–1828)

During the Napoleonic Wars, Britain managed to subjugate and colonize most of the world outside of Europe, with the exception of the United States, and spread its influence all over Europe. After 1815, the French – whether restored Bourbons, Orleanists, or Bonapartists – were generally pliant tools of London. The French king Louis Philippe who had been raised to the throne by a revolution, was very coldly looked on by the Eastern rulers. On the other hand, this turn of affairs in Paris led to “a good understanding” between France and Britain, whose



Palmerston, Henry John Temple (1784-1865) was born at Broadlands, near Romsey, Hants. There was the Irish branch in his family, the Irish Temples. Lord Palmerston descended from John Temple (1632-1704), who was speaker of the Irish House of Commons. Henry John had scarcely left Harrow, at the age of eighteen, when his father died (1802), and this raised him to the Irish peerage.

The Holy Alliance was broken up only for a short while when Nicholas I joined Britain and France with the object to liberating Greece in 1827. But the revolution in Paris (1830) and the rising in Poland (1830-1831)⁸⁴ made him see that Britain was highly unreliable and drew him to the camp of his older allies, Austria and Prussia. The three powers formally renewed their league in 1832. Because of his staunch anti-revolutionary stance Nicholas I, and Russia in general, were

financiers were sponsoring most European revolutions. Isolated in Europe, Louis Philippe was compelled to be pleased with the friendship of Britain, subordinating Paris to London policies. The alliance which resulted from these conditions lasted through Louis Philippe's reign (he abdicated in 1848) and well through the rule of Napoleon Bonaparte's nephew - Louis Napoleon Bonaparte.

But in central and eastern Europe, there was vast strong Imperial Russia, under the conservative Nicholas I and then reformer Alexander II. There were strong land powers, the Kingdom of Prussia and Prince Metternich's Austrian Empire. They concluded a Holy Alliance - a conservative union, established to maintain the international order established at the Vienna Congress (1815) and suppress revolutionary sentiments. Subsequently all monarchs of continental Europe, except England, the Pope of Rome and the Turkish sultan, joined the Alliance's declaration of mutual aid, signed in October 1815. Palmerston called the countries of the Holy Alliance the “arbitrary powers.” For Britain to rule the world, the Holy Alliance of Austria, Russia, and Prussia had to be broken up.

Tsar Nicholas I of the Russian Empire (1825-1855) was a staunch champion of legitimate governments and conservator of social peace in Europe. Possibly this was the influence of the murder of his father Paul I as a result of a conspiracy and his brother Alexander I in the course of the Decembrists' revolt.

⁸⁴After the Napoleonic wars, the Congress of Vienna decreed that Russia assumed hegemony over the Kingdom of Poland (Królestwo Polskie), which became in personal union with Russia. It was managed by the biennial Diet and the King (the Russian Tsar acted as King of Poland), who was represented by the governor in Warsaw. Alexander I sanctioned Polish autonomy, their own constitution, army, money, the use of their language. In general, until the Polish insurrection the Russian government treated Poland liberally.

defamed as “gendarme of Europe”.

During most of this time, Lord Palmerston, who was a follower of Canning, continued his policy as Foreign Secretary. In 1807 he delivered his maiden speech in the House of Commons, and this speech was so successful that in 1809 he was proposed to join some official duty at the government. He became the secretary-at-war, and in this position he remained, without any signs of an ambitious temperament or of the great political abilities, for twenty years (1809-1828). He had no influence at the cabinet he served. He was entirely devoted, like his friend Peel, to the Tory party of that day. Palmerston never was a Whig, still less a radical; he was a statesman of the old aristocratic type, liberal in his sentiments, favourable to the march of progress, but entirely opposed to the claims of the democratic government.

For 35 years, Palmerston held the offices of Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister. In Europe, he was called Lord Firebrand for his support of smaller nations’ separatism and instigating unrest. Yet being an advocate of national self-determination and constitutional liberties on the Continent, he was bitterly opposed to Irish independence and ruthlessly clamped down on the Young Ireland movement.

Some passages from Palmerston’s speeches became catchphrases, e.g. “We have no eternal allies, and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual, and those interests it is our duty to follow” and “with every British Minister the interests of England ought to be the shibboleth of his policy” (from his 1848 speech in Parliament). He also held that wherever in the world a British subject went, he could flaunt the laws, secure that the British fleet would support him. “Civis Romanus sum, every Briton is a citizen of this new Rome,” he thundered, and with that, the universal empire was proclaimed.

In foreign policies, Palmerston was what may be called a hard-headed manoeuvrer, in consonance with the pragmatic and often vile British policies in general. It was largely owing to Palmerston that Britain at the time so steadily and ruthlessly pursued its colonial policies: the Opium Wars with China, the Sepoy Mutiny in India, the ephemeral Mexican Empire (“the project of Maximilian”) and others. Palmerston became an ideologue of the division between the American North and South and of the American Civil War. His policy largely facilitated the incitement of anti-Russian sentiments in Poland to direct European hostility against Russia (based on older anti-Russian mythology). Cognizant of it, Russia strove to pursue independent foreign policies. It is a known fact that Palmerston began to prepare for war with Russia, which was to come later in the century and to go down in history as the Crimean War.

British historians describe Palmerston as a man of great decision and audacity, even to rashness, who was intent on marching the influence which Britain had gained by leading Europe against Napoleon. By their account, he sought to connect England with liberal movements on the Continent and opposed “the despotic tendencies of the Holy Alliance.”

One of the first results of revolution in France was to cause the break-up of Belgium from Holland — governed by one ruler according to the resolutions the Congress of Vienna. Some historians have justified it by the fact that those nations “differed in race, language, religion, and pursuits.” In 1830 the Belgian declared themselves independent. The Dutch marched an army against Brussels and fighting began. The powers thereupon interfered. A conference was held in London, which resulted in Belgium being recognized as independent. Holland at first refused to recognize it, but at length gave way to the joint pressure of a French army and the British fleet (1833).

In Portugal, Don Miguel, the uncle of the young queen Maria the Second and the head of the clerical party, had become regent and began to rule the country (1828). A somewhat similar conflict was raging in Spain. The king Ferdinand died in 1832, leaving his crown to his daughter Isabella, aged three years. His widow, queen Christina, became a regent. But his brother, Don Carlos, the head of the Catholic faction in Spain, claimed the crown. The Liberals resisted his claim, and civil war was the result. In order to save the pro-British Liberals in the Spanish

peninsula, Palmerston now made a compact with France and the liberal forces of Spain and Portugal, which was called as a Quadruple Alliance (1834). Don Miguel was expelled from Portugal, and that the Liberals in Spain were assisted to hold forces against the Carlists, as the supporters of Don Carlos were called. The Carlist War continued for several years. A British legion, composed of volunteers, fought in Spain until Don Carlos was expelled (1840). Three years later Queen Isabella was declared to be of age.

In 1832 the Eastern question came to the front, Ibrahim Pasha, at the head of an Egyptian army, made war against the Sultan. The latter appealed to Russia for help and Ibrahim failed in his attempts; whereupon the Sultan placed himself under Russian protection. Palmerston was anxious to prevent the Russian influence, which had begun to alarm Britain. His opportunity came in 1839. In that year the war between Turkey and Egypt was renewed, and, as before, Turkey was badly beaten. In order to prevent Russia from interference to save Constantinople — which would have strengthened her alliance with Turkey — Palmerston succeeded in persuading France to intervene along with Britain. But a question arose as to what should be done with Egypt.

The French, eager to strengthen their influence in Cairo, wished to make Egypt an independent state. The British government, on the other hand, was anxious to preserve it part of the Turkish Empire. Unable to bring France to the same views, Palmerston made a convention with Austria, Prussia and Russia to act together in the East, leaving France isolated (1840). The French were very indignant, and threatened war. But Palmerston took no notice of French threats. The British fleet was sent to the East, and several blows, the most remarkable of which was the capture of Acre, forced Ibrahim to submit. The treaty was finally concluded between the five great powers in July 1841, by which Turkey was put under the joint protection of Europe. Palmerston saw it as a success both against Russia and against France.

During Peel's ministry (1841-1846) Palmerston was out of office. His place was taken by Lord Aberdeen. The rivalry between Britain and France in Spain flared up when Louis Philippe married one of his sons to the heiress of the Spanish throne (1846).

Robert Peel resigned in 1846, John Russell, a veteran in the cause of reform, took his place. The Whigs in the new Parliament, which met in 1847, almost exactly balanced the Tories; the latter were disunited, because there was the division between the "Peelites", or Free Traders, and the Protectionists. Such a state of things made it impossible that any important activity should take place. The most influenced man in the ministry was Palmerston, who had been Foreign Secretary in all the Liberal governments since 1830, and who now again held this office.

John Russell retained office till 1852. His fall in this year was due to Palmerston, whose haughty and independent temper had already got him into trouble two years before. The Foreign Secretary has always stood in a closer relation with the crown than the other ministers, except the Premier; but Palmerston had formed the habit of acting without consulting the queen and had often changed the resolutions which were decided by him together with Victoria. The queen had more than once to remind her foreign secretary that all his papers must be seen by her before they were sent out, and though Palmerston agreed, the queen's complaint had to be continually repeated. John Russell, who did not want to offend his popular colleague, did his best to smooth the things over; but the queen continued to be displeased, and tried hard to get Palmerston removed, though without much success.

On 2 December 1851 Louis Napoleon, elected President of France in 1848, carried out a coup d'état by dissolving the National Assembly and arresting the leading Republicans. Palmerston privately congratulated Napoleon on his triumph, noting that Britain's constitution was rooted in history, but that France had had five revolutions since 1789, with the French Constitution of 1848 being a "day-before-yesterday tomfoolery". However, the Cabinet decided that Britain must be neutral and so Palmerston requested his officials be diplomatic. Prince Albert came to learn of Palmerston's favourable opinion towards the change in government and having sent a

dispatch without showing the Sovereign. Protesting innocence, Palmerston duly resigned. This ended Palmerston's career as a foreign secretary. In 1852, when Lord Aberdeen was formed cabinet, Palmerston chose to take the post of home secretary. Despite this, he enjoyed prestige in the matters of foreign policy, and the Crimean War was largely his doing.


Karl Marx wrote about Palmerston: "Although a Tory by origin he has contrived to introduce into the management of foreign affairs all the shams and contradictions that form the essence of Whiggism. He knows how to conciliate a democratic phraseology with oligarchic views, how to cover the peace-mongering policy of the middle classes with the haughty language of England's aristocratic past — how to appear as the aggressor where he connives, and as the defender where he betrays— how to manage an apparent enemy, and how to exasperate a pretended ally— how to find himself, at the opportune moment of the dispute, on the side of the stronger against the weak, and how to utter brave words in the act of running away."

The First and Second Opium Wars

As we know, Indian cotton weavers and other artisans, as well as the peasantry, had been ruined by the British order and suffered terrible need. As a Governor-General of India in 1828—1835, Lord Bentinck, remarked: "...the bones of weavers bleach the plains of India." The Indian markets were seized by cheaper British goods and India had become economically dependent on Britain. It needed currency to pay for the British finished goods. The suggested solution to the Indian economic problems was the production of a growing amount of opium and selling it to the British East India Company. In 1773, the Company created a British monopoly on opium in Bengal (continued with minimal changes until 1947). The drug was smuggled into China from Bengal by traffickers and agency houses such as Jardine, Matheson & Co, Dent & Co., David Sassoon and others in amounts averaging 900 tons a year. By 1825, most of the money needed to buy tea and other goods in China was raised by the illegal opium trade. By 1838 with the amount of opium entering China approached 1,400 tons a year, an estimated 2 million Chinese became addicts.

The smuggling took place despite the Qing ban on opium imports and a death penalty for opium smuggling. In 1839, the Qing government sent a Special Imperial Commissioner Lin Zexu, a man of formidable staunchness, high moral standards and competence, to Guangdong Province to deal with the smuggling there. Determined to wage a war against the debilitating drug, Lin arrested more than 1,700 Chinese opium dealers and confiscated over 70,000 opium pipes. He initially attempted to get foreign companies to forfeit their opium stores in exchange for tea, but this ultimately failed, and Lin resorted to using force in the western merchants' enclave. It took Lin a month and a half before the merchants gave up nearly 1.2 million kilograms (worth 2.6 million pounds) of opium. In 1839, 500 workers laboured for 23 days in order to destroy it, mixing the opium with lime and salt and throwing it into the ocean outside of Humen Town. Lin also wrote an extraordinary "memorial", by way of an open letter published in Canton, to Queen Victoria of Great Britain in 1839 urging her to end the opium trade. His primary line of argument was that China was providing Britain with valuable commodities such as tea, porcelain, spices and silk, while Britain sent only "poison" in return. He accuses the "barbarians" of coveting profit and lacking morality. His memorial, written in the spirit of Confucian morality and spirituality, expressed a desire that Victoria would act in accordance with decent feeling and support his efforts⁸⁵. The memorial was never delivered to the queen,

⁸⁵He wrote: "We find that your country is sixty or seventy thousand li from China. Yet there are barbarian ships that strive to come here for trade for the purpose of making a great profit. The wealth of China is used to profit the barbarians. That is to say, the great profit made by barbarians is all taken from the rightful share of China. By what right do they then in return use the poisonous drug to injure the Chinese people? Even though the barbarians may not necessarily intend to do us harm, yet in coveting profit to an extreme, they have no regard for injuring others.



This British cartoon shows backward Chinese blocking the Progress ten years after the Opium War when the British government used troops and gunboats to force the Chinese to accept illegal opium trafficking.

although it was published in *The Times*.

As the British interests supported the opium trade, Palmerston initiated the Opium War (1839–42) with the proclaimed aim of obtaining full compensation for the destroyed opium. The British government used its newly developed military power to enforce violent redress. In 1842, the war ended, and Treaty of Nanking was signed — the first of what the Chinese later called the unequal treaties. According to it, Hong Kong was ceded to Britain and the Chinese market was opened to the opium traders.

The Chinese population began to fall off. While in 1842 the population of the empire was 416,118,200 people, of whom 2 million were addicts, in 1881 there were 369,183,000 people in China, of whom 120 million were addicts. The British Consul in China, Richard Willett Hurst, remarked in 1895 at a meeting of the Royal Commission on Opium: "As long as China remains a nation of opium smokers, there is not the least reason to fear that she will become a military power of any importance, as the habit saps the energies and vitality of the nation."⁸⁶ And indeed, the former great power went to pieces. In the Chinese coastal provinces almost 90% of men under the age of forty had become drug users. For the purchase of opium, Chinese spend so much silver that it almost disappeared from circulation. Paying taxes was virtually abandoned, the state treasury was empty. Officials were mired in corruption. Vagrants and beggars were about 40 million people, or about 10% of the population of China. They sold their children.⁸⁷

The weakening of the Manchu imperial power after the First Opium War was a turning point in the history of this state. In 1851-1864 there was civil war in the Qing empire between the newly formed Taiping state and the Manchu government. In the initial phase of the Taiping rebellion Britain, France, and the United States remained neutral. However, in fact, already in

Let us ask, where is your conscience?" — Lin Zexu, *Open letter addressed to the sovereign of England and published in Canton (1839)*

⁸⁶ Rowntree, Joshua. *The imperial drug trade*. London: Methuen Co., 1906. P.206 (219) - 207 (220).

⁸⁷Dergachev, V.A. *Western Angels of Death*. URL.: http://dergachev.ru/geop_events/131011-2.html#_ftn3 (Retrieved 2 June 2015)

1854 they tried to use the Civil War for their own purposes. Diplomatic representatives from Britain, France and the United States presented the Manchu emperor a joint demand to renegotiate the contracts 1842-1844. The Qing government rejected the demand, but so far it did not come to an open conflict, as the British armed forces at the time were engaged in the wars with Russia, Persia and India.

After the Crimean War (1853— 1856), the British began to look for an excuse to begin a new military conflict in the Qing Empire. The British demands to Chinese included opening all of China to British merchants, legalising the opium trade, exempting foreign imports from internal transit duties, suppression of piracy, the regulation of the coolie trade, permission for a British ambassador to reside in Beijing and for the English-language version of all treaties to take precedence over the Chinese. The pretext for a new war was the detention by Chinese authorities of the British ship called *The Arrow*, engaged in smuggling. So, the Second Opium War (1856–1860) began. In this war, France and the US joined the British. In October 1856 the British fleet bombarded the port of Guangzhou. At the beginning of 1857 American ships joined in the hostilities. Soon France joined England on the pretext of the arrest and death of a French missionary.

Contrary to the policy of the West in China, the imperial government of Russia relied more on diplomacy and “soft power”. On February 5, 1852, the Rules for Trade with Western China were signed by the Foreign Minister Nesselrode and approved by the Czar. They forbade the export to Xinjiang of gold, silver and banknotes, firearms and gunpowder. A special article imposed a definitive ban on the importation of opium into China (about this time Britain and France unleashed the Second Opium War against the Chinese people). The instruction of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs obliged the consuls coming to do in Western China to make sure traders in China behaved with utmost decorum. As a result, the Russian export of commodities in Xinjiang increased [Khalfin 1960]. During the Second Opium War Russia offered military assistance to the Qing Empire in exchange for territorial concessions. In gratitude for the salvation of Beijing from looting by the Anglo-French troops, the Qing Empire signed an agreement with Count Nikolai Ignatiev, by which Russia gained the right to the left bank of the Amur and Ussuri.

China lost the Second Opium War, but the Western victory was not decisive – it never became a colony in the full sense of the word. On 24-25 October 1860, the Beijing Treaty was signed under which the Qing government agreed to pay Britain and France 8 million liang in indemnity, to open Tianjin to foreign trade, to authorize the use of Chinese as laborers (coolies) in the colonies of Britain and France. From then on Hong Kong passed to the British.⁸⁸

The peace treaty stipulated for foreigners the right of sailing along the Yangtse river which practically opened the whole of China to the colonizers. Now the way was opened for British colonial advance to Burma since the latter had recognized the sovereignty of China. This was done with great expedition. The coastal area of Burma was seized, and the whole coast of the Indian Ocean from Calcutta to Singapore was overrun by British colonial forces.

When we think of the huge wealth of the British Monarchy and the march of the Industrial Revolution in Britain, we should bear in mind that much of it was based on opium trade and slave trade. The money thus gained completed the accumulation process and went to finance inventions and sponsor the building of machines, iron foundries, roads, canals, etc.

⁸⁸ A stream of Western-sold opium to China continued to spread addiction among the Chinese well into the 20th c., until in 1949 the Communists came to power in China. In a short term the authorities destroyed all the 80 thousand poppy plantations of over one million hectares. Drug traffickers were arrested, many of them shot. The campaign against drug addiction became a massive popular movement. The main weapon in that struggle was the belief in a bright future, which would replace the centuries of stagnation and degradation in China.

Comprehension questions

1. Louis Philippe and France's alliance with Britain. Nicholas I and the Holy Alliance.
2. Palmerston and his creed. Characterise his foreign policy.
3. The independence of the Belgian.
4. Egypt and the Ottoman Empire.
5. Palmerston and the queen. Palmerston's resignation from the position of the foreign secretary and his office of home secretary.
6. Opium smuggling into China.
7. The First Opium War.
8. The Second Opium War.

Names and expressions

- ...frightened him back into the arms of his older allies** — так его напугало, что он снова бросился в объятия своих старых союзников
- secretary-at-war** — министр по делам войн (внешней политики)
- Miguel** [mi'ge:l] — Мигель
- he made use of his position** — он воспользовался своим положением
- Ferdinand** ['fɜ:di'nænd]
- Christina** [kris'tinə]
- Carlos** ['keels]
- Quadruple** [kwod'ru:pl] — четверной союз (лат.)
- Queen Isabella was declared to be of age** — было объявлено, что королева Изабелла достигла того возраста, когда можно занять престол
- to the front** — на первый план
- Constantinople** [ˌkɒnstænti'nəʊp(ə)l]
- which would have strengthened her hold upon Turkey** — что усилило бы ее (России) позицию в Турции
- Egypt** ['idʒɪpt]
- Cairo** ['kai(ə)rəʊ]
- unable to bring France to the same views** — не в состоянии убедить Францию в правоте своих взглядов
- Acre** ['eɪkə] — Аккра
- Aberdeen** [ˌæbə'di:n] — Эбердин (Абердин)
- held this office** — занимал этот пост
- had already got him into trouble** — прежде уже привело его к неприятностям (осложнениям)
- which remained memorable** — который остался памятным
- as a matter of form** — в качестве формальности
- chateau d'Eu** [ˈʃæ təʊdə'o] — Шато д'О
- Raleigh** ['ro:li]
- the Order of the Garter** — орден Подвязки, высшая награда в Великобритании
- to smooth the things over** — смягчать (сглаживать) положение
- to follow his own will** поступать по-своему

33. THE GROWTH OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

The loss of the United States of America in 1783 was more than offset by the growth of British colonial power elsewhere during the next seventy years. The growth was due partly to conquest, partly to settlement, partly to the natural development of new communities. A Greater Britain sprang into life in Canada, South Africa, and Australia, while Indian empire continued to increase.



Canada

Canada, after 1763, had at first been governed as a conquered territory. In 1791 it was divided into two provinces — Upper and Lower Canada — and representative government, of a certain kind, was

given to each of them. But this constitution was soon found to be unsatisfactory. The governors and the legislative councils were appointed by the home government, and the Assembly — an elective body representing the people — had no real power. In course of time this system produced its natural results: quarrels between the governors and the Assemblies became frequent; and at length, in 1837, the rebellion broke out.

The rebellion was easily suppressed, but the lesson of the American War had not been thrown away, and in 1840 the existing system was radically changed. The two provinces of Canada were united; the legislative council was enlarged; complete control over taxation was given to the Assembly; and the ministry became responsible to Parliament. Thus, although the governor remained responsible only to the crown, the Canadians got self-government. In 1867 the different provinces were united into one confederacy — the Dominion of Canada — with separate governments for local affairs, but one national Parliament under the crown.

The Cape Colony

The growth of British powers in South Africa was the Cape Colony, finally acquired from the Dutch in 1815. The transfer of allegiance from Holland to Britain made many of the Boers (that is, farmers) emigrate into the still unoccupied territories to the north and east.

So, the colony of Natal and a settlement across the Orange River were founded about 1837. In 1842 Natal was brought under British supremacy; in 1844 it was made a part of Cape Colony; and it became an independent colony in 1856. In 1872 the Cape received the rights of self-government.

Australia and New Zealand

The Australian colonies had a very different origin from that of Canada and the Cape. It was in 1770 that Captain Cook, on his famous voyage of discovery, found Botany Bay on the east coast of the vast and almost unknown continent of Australia. In 1788 Port Sydney was first occupied as a penal settlement to which criminals sentenced to transportation might be sent. The convicts created many popular songs in which they sang of their unhappy fate.

"It was on the twenty-eighth of May
 From England we did steer,
 And all things being safe on board,
 We sailed down the river, clear.
 And every ship that we passed by,
 We heard the sailors say —
 "There goes a ship of clever lads,

And they are bound to Botany Bay"

Another song:

"Oh, listen for a moment, lads,
And hear me tell my tale;
How, o'er the sea from England's shore
I was compelled to sail.
The jury said, 'He's guilty, sir!'
And says the judge, says he —
'For life, Jim Jones, I'm sending you
Across the stormy sea'.

'You'll have no chance for mischief there —
Remember what I say:
They'll flog the mischief out of you
When you get to Botany Bay!
The waves were high upon the sea,
The winds blew up in gales;
I'd rather be drowned in misery
Than go to New South Wales.

For night and day the irons clang,
And, like poor galley slaves,
We toil and moil, and when we die
Must fill dishonoured graves."

But soon the advantages of Botany Bay for other purposes were found out. Sheep-farming and export of wool became important sectors of the economy. Sheep-farming in Australia began about 1797; and the original colony, called New South Wales, began to develop.

Gradually the various groups of settlements were formed into different colonies. New Zealand thus became separate in 1841, Victoria in 1850 (it was called, of course, in the Queen's honour). The transportation of convicts was stopped in 1840, and the beginnings of representative government were introduced. Much poor people came to Australia to have farms and develop agriculture hoping to become rich. Big sheep farms were called "stations."

In 1850 the discovery of gold in Australia led to a rapid growth in wealth and population and was accompanied by the possibility of self-government to the Australian colonies, two years later New Zealand also received this right. With the massive influx of immigrants and the development of industries at the end of the 19th century, Australia developed as an English-speaking nation.

The policy of the British respecting Aborigines was ruthless. Unlike earlier visitors, the British settlers immediately disrupted Aboriginal life, taking over good sources of water, productive land, and fisheries. The legal doctrine on which Britain claimed Australian territory, terra nullius (land belonging to no one), denied that Aborigines had any rights to or ownership of land because they did not build permanent houses or practice agriculture. Count Strzelecki, a Polish explorer who was in Australia in the late 1830s, was moved to write: "Degraded, subdued, confused, awkward and distrustful, ill concealing emotions of anger, scorn or revenge, emaciated and covered with filthy rags; these native lords of the soil, [are] more spectres of the past than living men, and dragging on a melancholy existence to a yet more melancholy doom'..."

The indigenous population of Australia was almost completely destroyed and had to eke out a

living on reserves. All in all, during the British settlement in Australia and New Zealand an estimated one million Aborigines were destroyed or caused to die. In many cases, the extermination of the Australian aborigines was not ordered by a government but occurred spontaneously.

From 1845 to 1872 the New Zealand Wars, which were long known as the Māori Wars, took place. They were a series of armed conflicts between the New Zealand government and indigenous Māori. Though the wars were initially localised conflicts triggered by tensions over disputed land purchases, they escalated dramatically from 1860 as the government became convinced it was facing a united Māori resistance to further land sales and a refusal to acknowledge Crown sovereignty. The government summoned thousands of British troops to mount major campaigns to overpower the Māori King Movement and acquire farming and residential land for English settlers. Later campaigns were aimed at quashing the Hauhau movement, a part of the Pai Marire religion, which was strongly opposed to the alienation of Māori land and eager to strengthen Māori identity.

At the peak of hostilities in the 1860s, 18,000 British troops, supported by artillery, cavalry and local militia, battled about 4,000 Māori warriors in what became a gross imbalance of manpower and weaponry. Although outnumbered, the Māori were able to withstand their enemy with techniques that included anti-artillery bunkers and the use of carefully placed pa, or fortified villages, that allowed them to block their enemy advance and often inflict heavy losses, yet quickly abandon their positions without significant loss. Guerrilla-style tactics were used by both sides in later campaigns, often fought in dense bush. Over the course of the Taranaki and Waikato campaigns the lives of about 1800 Māori and 800 Europeans were lost and total Māori losses over the course of all the wars may have exceeded 2100.

By the 1820s the entire population of Tasmania (believed to have been about 5,000-10,000 at the time of colonization) was wiped out by the violent conflict and diseases. Almost all of the few Aborigines who remained were removed in the 1830s to Flinders Island, where they perished. Alan Moorhead so described how Australia was made: "In Sydney it had been a wearing away of the wild tribes. In Tasmania it was a wholesale massacre... free settlers... and convicts... all of them eager for land and none of them disposed to let the blacks stand in their way. But those mild and cheerful people whom Cook had visited half a century before did not prove so tameable as the aborigines on the mainland; when their land... was taken over for farms they attacked the settlers with their spears, and an organized man hunt was begun against them. There was no particular secrecy or shame about this; it was supported by the government... So, the manhunt started, and it grew more savage as it went on. In 1830 Tasmania was put under martial law, a line of armed beaters was formed across the island, and an attempt was made to drive the aborigines into a cul-de-sac. They succeeded in slipping through the net, of course, but by now the heart had gone out of the tribe, and their terror was greater than their desperation... Felix Maynard, the surgeon of a French whaling ship that was based on Hobart at this time, wrote that the natives were 'continually hunted and tracked down like fallow deer, and, once... away from their tribal hunting grounds.., the instinct to survive very quickly flickered out.... The last pure-blooded Tasmanian died in 1876."⁸⁹

Only in 1938, in the year of Australia's sesquicentennial celebrations, the rise of Aboriginal rights began. William Cooper and William Ferguson, the Australian Aboriginals League representatives, wrote: "There are enough of us (Aborigines) remaining to expose the humbug of your claims, as White Australians, to be a civilised, progressive, kindly and humane nation."

And only in 2008 the Australian prime minister Kevin Rudd apologized for the forcible separation of Aboriginal children from their families in the interest of turning them into white

⁸⁹ Moorhead, Alan. *The fatal impact: An account of the invasion of the South Pacific 1767— 1840*. Harmondsworth, 1966. P. 212.

Australians, as he formulated it, “for the laws and policies of successive Parliaments and governments that have inflicted profound grief, suffering and loss on <...> our fellow Australians.”

Today most of the estimated 20.7 million Australians are descended from nineteenth- and twentieth-century European settlers, the majority from Britain and Ireland. The term Anglo-Celtic is commonly used in Australia to refer to a person whose ethnic origin was in the British Isles, e.g. English, Irish, Scottish etc. Anglo-Celtic Australians comprise around 74% of the population. The vast majority of the population, around 92%, is of European descent. Aboriginal numbers remain small; in 2001 they stood at 1.04%.

India

The early years of Queen Victoria there was a great consolidation of English power in India. Since the days of Warren Hastings, the political side of English position there had more and more overshadowed the commercial traditions of the East India Company. In its struggle with France Britain proved to be a better bird of prey.

Following the principle of “divide and rule” in their colonial policy, the British used the fragmentation of India and conflicts both between different kingdoms and between different social and religious groups to establish British influence.⁹⁰

Except for a moment when Napoleon's Eastern expedition had offered French support to Tippoo Sahib, the son of Hyder Ali, the English were concerned with native rulers. The English representative at that time was Marquis Wellesley, brother of the Duke of Wellington, and he was determined to strengthen the British position in all the native courts.

In 1817 a war broke out with Marathas. The Maratha chiefs were invited to be persuaded in putting down the robbers; but their head, Peishwa, refused, and made war upon the British. Several of his chief vassals followed him. The conflict (1818) had as a result suppression of the revolt, the dethronement of the Peishwa, and the submission of the other chiefs. The Maratha power was thus finally broken.

Then there was peace in India for nearly five-and-twenty years. The wars Burma and Afghanistan, which took place during this interval, were fought beyond the British frontier. The former took place in 1824, and it ended in 1826.

Soon after this the period of peace in India came to an end. The refusal of the rulers of Sindh to pay their tribute led to a war, conducted by Charles Napier, and it ended in the annexation of Sindh (1843). In the same year domestic disturbance in the territory of the Maratha prince, Sindia, required British intervention, and as a result the British ceased the strong fortress of Gwalior, and Sindia army was disbanded.

Two years later a much more serious conflict with the Sikhs began. The Sikhs originally were a body of religious enthusiasts whose faith was a mixture of the Mohammedan and Hindu creeds. By now they had built up a formidable military power in the Punjab. In 1845 they invaded the territory of British allies.

After a series of battles, which were very hot and stern, the Sikhs were driven back into their own territory (1846), and the British army advanced to their capital, Lahore. The Sikhs submitted, and a British resident was appointed to supervise the government. Two years later the province rose against British influence, and a second severe struggle was the result. After more

⁹⁰By the way, after the collapse of the colonial system, the British divided their former colony into India and Pakistan. Because of the division of Punjab and Bengal, bloody clashes between Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims began that killed more than 500,000 people. The division of India also led to one of the greatest migrations in modern history of the world - about 12 million Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims settled on the territories of the newly created states of India and Pakistan. (Symonds, Richard. *The Making of Pakistan*. — London: Faber and Faber, 1951. — P. 74.)

than one battle the Punjab was formally annexed to the British Empire (1849).

By 1856, most of India was still under the control of the British East India Company. A year later, a nationwide insurrection of rebelling military units and kingdoms, known as India's First War of Independence or the Sepoy Mutiny, seriously challenged the Company's control. As a result, India was brought under the direct rule of the British Crown.

So, the sometimes vile and sometimes harsh British policy ensured that the Indian local rulers were subdued and nearly all India was subjugated to the British crown.

British Policies in Asia. The Anglo-Afghan War of 1838-1842

In the first half of the 19th century, England led the colonial war with a number of Asian countries. From the time of Wellesley's recall till the accession of Queen Victoria there was continual war with the natives in the Hindustani Peninsula and its borders. In 1813 there was fighting in Nepal; in 1824 in Burmah and in Arakan; in 1826 Assam was annexed. In 1836 - 1837, taking advantage of the Shah of Persia's attempt to seize the Herat oasis, England sent troops against this country. Through the British military and political pressure, in 1841 Persia was forced to sign contracts and open her markets for British manufactured goods.

In 1838, the British ruling circles began a war of aggression against Afghanistan. In the first phase (1838-1841), colonizers managed to achieve major successes. They occupied the major Afghan cities of Kabul, Kandahar, Ghazni and others. In Herat (in those years - the independent city) a British resident, Major D'Arcy Todd was established, who turned it into the centre of the British subversive activities in the Central Asian khanates - Khiva, Bukhara and Kokand. This fact worried the Russian Empire, who had had lasting and well-established trade and cultural relations with those neighbouring countries.

The ruling circles of Britain carefully studied the region. Under various pretexts Turkestan was visited by the missions of Meer Izzut-oollah (1812), William Moorcroft and George Trebeck (1819-1825), Alexander Burns (1831-1833), John Wood (1837), etc. They collected material, which was supposed to facilitate the preparation and implementation of aggression against Central Asia. Meanwhile, British goods gradually penetrated in the markets. British emissaries Abbott, Shakespeare, Connolly, Standard visited Khiva, Kokand, Bukhara, conducting intelligence and propaganda activities there. British Army officers Rollo Burslem and Charles Sturt engaged in surveying passes through the Hindu Kush. Scouts managed to penetrate the Uzbek principality of Hulme on the left bank of the Amu Darya and put on the map the most important roads of the valley of the river. During their trips Burslem and Sturt repeatedly met British agents - Indian Muslims returning to British India from Central Asia with all sorts of information about the situation in Bukhara, Khiva and the Kokand Khanate. Among these agents were former students of a special intelligence school, established in India by the British authorities under the supervision of Captain Dalgetty. For the invasion of Central Asia troops were formed, some of which in 1840 moved to the north of Afghanistan, to the Hindu Kush passes.

However, those British troops were defeated by the people's militia, created by Uzbek and Tajik population of the left bank of the Amu Darya with the participation of the Ameer of Afghanistan, Dost Muhammad Khan.

The Afghanis also opposed the British. The latter were defeated and forced to temporarily abandon the expansionist plans in Afghanistan and Central Asia. Not having succeeded in Afghanistan, Britain took the offensive in India, taking possession of the principality of Sindh in 1843, and Punjab in 1846-1849. The capture of the last major independent states of India allowed the British bourgeoisie to step up expansion in the East, especially against Afghanistan and Central Asia [Khalfin 1960].

Below is how the British historians describe those events. In 1839 the Afghan trouble broke out. In that year an English expedition was sent to Cabul, because Britain feared that Russian

influence in Afghanistan exposed India to invasion. The Ameer, Dost Mohammed, was sent to India, while Shah Shuja was set up instead of him, with Alexander Burnes as his political adviser. But all this had been done without any reference to the Afghans themselves. When they revolted in 1841, under Akbar Khan, Dost Mohammed's son, General Elphinstone, consented to retire with his troops into India.

It was the beginning of January when the small British army began their march through the mountain passes. They were attacked incessantly throughout the march by the wild Afghan tribes. Only one man — Dr. Brydon, — survived and succeeded in reaching Jalalabad, which had not been evacuated by British troops. At that moment Ellenborough had arrived as Governor-General at Calcutta; he was altogether opposed to a forward policy, but he allowed the military authorities to recover Cabul before ordering a final evacuation of Afghanistan.

In 1842 a second expedition marched to Cabul and inflicted some punishment; but the Afghans were then allowed to choose their own sovereign, and Dost Mohammed was restored to the throne. A terrible waste of life and treasure had been made for no advantage at all.

However, after the inglorious defeat, bribing was resorted to, and the Cabul Ameer was eventually persuaded to sign a treaty by which he was to be faithful to the East-India Company.

Comprehension questions

1. Britain's conquest of Canada.
2. Britain's withdrawal of the Cape Colony from Holland and Natal from the Boers.
3. The expansion in Australia and New Zealand.
4. The fate of the Aborigines. The Aboriginal struggle.
5. The British subjugation of India.
6. The Afghan War.

Names and expressions

the lesson of the American War had not been thrown away —

урок американской войны (за независимость) не остался неучтенным

to be responsible to the crown — быть подчиненным королевской власти

under the crown — подчинен королеве (короне)

Cape Colony ['keɪp 'kɒləni] — Капская колония, впоследствии часть ЮАР

Boer ['bɔɪə, 'bo:(ə)] — бур

Natal [nə'tæl] — Наталь, впоследствии часть ЮАР

they are bound — они приговорены, высланы

o'er = over

they'll flog the mischief out of you — из тебя выбьют желание безобразничать

New Zealand ['nju: 'zi:lənd]

Tippoo Sahib ['tipə sa:b, 'sa:(h)ɪb]

Hyder Ali ['haɪd(ə)rə'li]

Peishwa [peɪʃu'a]

Burma ['bɜ:mə] — Бирма

Afghanistan [æf'gænistæn]

Nepaul [ni'pɔ:l] — Непал

Arakan ['ærə'kan] — Аракан

Assam [ə'sæm] — Ассам (штат в Индии)

Shah Shuja [ʃa:ʃu: dʒə]

Burnes [bɜ:ns] — Бернс

Jelalabad [dʒəl'ælə'bæd]

Calcutta [kæl'kʌtə]

Cabul (Kabul) ['ka:bul, 'ko:bul]

a terrible waste of life and treasure had been made for no advantage at all — ужасные человеческие жертвы и потери средств совершенно ни к чему не привели

Sindh [sɪnd] — Синд (река в Индии)

Napier, Charles ['neɪpiə] (1782-1853) — British General

Sindia ['sɪndiə]

Sikhs [si:ks] — сикхи (сигхи)

Punjab [pʌn'dʒɑ:b] — Пенджаб

Lahore [lə'ho:] — Лахор

34. THE CRIMEAN WAR (1853-1856)

A whole range of reasons were adduced to explain the Crimean War, the major of which were probably economic and geopolitical. Economically, in the mid 19th c. there were three major economies, or economic world-systems⁹¹: Chinese (East Asian), Russian and European with



Allies: Abdul Majid II, Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, Queen Victoria, and French President Louis Napoleon Bonaparte.

Britain as its centre since the Industrial Revolution of the mid 1840s.⁹² For the West and Britain as the Western hegemon it had become essential to embrace the remaining two world-systems as a semi-periphery and periphery of the emerged capitalist system. With the common financial groups cementing the Anglo-French alliance, these countries committed aggression against Russia in 1853-1856 and, immediately after it, launched the Second Opium War against China (1856-1860).



Nicholas I of Russia

As a result, Russia and China ceased to be independent world-systems but became increasingly embraced in the global Britain-dominated economic system.

Geopolitically, after Napoleon's defeat, Britain became the most powerful country in Europe

⁹¹The global economic system implies the inter-regional and transnational division of labour, which divides the world into separate "world-systems": core countries, semi-periphery, and periphery. Core countries focus on higher skill, capital-intensive production; peripheral countries focus on low-skill, labour-intensive production and extraction of raw materials. This process constantly self-reproduces and reinforces the dominance of the core countries. Nonetheless, the system has dynamic characteristics, in part as a result of revolutions in transport technology, and individual states can gain or lose their core (semi-periphery, periphery) status over time. For a time, some countries become the world hegemon; during the last few centuries, as the world-system has extended geographically and intensified economically, this status has passed from the Netherlands to the United Kingdom and (most recently) to the United States of America (Fernand Braudel, Immanuel Wallerstein).

⁹²The colonies and peripheral states used as markets had become the major prerequisite for the success of the British industrial revolution. Without her colonies, Britain would not have had enough initial capital for the modernization. The industrialization could have been by far less brisk and spectacular, or it would have lasted much longer. After the industrialization the West utilized its advantages and gained control over most of the world economy, presiding over the development and spread of industrialization and capitalist economy, indirectly resulting in unequal development.

except for Russia. She wanted to expand in the Middle East; to achieve it she had to oust the Russian Empire with its influence there. Following the staple pattern of weakening any power that was able to challenge its world dominance through provoking strife and wars of third countries with it, Britain launched anti-Russian propaganda in Europe.⁹³ Another British interest was to preclude the union of Russia with the Balkan States, Britain much depended on the Russian export of grain, and another large market for grain was the Balkan states. If Russia and the Balkans had united, they would have dictated the terms of grain sale to Britain. This Britain would not have permitted.

As for France, since Napoleon's surrender in 1815, it had largely fallen under the British control, and once try to carry out independent policy, it was rocked by social unrest. Since the French Revolution of 1789, there were revolutions in 1830, 1848, 1870 in France and the Paris Commune of 1871 (the latter was the world's first communist organization, cruelly shot down by the government troops).

At the beginning of the year 1848 the French king, Louis Philippe, appeared as secure as he had been since his accession to the throne eighteen years before. However, the British needed a person more loyal to them at the helm of France. So, they courted young Louis Napoleon (future Napoleon III), nephew of the great emperor, whose entire career of future would depend on Britain, until his downfall during the Franco-Prussian War. In February Paris again broke into revolution. Louis Philippe fled, and republic was immediately proclaimed. In December 1848 Louis Napoleon was elected as President of the Republic. In 1851 he staged a coup and removed the legislative power. A year later he declared himself emperor Napoleon III of the Second Empire. The new French ruler wished a revenge for the defeat of Napoleon I in the Russian campaign. This consolidated his alliance with the British – the centuries long enemies France and England united in the anti-Russian cause. The French opposed the Russian strengthening on the Balkans and desired to strengthen their positions in the Middle East. In all this they found rapprochement with the British who played upon the French-Russian contradictions.

As for other European countries, the shock of the French Revolution was felt throughout Europe. Popular risings took place in almost every capital of Germany and Italy; their sovereigns hastened to save themselves by granting some or other form of constitutional government. These outbreaks were accompanied by a strong movement in favour of German and Italian unity, which threatened the downfall of Austria as she had her interests in both countries — they were occupied by her armies. But after about eighteen months of violent fighting the European governments recovered their control, Austria regained her former position, and German and Italian unity seemed even farther off than ever. Britain took active behind-the-scenes part in these events with its diplomacy, leverage over politicians, intelligence. Palmerston gave “plenty of good advice” to the governments of Europe, but “declined any warlike intervention.” As British historians put it, “most people in England would have been glad to continue the cause of reforms, as well as that of German and Italian unity; but Palmerston had to maintain the Austrian Empire as a counterpoise both to France and Russia.”

Many European powers feared strong Russia. Austria, Prussia, Sweden, Denmark, formally remaining neutral or even friendly, were overall hostile towards Russia, and Russia had to protect its borders vigilantly, which resulted in the fact that no more than 15 per cent of its troops

⁹³Prince Petr Vyazemsky who travelled in Europe (Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Italy) on the eve of the Crimean War was struck by the deafening anti-Russian propaganda campaign launched by European newspapers. Vyazemky wrote: “...La Presse's lying and raging. Magazines do not know the first thing about either Russia or Turkey, but dispose of them as of their property.” “(Magazines) cry and rage against the so-called autocratic and unprecedented demands of Russia. The foolish public does not pay attention to the official documents, but enjoys the vociferations of magazine screamers.” “Magazines are laughable in their absurdity ... just scream and make noise and do not explain anything.”

participated in the actual battles on the fields of the Crimean War.

As for Turkey, on the eve of the Crimean War in the mid 19th c. it also largely followed in the wake of the British policy. Since 1838 the British commodities were exempt from customs dues in Turkey, thus the country was in fact dependent on the British trade companies. The British Ambassador in Constantinople from 1842 till 1852, Canning, 1st Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe, was called the Great Elche and "second Sultan." Stratford actively contributed to the deepening of differences between Russia and Turkey, promoting the declaration of war.

In 1851 the Great Exhibition⁹⁴ was held in London – “with a noble purpose to proclaim the advent of universal peace”, but within three years of that date another great war was raging in the East of Europe.

The beginning of the Crimean War

As mentioned above, Tsar Nicholas I, who reigned at the time in Russia, was a conservator, a religious man, opposed to materialism, permissiveness and amorality, which the liberal European revolutions epitomized to him. He viewed the revolutions, supported by the British, as a means to topple legitimate rulers and slacken traditional monarchies, and new materialist world as a threat to the old consecrated world order. The preservation of traditionalist values and the Holy Alliance were his major goals. He viewed Napoleon III of France, cultivated by the British, as a usurper and revanchist, and was determined to check any French expansion. His principle was to support legitimate rulers in every country: he supported the Sultan of Turkey as a legitimate ruler, even though Turkey was the opponent of Russia at the time. In the issuance, it was represented that Russia was the “gendarme of Europe” and, although Nicholas I consolidated around Russia a number of long-time friendly countries, many European powers were consolidated against her, which showed itself in the Crimean War. The conservatory position lost to the idea of revolutionary change.

In 1850, a dispute arose between Nicholas I and Napoleon III on the protection of the holy places in Turkey, which became a prelude to the Crimean War. A hundred years before the guardianship of the holy places in Palestine was given to France, but when in the course of time the number of pilgrims belonging to the Greek or Orthodox Church became far greater than those belonging to the Latin and Catholic Church, the Greeks tried to drive their rivals away from their privilege. Louis Napoleon put pressure on the Ottoman Porte in support of the Latins, and the Greeks turned to Russia, the leading Orthodox Power.



*Admiral Pavel Stepanovich
Nakhimov*

In hindsight, a number of miscouunts were made by the Russian government and diplomacy, the major of which being too much trust in Britain and the underestimation of the strength of the Franco-British alliance. In a private talk with the British Ambassador to Russia Seymour, Nicholas I allegedly said some words which were interpreted by the latter as a suggestion of a partition of the Ottoman Empire.⁹⁵ Nicholas I

⁹⁴It followed the successful French Industrial Exposition of 1844; indeed, its prime motive was for "Great Britain [to make] clear to the world its role as industrial leader."

⁹⁵According to a British historian Harold Temperley, Seymour in a private conversation pushed the Tsar to be more specific about the Ottoman Empire. Eventually, the Tsar said, "Turkey seems to be falling to pieces, the fall will be a great misfortune. It is very important that England and Russia should come to a perfectly good understanding... and that neither should take any decisive step of which the other is not apprized." And then, the following phrase is attributed to him: "We have a sick man on our hands, a man gravely ill, it will be a great misfortune if one of these days he slips through our hands, especially before the necessary arrangements are made." However, even if this phrase was actually said, the implications from it were not the partition of Turkey, but its joint Russian-British protection.

sent Prince Alexander Sergeyeovich Menshikov on a special mission to the Ottoman Sublime Porte in February 1853. When the Sultan Abd-ul-Mejid I committed himself "to protect the Eastern Orthodox Christian religion and its churches", Menshikov demanded a full Russian protectorate over all 12 million Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire, under the control of the Orthodox Church's hierarchy. Some compromise was reached regarding the Orthodox access to the Holy Land, but the Sultan, advised by the British ambassador Stratford Canning, rejected the Eastern Orthodox protectorate under the threat to the independence of the Ottoman Empire. In May 1853 Menshikov with his colleagues left Constantinople, which could spell war. It was also a diplomatic miscourt.

On May 26, 1853 Nicholas I issued a Manifesto in which he proclaimed the occupation by the Russian troops of Moldavia and Wallachia – the Ottoman principalities in which Russia was acknowledged as a special guardian of the Orthodox Church. In June the Russians crossed the Pruth and entered Moldavia and Wallachia on the pretext that the Sultan failed to resolve the issue of the Holy Places. Britain, hoping to maintain the Ottoman Empire as a bulwark against the influence of Russian power in Asia, sent a fleet to the Dardanelles, where it joined another fleet sent by France. Entering the Dardanelles and the Sea of Marmara, Britain and France infringed upon the Straits neutrality convention.

Turkey was encouraged and declared war on Russia in October 1853. The Sultan's armies proceeded to the attack, moving on the Russian army near the Danube later that month. Russia and the Ottoman Empire massed forces on two main fronts, the Caucasus and the Danube. An Ottoman leader Omar Pasha managed to achieve some victories on the Danubian front.

Nicholas I responded by despatching warships under Admiral Pavel Stepanovich Nakhimov, who destroyed the Ottoman fleet at Sinop on 30 November 1853, allowing Russia to land and supply its forces on the Ottoman shores fairly easily. The destruction of the Ottoman fleet and the threat of Russian expansion alarmed Britain and France.

In 1854, after Russia ignored an Anglo-French ultimatum to withdraw from the Danubian Principalities, Britain and France declared war. Emperor Nicholas I presumed that Austria, in return for the support rendered during the Revolutions of 1848 (in particular, the Hungarian Revolution of 1848, which encountered the resistance of the Slavic peoples, led to an increase in interethnic tension and a war in which Russia was involved), would side with him, or at the very least remain neutral. However, Austria felt threatened by the Russian troops in the nearby Danubian Principalities. When Britain and France demanded the withdrawal of Russian forces from the Principalities, Austria supported them; and, though it did not immediately declare war on Russia, it refused to guarantee its neutrality. When, in the summer of 1854, Austria made another demand for the withdrawal of troops, Russia (fearing that Austria would enter the war) complied, whereupon Wallachia and Moldavia were immediately occupied by the Austrians.

Though the original grounds for war were lost when Russia withdrew her troops from the Danubian Principalities, Britain and France continued hostilities. Determined to address "the Eastern Question", the allies posed to Russia several conditions for a ceasefire, including that Russia should give up its protectorate over the Danubian Principalities; that Russia should abandon any right to interfere on behalf of Orthodox Christians; that the Straits Convention of 1841 was to be revised; and finally, all nations were to be granted access to the river Danube. As the Russian Emperor refused to comply with these "Four Points", the Crimean War proceeded.

As the British historians write, "under these conditions, peace might probably have been made; but the opportunity of finally putting a stop to Russian aggression seemed too good to be lost, and the allies decided to invade the Crimea." In fact, this second half of the War was the joint Anglo-French and, broader, European aggression against Russia.

The allies began bombardments of Odessa, the Solovets Monastery in the White Sea, Petropavlovsk Kamchatski. On September 14, 1854, the Anglo-French troops landed in the Crimea (Yevpatoria) and marched on Sebastopol. The allies had 360 warships (including 31

ships of a fighter squadron) and 67,000-strong army near Sebastopol (including 41,000 French, 20,000 British and 6,000 Turks) against 52,000-strong Russian troops (of whom in Sebastopol were 33,000). All in all, the allies' advantage of ships and troops was double as compared to the Russians.

The battle of the Alma was fought a few days later (September 20). The Russians held a strong position on the southern bank of the little river Alma, which the allies had to pass in order to reach Sebastopol. The French were on the right, near the sea; the British on the left. The chief part of the fighting fell on the latter. The English commander was Reglan. The battle at the river Alma was won by hard fighting, but the Russians were driven back into Sebastopol. The Russians fought heroically, but, as Menshikov later exoneratingly explained, the rifles widely used by the British troops tipped the scales in their favour.

It should be noted that in general the allies surpassed the Russians in ordinance. The numerical superiority was 541 guns (130 heavy) of the allies against 466 ones (57 heavy) which the Russians possessed. However, the Russian systems of mines and mine-laying gear, invented by Boris Jacobi, far excelled those of the allies.

On 5 October, at about 10 a.m. the artillerymen of the 5th Russian bastion succeeded in blowing up a powder-magazine of the French battery. Most of the French batteries lost their guns. So, by 11 o'clock, the French guns were silenced. On the left flank of the line of defence the battle with the British was in full swing. The 3rd bastion, on which most of the British guns had been concentrating their fire, was severely damaged. By 3 p.m., the gun crews had been relieved twice. Despite the enemy withering fire, our artillerymen kept on firing non-stop. The steam-frigates Vladimir (Captain Second Rank G. I. Butakov) and Khersones (Captain-Lieutenant I. Rudnev) actively participated in firing at the British batteries, as a result of this damage to the British was caused. The heroic actions of the Sebastopol citizens prevented the enemy from achieving his main goal. All the plans and efforts of the Allied troops, which were under arms all day, to carry out an infantry attack were in vain. The assault did not take place.

On that day the Sebastopol garrison's losses were 1,250 men in killed and wounded, among them Vice-Admiral Vladimir Alexeevich Kornilov, who led the defence of Sebastopol. During a heavy cannonade, he was inspecting the batteries, instructing the commanders and reassuring the soldiers and sailors. At 11.30 he was fatally wounded with a cannon-splinter, and the same evening he died. Kornilov's last order was as follows: "Defend Sebastopol". After Kornilov died, Pavel Stepanovich Nakhimov remained the one and only Chief of Sebastopol defence. Having made sure that Sebastopol could not be taken as quickly as they had expected, the British-French started to besiege the city. The town lies, for the most part, on the south side of a long inlet running in from the sea. The allies marched round the head of this inlet, and began the siege from the southern side, getting their supplies from the harbour of Balaklava, still farther in the south. Meanwhile the Russians sank seven old sailships in the entrance of the harbour so as to prevent the allied fleets from forcing their way in and bombarding the city, and they had time to strengthen their fortifications. The Russian main body was under the command of Alexander Menshikov. Eduard Todleben, Chief Engineer, was working there, day and night re-creating, rearming and improving the fortifications (those fortifications had been blueprinted already in 1834, but postponed).



On the 17th of October 1854 the first attack took place. All that day a tremendous artillery duel raged. The French siege corps lost heavily. The fleet engaged the harbour batteries close inshore, and suffered a loss of five hundred men, besides severe damage to the ships. On the other hand, the British siege batteries silenced the Malakoff (i.e. the fortifications on Malakoff Hill). The attack might have succeeded, but by daybreak the Russians had repaired and improved the damaged fortifications. On that very day, on the 17th of October, the bombardment of Sevastopol began. It lasted for a week, but produced little effect, and on October 25 the Russian army outside the city made an attempt to drive off the besiegers. It was not long before Menshikov and his army appeared on the river Chernaya and moved towards Balaklava lines and the British base.

The battle of Balaklava, which followed on the 25th of October 1854, was fought almost entirely by the cavalry. The British Heavy Brigade dashed through a superior body, and later in the day the Light Brigade made its famous attack against the Russian guns. The commander led the Light Brigade straight at the Russian batteries, which immediately met the advancing squadron with a deadly fire, but the troopers nevertheless reached the guns and cut out the artillerymen. The "Heavies" tried to advance but were met with such a storm of fire that they withdrew. By twos and threes, the survivors of the Light Brigade made their way back. Two-thirds of its numbers were left on the field. The day closed with the Russians still in possession of the Vorontsov ridge. Alfred Tennyson's poem "Charge of the Light Brigade" dedicated to those events has entered textbooks and is still taught in the schools of the UK.

If the heights lost in this action were not important to the safety of the Allies, the point selected for the next attempt was of vital importance. The union of the covering army and the siege corps near Inkerman was the day of an action on the day following Balaklava, and the battle of Inkerman followed on the 5th of November. At dawn the Russian army, now reinforced from Odessa, assailed the British divisions. The battle of Inkerman defies description; every regiment, every group of men bore its own part in the confused and doubtful struggle. It was "a soldiers' battle", pure and simple. The British troops, already much reduced in numbers, defended the Inkerman ridge against the Russian troops advancing from the city, who were joined by the army outside. At length, when the British were almost worn out, the French came to their assistance. Both sides lost heavily in this battle.

Soon after this winter came in full severity. The siege was maintained, but only at the cost of terrible suffering and great loss, more by illness and exposure than by battle. The British troops suffered even more than the French, chiefly because of the inexperience and carelessness of the War Office. Desertion from the British army was high. So great was the popular indignation that the ministry of Aberdeen resigned. His place was taken by Palmerston, who brought a new spirit

in the administration. Military hospitals were reformed, chiefly through the agency of Miss Nightingale.⁹⁶

It is hard to say how the war might have ended, but on 18 February 1855 Nicholas I deceased, and his son Alexander II ascended to the Russian throne. In April the allies bombarded Sebastopol for ten days, launching 168,700 shells while the Russians returned 88,700. The Sebastopol defenders used up almost all their shells reserve with the exception of the emergency reserve saved for assault operations. The new Commander-in-Chief, Prince Alexander Alexeyevich Gorchakov, persuaded the Tsar to surrender, but Alexander II at first supported assault. In the summer of 1855, the allies' siege of Sebastopol was vigorously pressed on. Some small successions were won, and in June a great assault was made. But the fortifications were too strong, and the inhabitants of the town behaved heroically. On 28 June, Sebastopol defenders suffered the most terrible loss: Admiral Pavel Stepanovich Nakhimov was fatally wounded by a sniper at the Malakoff redoubt. The bullet struck him in his temple the very moment he went out of the cover of the fortification to examine the enemy trenches. Without coming to his senses, Nakhimov died on 30 June 1855.

In the garrison order of the day, the following lines were written concerning the admiral's death: "...Our garrison will not be the only one mourning over the death of such a valorous fellow-seaman, outstanding and talented commander, a knight without fear and without reproach, - all Russia will be crying the tears of sincere grief over the untimely death of the Sinope Hero.

Sailors of the Black Sea Fleet! He was a witness of your valour and heroism; he was capable of appreciating your remarkable selflessness at its true value; he never abandoned you in the face of difficulties; he always led you to victory and glory..."

With Nakhimov passed away, Sebastopol lost "the heart and soul of defence", the Russian Fleet lost one of the greatest and most talented fleet commanders while the people of Russia – one of the worthiest sons. Sebastopol saw especially hard times. By the beginning of August, the distance between the French forward-trenches and the Malakoff redoubt was not more than 110 metres. In August the allies began a new intensified bombardment; it lasted for twenty days and was exceptionally heavy.

On September 8, another assault was ordered, and, after fierce fighting, the Malakoff redoubt was taken. Of course, the allies did not even think that taking the Malakoff redoubt would lead to Russians' complete withdrawal from the territory. Yet Chief Commander Gorchakov, having estimated the current state of affairs on the site, ordered to cease all counterattacks on the Malakoff redoubt. He decided to surrender. As the Russians withdrew from the southern part of the town, the siege was at the end. The Russian heroic defence of Sebastopol lasted for 349 days. Vice-Admiral Vladimir Kornilov and Admiral Pavel Nakhimov became the main heroes of the defence.

The allies mustered a large joint army to break the heroic defence. The forces were uneven: in 1855 about 110,000 Russians stood up steadfast in Sebastopol against the 175,000-strong army

⁹⁶Florence Nightingale (1820-1910) was born in Italy, Florence, and got her name in honour of that city, but her childhood was spent in England, chiefly in Derbyshire. From her earliest years she had a great love of nature and animals. She had a great delight in nursing and bandaging her dolls. Her most ardent desire was to use her talents for the benefit of humanity. On the 24th of October 1854 Nightingale went to the Crimea with a staff of thirty-seven nurses, partly volunteers, partly professionals trained in hospitals. They reached the Crimea on the 4th of November, just in time to receive the Balaklava wounded. A day or two later these were joined by 600 from Inkerman. The story of Miss Nightingale's labours is one of the bright pages in English history. She gave herself, body and soul, to the work. She regularly took her place in the operation-room, to hearten the sufferers by her presence and sympathy, and at night she would make her solitary round of the sickrooms, lamp in hand, stopping here and there to speak a kindly word to some patient. Avowedly, the effects of her measures were seen in a lowered death-rate.

of Britain, France and Turkey. And it should be noted, that to the end the Russians had the staunchness and will to contest, while the allies had no wish to continue the war.

Having lost Sebastopol, the Russians achieved success in the Asian and Caucasian theatres of the war. During the Crimean War, Britain and the Ottoman Empire paid a lot of attention to economic, ideological and military-political expansion in Central Asia. However, they failed to make the Central Asian khanates (except Kokand) take a stand against the Russian Empire or to create an anti-Russian bloc. Proposals for a rapprochement with Britain were met there with hostility in most cases. Among Kazakhs, preaching hostility to Russia was never a success. The largest of the Central Asian khanates - Bukhara - was interested in developing closer economic ties with the Russian Empire, which had long been established and brought benefits to both sides. Bukhara merchants marketed agricultural products on the Russian market with a large profit. The Khanate was in constant need of metal and textiles, which it received from Russia. In addition, the ruler of Bukhara was deeply concerned about the duplicitous policy of the British ruling circles, flirting with the Bukhara Khanate, and at the same time supporting the offensive of the Afghans in Southern Turkestan. The Khanate, located in the heart of Central, Asia was the most economically developed and played a leading role in the political sense. Its refusal to join the anti-Russian coalition cobbled together by the British and Turkish emissaries contributed to the failure of those plans. The position of the ruling circles of the Bukhara Khanate, who did not want a rapprochement with the British expansionists, played a decisive role [Khalfin 1960].

An important Russian victory was gained on 28 November 1855, when the Russian army under General Nikolay Nikolayevich Muravyov besieged and then took Kars. The commander of the Kars garrison, Mehmet Vasif Pasha, yielded the fortress keys; 12 Ottoman banners and 18,500 soldiers were taken captive. As a result of this operation, the Russian Army assumed control not only over the forts and the city of Kars, but also over the area including Ardahan, Kagyzman, Oltu and part of the Basen district. In 1856, the Russians had plans to advance on Erzurum, but the peace of Paris in March 1856 put an end to further operations.

In the Caucasus, the Ottomans were able to stand ground with the help of Chechen Muslims led by Imam Shamil. The latter was supported by the British, who frequently hovered behind European plots, wars and revolutions. However, with Shamil, the rebellion turned into union: in 1866 in the front hall of the Kaluga provincial Noble Assembly Shamil together with the sons Gazi-Magomed and Magomed-Shapi brought an oath of allegiance to Russia and ensured the present unity between the Russian State and the peoples of the Caucasus.

The victory in the Asian and Caucasian theatres of war enabled Russia to begin peace negotiations without too much prejudice to herself. The Treaty of Paris was signed in March 1856⁹⁷. It recognised the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire, neutralised the Black Sea, closed it and the Dardanelles to ships of war, and forbade either Russia or Turkey to maintain any arsenal on its coasts. Shortly after the Treaty of Paris, in 1858, Britain, France and Austria entered into supplementary arrangement, which forbade sailing under neutral flags. They agreed to maintain the integrity of the Turkish Empire. In effect, the 1856 Treaty of Paris banned the Russian Black Sea fleet. This clause was cancelled only in 1870, when Russia refused to maintain compliance with the Treaty.

That Russia was defeated in the Crimean War, despite the common belief, is not so obvious. Russia may be regarded as defeated in Sebastopol, which was surrendered after a long siege. Alexander Gorchakov chose to achieve his goals by diplomatic ways, and he was soon able to return Russia's lands in the Crimean Peninsula, exchanging them for the captured Turkish lands. But it was the only evident success of the allies in their war against Russia. The offensives in Petropavlovsk Kamchatsky, in the Baltic Sea, in the White Sea, in the Caucasus were beaten

⁹⁷Later, Tsar Alexander II regretted his assent to the peace talks so early. He thought that if the war had lasted a year or a year and a half longer, the allies would have been obliged to evacuate.

back by the Russians. In the south-eastern front, the “force of the Russian arms”, of which glory Nicholas I was sure to his death, won outstanding victories.

However, Russia's weakening after the Crimean War resulted in a more complete occupation and colonial exploitation of Eastern countries by Britain. Besides, because of the great expenditures during the Crimean War, Russia had to massively borrow from the Western capital, particularly, with the house of Rothschilds, and, like today, loans to Russia were given at the highest interest rates in Europe.

On the example of the Crimean War we can again observe the dexterity of the British geopolitics and the losses of Russia as a result of her involvement with them. As the Russian geopolitician Alexey Edrikhin noted: "Only one thing can be worse than the antagonism with the Anglo-Saxons – and it is friendship with them." This statement may appear too strong, but it only emphatically stresses the necessity of independent policy and having the people's interests at heart. To be independent in geopolitical games, a government should stay out of world conflicts, keep more or less decent relationships with all global players, refrain from shedding blood for the third parties' interests. Our "allies" should be everyone at the same time. It will be the right decision, universal for all times and all rulers.

Comprehension questions

1. Causes of the Crimean War.
2. The position of France, other European powers and Turkey on the eve of the Crimean War.
3. The views of Tsar Nicholas I.
4. The beginning of the Crimean War (1853).
5. The goals of the warring parties.
6. The bombardments by the allies of the coastal Russian cities. The allies' invasion of the Crimea (1854).
7. The comparison of the armaments.
8. The siege and the heroic defence of Sebastopol.
9. The battle of Balaklava. The battle of Inkerman.
10. Heroes of the Crimean War.
11. The surrender of the southern side of Sebastopol (September 8, 1854).
12. The Russian success in the Asian and Caucasian theatres. The taking of Kars (1855).
13. The Treaty of Paris (March 1856).
14. Evaluation of the Crimean War.

Names and expressions

...unity seemed even farther than ever — объединение, казалось, еще более невозможно, чем всегда (букв. — еще дальше)

Sardinia [sa:'diniə] — о-в Сардиния

Lombardia [lom'ba: diə] или Lombardy [ˌlɒmbədi] — Ломбардия

Venetia [vi' ni:ʃ(ə)] — Венеция (провинция в Италии, не город!)

Hungarian [hʌŋ'ge(ə)riən] — венгры, венгерский

took the Home Office — занял пост министра внутренних дел

Palestine ['pælistain] — Палестина

in course of time — с течением времени

to drive their rivals away from their privilege — лишить своих соперников привилегий

put pressure — оказывал давление

turned to Russia — обратились к России

against what it regarded as Russian aggression — против того, что считалось русской агрессией

Moldavia [mol'deɪvlə] — Молдавия
Wallachia [wo'leɪkiə] — Валахия
Dardanelles [da:də'nelz] — Дарданеллы
Sinope ['sɪnə(u)] — Синоп
Danube ['dænjʊ:b] — р. Дунай
Baltic ['bɔ:ltɪk] — Балтийское (море)
the Crimea [kraɪ'mi:ə] — Крым
Sebastopol [sɪbæ'stəpɒl] — Севастополь
Alma ['ælmə] — Альма
the chief part of the fighting fell on the latter — основная часть сражения легла на последних (т. е. на англичан)
Balaklava [bə'læk'lævə] — Балаклава
main body — основное войско
the French siege corps lost heavily — французский осаждавший корпус понес тяжелые потери
by twos and threes — по двое и по трое
the War Office — военное ведомство
Nightingale ['naɪtɪŋgeɪl] — Найтингейл
Derbyshire ['dɑ:bi 'dʒaɪə] — Дербишир
sympathy — сочувствие
a lowered death-rate — понижение уровня смертности
Redan [ri' dæn]

35. THE SEPOY MUTINY (1857–58), OR THE FIRST WAR OF INDIAN INDEPENDENCE

The Crimean War was hardly over when Britain became engaged in a struggle to maintain her empire in India. Since the end of the Sikh War in 1849 several events occurred in India. Lord Dalhousie, who was Governor General of the East India Company from 1848 to 1856, continued with more energy the policy of annexation, which had led to the conquest of Sindh and the Punjab. Such states as Satara, Jhansi, Nagpur, Oudh were annexed in this period. The British imposed "the doctrine of lapse", according to which any princely state or territory under the direct influence (paramountcy) of the British East India Company, as a vassal state under the British subsidiary system, would automatically be annexed if the ruler was either "manifestly incompetent or died without a male heir". So, whenever the ruling native family was extinct, the territory was annexed to the dominion of the East India Company. In this way, the Maratha territories were annexed; and on the death of the Rajah of Jhansi, his widow was not allowed to succeed to his dominions. When the Peishwa — the titular head of the old Maratha confederacy — died, Dalhousie refused to recognize as his heir his adopted son, Nana Sahib, who was thus turned into a bitter foe of the British rule. Still more important was the annexation of Oudh, the great native state which since the days of Clive had been nominally independent (1856).

The British frequently bribed native princes and landowners giving them all sorts of privileges to betray their people and submit to the British crown.

There were other reasons for the rebellion. Dalhousie never consulted with Indian leaders. He proceeded on the assumption that Western civilization far surpassed that of India. He replaced justice by village elders with a British court system, introduced the British method of schooling and made English the official language of the government. Indian religion and culture were suppressed in every way.

Loss of British prestige in the Afghan and Crimean wars, indiscreet attempts to force

Christianity upon Brahmins and Mohammedans, a violation of native religious matters – all of these were also conducive to the native rebellion.

But critical for the First War of Indian Independence were the problems arising from the British colonialist policies. Britain had capitalized on the highly-skilled Indian textiles by selling them in Europe and then, having acquired their know-how and turning to machine mass production, prohibited the importation of cotton prints from India in Europe and their sale on the local market. Using the policy of protectionism of the British producers, Britain flooded India with its own cotton manufacturers' textiles and ruined the local artisans. The protectionist policy of Britain, domestic mass production and importation of goods in India had led to the economic decline of the regions in which the weaving and dyeing had developed for thousands of years. The same happened to other old industries: shipbuilding, metalworking, glass-blowing, paper industry, and many crafts. The outcome of the policy of the colonialists was the mass impoverishment of the local population, unemployment of an incredible size, famines, diseases and very high mortality.

Land taxes had become prohibitive for most Indians. For centuries, landowners had owned India's villages and the lands were tilled by tenant farmers. The British broke up those large estates and distributed the land to the tenant farmers, requiring them to pay land taxes. With their estates gone, the large landowners were ruined. The peasants who were unable to pay very high taxes imposed on them, were made dependent on usurers and merchants protected by British authorities. The majority of them were ruined and ousted from their lands. On their lands large-scale farming with technical crops British industry needed as the central interest were organized. The peasants, reduced to veritable slavery on those fields which used to feed them, died of hunger and epidemics.

The discontent with the British policies in the large native armies was also brewing. The East India Company used three large private armies to protect its property and to expand its control over Indian territory. All in all, in India there were 311,000 native troops in three armies, 40,160 European troops, 5,362 officers.

Most native soldiers were infantrymen called *sepoys*, they were mainly high- and middle-caste Indian mercenaries, armed with the latest technology arms (although their training did not reach the standards of the British), and regularly paid a respectable salary by the British government. Not surprisingly, for the local poor to get on the service of the British was an accomplishment. Three-fourths of the sepoys were Hindus, and the rest were Muslims. The sepoys had a reputation as fierce fighters. In general, they were taller, stronger, and healthier than the British, who tended to wilt in the Indian heat. The Hindu sepoys carefully observed their duty to their caste and religion, which forbade them to eat beef. The Muslims equally followed their faith, which prohibited them from eating pork.

By the beginning of the Sepoy Mutiny a dangerous spirit of disaffection was spreading in the native army. Dalhousie's reforms and annexations, together with increasing rumours of rebellion, unsettled the sepoys of the 105,000 Bengal Army stationed throughout northern India.

It had already been almost 20 years that Britain waged incessant wars in Southeast Asia, and, as it was not profitable to lose British soldiers far from their homeland, the main striking force on battlefields were the sepoys. Actually, from the "privileged class" they had turned into mere cannon fodder. However, the sepoys were refused promotion. The company hired British officers and soldiers to command the sepoy regiments. The British conquests had been mainly won by native troops under the command of British officers. For the most part, the British militarymen had as little contact with their sepoy troops as possible. Most of the British considered them racially inferior. This conflicted with the self-esteem of the sepoys, who thought themselves invincible warriors. In addition, religious and caste remonstrances were aroused. The tendencies of the British government seemed to degrade the high-caste man, and to place him on a level with men of a lower caste, whom he despised.

From Mutiny to Uprising

The immediate pretext for the overbreak was the introduction of the English rifle, which involved the use of cartridges. To use them the soldier had to open the cartridge with his teeth. The cartridges were greased, and it was believed that the grease was made from the fat of pigs, which are forbidden for the Mohammedan, or of cows, an animal sacred to the Hindus. So, the use of cartridges was regarded by both as a forbidden thing, and the order to use them was regarded as a plot to destroy the native religions.

On 29 March 1857 a 29-year-old soldier of the regiment, Mangal Pandey, declared his disagreement with the actions of the British. When the regimental adjutant, Lieutenant Blau arrived to investigate the incident, the soldier shot at him and hit his horse. Gen. John Hersey ordered the jemadar (lieutenant) Ishwari Prasad to arrest Pandey, but the latter refused. The whole regiment, with the exception of one soldier, Shaikh Paltu, refused to arrest the mutineer. However, Pandey's attempt to rouse the people to mutiny failed. Pandey tried to shoot himself, but only injured himself. He was sentenced to death and hanged on April 8. Then Jemadar Prasad was sentenced to death and hanged on 22 April, whereupon the regiment was disbanded. Shaikh Paltu was promoted to jemadar's rank.

The severe punishment made a strong impression on the other regiments of sepoy. In April, the introduction of new cartridges led to excesses at Agra, Allahabad and Amballe. On April 24, in Meerut 90 soldiers were ordered to carry out firing practice with new cartridges. 85 soldiers refused and were sentenced to death, commuted to 10 years of hard labour. 11 relatively young soldiers got 5 years of labours. As chevrons were torn off the convicts in full view of the garrison, and they were conveyed to jail, they publicly cursed at their colleagues for their refusal to support them.

The next day, on Sunday, riots broke out in Meerut. After violent protests in the local market a few houses in the town were set on fire, and the Indian units led by the 3rd Cavalry mutinied. The Meerut garrison consisted of 2,357 sepoy and 2,038 British. On that day, many of the British soldiers were resting and were not in garrison. The mutineers attacked the present Europeans - military and civilian - and killed four men, eight women and eight children. In the local bazaar a crowd attacked British soldiers on leave. Some British junior officers who tried to stop the mutiny were killed. 85 sepoy freed their comrades and together with them 800 other prisoners (debtors and criminals). During those events 50 Indians were also killed. Some sepoy (especially the 11th Bengal Infantry Regiment) accompanied British officers, women and children, protecting them from the rebels. The British escaped to Rampur, where they received shelter at the local Nawab.

On May 11 the rebels went to Delhi and came to the palace of the Great Mogul, asking Bahadur Shah to head them. Bahadur Shah did not answer the request, but many courtiers expressed support. During the day, the uprising spread in the city; the sepoy and local people attacked European officials, shopkeepers, Indian Christians. At that time there were three battalions of Bengal native infantry in the city; some units joined the revolt, some did not, but they refused to use force against the rebels.

The sepoy attacked a local armoury. Nine British officers opened fire at them, but seeing that resistance was futile, blew up the arsenal. Six of nine officers survived, but the explosion killed many people in the streets and damaged neighbouring houses. The news of this led to an open rebellion of all sepoy units around Delhi. They still managed to capture some of the weapons from the arsenal. In addition, the rebels captured a warehouse less than two miles away from Delhi with three thousand barrels of gunpowder, which surrendered without resistance.

Surviving European officers and civilians took refuge in the Tower of Flagstaff, and, realizing that no help was within reach, tried to escape in Karnal.

On May 12 Bahadur Shah convened the first court for many years. He expressed concern over the events but accepted the sepoy's service and expressed support for the uprising.

Thanks to the telegraph, news of the fall of Delhi quickly spread throughout India. Many of the civil servants fled with their families to safer places. In Agra 160 miles from Delhi six thousand Europeans took refuge in a local fort. This flight gave courage to the rebels.

Civilian rebels soon outnumbered the sepoys. The mutiny grew into an uprising against the colonialists which spread across northern (Doab) and central India. However, the British managed to check its further escalation.

The revolt was immediately joined the peasantry in Oudh and Bundelkhand: they drove away the new landlords, smashed government offices, and suspended the payment of the rent, even to their old zamindars and Talukdar. Having expelled the representatives of the colonial authorities, community members created self-defence units and with arms defended their communal lands. Citizens of Doab took an active part in the uprising, taking a number of major cities such as Ali Garh (May 21), Bareilly and Lucknow (31 May), Cawnpore (June 4), Allahabad (6 June), and others.

In 54 of 75 regular infantry regiments of the native Bengal army riots began. Each of the 10 regiments of the Bengal Light Cavalry rioted. 29 cavalry and 12 infantry irregular troops of natives of the Bengal Army also supported the rebels. Governor General Canning, mobilizing all the Europeans that were there, including British civilians, managed to prevent the mutiny of sepoys, disarmed them and quelled the riots in some parts where they occurred. Almost all the rest of the sepoys were disarmed.

The 29 troops of the Bombay army had three mutinous excesses. In 52 troops of the Madras army there were no mutinies, although one of the regiments refused to go to the service in Bengal. In many cases the military tried to disarm the sepoys to prevent mutinies. In Benares and Allahabad attempts of disarmament caused riots.

Most of southern India remained passive. Many local principalities were ruled by the Nizam dynasty of Mysore and were not directly subordinate to Britain. As for the Muslims, some of their leaders called for jihad, but soon the differences between the Sunnis and the Shiites became apparent. Many Sunnis refused to join the uprising where Shiites took part. Some Muslims, for example, the Ismaili leader Aga Khan I, supported the British.

Three centres of the concentration of rebel armies emerged during the uprising: Delhi, Cawnpore and the capital of Oudh - Lucknow. In those towns independent governments were created. In Delhi, along with the Government of Bahadur Shah, the Jalsa - the high administrative board consisting of sepoys and townsmen - was set up. The command of the Delhi troops was assumed by its member Bakht Khan, an energetic leader of the detachment from Bareilly, one of the most capable leaders of the sepoys. However, in Delhi and Lucknow the governments, made up by former courtiers, could not organize the governance properly, and dissension among the rebels began. In Delhi, the Jalsa and Bakht Khan were unable to impose order, in spite of drastic measures taken. Things were somewhat better in Cawnpore. There the governance was better and food supplies for the population and troops was provided.

With the spread of the uprising in India the split between the rebels began to grow. In Delhi. Bahadur Shah declared the restoration of the power of the Mughals and himself the sole legitimate ruler of all of India (corresponding to the territory of modern India, Pakistan and Bangladesh). He began minting coins with his picture and asked the public oath of allegiance. The Marathas who wanted their own state were displeased, as well as the Awadhi, who insisted on the governance of their own Nawab. These steps also antagonized the few Sikhs and Punjabis among the rebels who did not want the restoration of Muslim rule of the Mughals.⁹⁸

⁹⁸Many Sikhs and Pathans of the Punjab and North West Frontier supported the British and helped in suppressing the uprising in Delhi.



Vasily Vereshchagin (1842–1904), "The suppression of the Indian uprising by the British". The painter immortalized the particular method of execution used by the British for captured sepoys sentenced by courts-martial. The original painting was stolen.

The sepoys were able to push off the East India Company forces and to capture a number of strategically important points, but then the absence of centralized command began to tell. There were a number of natural leaders among the rebels such as Bakht Khan (who was later appointed Commander by the Great Mogul Bahadur Shah, instead of his own son), but most were forced to act with regard to their Rajas. Some of the latter were good leaders, but many of them were not.

The sepoys, accustomed to discipline, but not knowing military science, who had not commanded a military division larger than a squad, were able to solve only tactical, but not strategic problems. Having captured a strong fortress that was the Red Fort in Delhi, they

began to prepare for the defence, rather than extend the rebellion to areas not yet covered by it. This gave the British a chance to recover, pull loyal troops and besiege Delhi.

Karl Marx wrote about those events: "a motley crew of mutineering soldiers who have murdered their own officers, torn asunder the ties of discipline, and not succeeded in discovering a man upon whom to bestow the supreme command, are certainly the body least likely to organize a serious and protracted resistance."

Rao Tula Ram, Haryana governor, tried to obtain weapons from Russia, but died on his way. Later, when the tribal chief of Peshawar offered help, the Great Mogul said in Delhi that it was better not to come, because the treasury was empty, and the army was becoming uncontrollable.

The Siege and Defence of Delhi

The British took time to gather strength. Some troops had been redeployed from the metropolis and Singapore by sea, a part, after the end of the Crimean War - overland through Persia, some - from China. Two groups of European troops slowly moved towards Delhi.

On their way to recapture Delhi, British soldiers tortured, shot, and hanged lots of Hindus. The British forces (with two Gurkha units) met at Karnal, and in a battle with the main rebel forces at Budleigh-ke-Serai, drove them to Delhi.

The siege of the city lasted from 1 July to 21 September 1857. At first the rebels outnumbered the troops of the Company and their encirclement had not quite been completed, so that it seemed that it was the British who were under siege, and not Hindus. But on August 14 the British reinforcement arrived, together with Sikhs and Pathans. On September 7 the British received siege weapons and made breaches in the walls. On September 14 the British tried to storm the Kashmiri Gate through the breaches but suffered heavy losses. The British commander tried to retreat but was withheld by his officers. After a week of street fighting the Company captured the city.

The uprising was crushed quite ruthlessly. When the city was captured, the British army was given freedom to loot it for three days. Many Indians were killed in retaliation for the violence of the rebels against the Europeans. Lord Elphinstone wrote to John Lawrence: "The revenge was taken without differentiating between friend and foe..." Montgomery Martin wrote, "When our troops entered Delhi, wherever the inhabitants were found, they were killed on the spot..."

The British fired artillery at the main mosque with the surrounding buildings, where the Muslim elite from all over India lived. The Great Mogul Bahadur Shah was arrested, and his two sons and grandson slaughtered. The British executed many sepoy mutineers they captured by lashing the victim to the muzzle of a cannon and blasting him to pieces.

The Defence of Cawnpore, Lucknow, Jhansi



Lakshmibai, The Rani of Maratha-ruled Jhansi, one of the principal leaders of the rebellion who earlier had lost her kingdom as a result of the Doctrine of Lapse. Probably the portrait was done after her death (June 1858). She wears a valuable pearl necklace and a cavalrywoman's uniform

General Neil, who had marched with the troops from Calcutta to help the British at Delhi, on his way brutally cracked down on the rebel sepoys and the townspeople in the towns of Benares and Allahabad. His cruelty caused displeasure even of Governor General Canning, who dismissed him and handed over command of those parts to General Havelock. However, the latter made a real hunt for the Indians, burning villages and leaving behind hundreds hanged. Havelock's way lay through Cawnpore, one of the three centres of the uprising (Delhi, Cawnpore, Lucknow). Here Nana Sahib, his bodyguard and secretary Tatya Topi and Azimulla Khan, a well-educated man, who had twice visited Europe, were at the head of the rebels. Several months before, the English garrison of Cawnpore and their families had taken refuge in their military camp, and, having artillery, for three weeks repelled the besieging sepoys. Finally, they were forced to surrender on terms proposed by Nana Sahib, who promised to send them down the Ganges in boats. When a large group of the British were put in boats, the crowd maddened by hatred assaulted them and killed all men but two — it happened on the 27th of June 1857. Then, on the orders of Nana Sahib women and children were locked in jail. The wanton murder of the unarmed infuriated the British troops moving to Cawnpore. Meanwhile, in the city with about 10 thousand rebellious sepoys and peasants, lacking food, the same difficulties as in Delhi repeated. The Sinai troops twice fought against the approaching army of Havelock, but both

times, despite the courage of warriors, were defeated. Then Nana Sahib ordered the killing of captured British women and children, and on the 12th of July, with the British force approaching Cawnpore, they were all murdered. In retaliation, when the British army troops under Havelock on July 16th fought their way into Cawnpore, they looted the town, raped and murdered a lot of townspeople and hanged any sepoys they found.

In Lucknow events developed as follows. After the uprising the power of the former dynasty (Oudh Nawabs) and old courtiers was restored. Oudh nobles took over the government of the town. The real leader of the rebels was Ahmadullah Shah from a noble family of Madras. At one time he had travelled to England, but on his return he joined the Wahhabis and became an itinerant Wahhabi preacher. The English garrison and their families hid behind the walls of the Residence (the palace of the political agents of the Company at the court of Oudh). The sepoys besieged and bombarded the Residence, but, as the sepoys did not possess the art of marksmanship, the British did not suffer serious damage. Then the rebels began to dig a tunnel. Only on September 21 Havelock's squad broke in Lucknow. However, surrounded by sepoys, the squad itself came under siege.

Meanwhile Lucknow gathered not only sepoys and rebel peasants from the suburbs of Doab, but also the people from all over the region who fled the British armies looting and burning all around them – all in all over 50 thousand. On 17 November 1857, the British Commander-in-Chief Colin Campbell with 4.5 thousand men came from Cawnpore to Lucknow. He was unable to take Lucknow, but on his leave he managed to draw out with him the British garrison locked in the Residence. Meanwhile Tatya Topi with a group consisting of Gwalior citizens (who had rebelled despite their prince's loyalty to the British) made a sudden advance at Cawnpore and defeated a British detachment under General Windham left there. In subsequent battles Campbell managed to defeat Tatya Topi and recapture Cawnpore. And it was only three months later, after

collecting a 45 thousand strong army, that Campbell finally decided to storm Lucknow. The city was defended by all the about 200 thousand population assembled there. They fought bravely but were poorly armed and had no real military leaders. Fighting for Lucknow lasted for months. On March 19, 1858 the city fell. About two weeks the British army indulged in Lucknow looting and murder. The plunder of Lucknow was great. After the fall of Lucknow, the sepoys broke into small groups and began to conduct guerrilla warfare, engaged in small skirmishes with the British troops. In March 1858, Governor General Canning announced the confiscation of estates in Oudh Talukdar (feudal lords). Talukdar rose in defence of their possessions and joined Khan Bahadur Khan in Bareilly. Only in May 1858 did Campbell manage to take stubbornly resisting Bareilly. After this, a part of the sepoys went to the border of Nepal with Nana Sahib and Oudh nobles, a part of them followed Ahmadullah and some other leaders to Oud. There Ahmadullah was assassinated by a feudal lord.

The vassal principality of Jhansi at the time was ruled by the widow Lakshmi Bai, the Rani of Jhansi. Hugh Rose, commanding the British forces, demanded the surrender of the city; if this was refused it would be destroyed. After due deliberation the Rani issued a proclamation:



"New crowns for old ones!" An 1876 Punch cartoon of Benjamin Disraeli offering Victoria the Crown of India in exchange for her old one.

We fight for independence. In the words of Lord Krishna, we will if we are victorious, enjoy the fruits of victory, if defeated and killed on the field of battle, we shall surely earn eternal glory and salvation." She defended Jhansi against British troops when Hugh Rose besieged Jhansi on 23 March 1858. Determined resistance was encountered in every street and in every room of the palace. Street fighting continued into the following day and no quarter was given, even to women and children. "No maudlin clemency was to mark the fall of the city" wrote Thomas Lowe. The Rani of Jhansi herself fell in a battle.

The main reasons for the defeat of the First War of Indian Independence was the military superiority of the British over the insurgents; differences in the goals of the rebels, especially between peasants and feudal lords; the existing disunity of the peoples of India which helped the colonialists to isolate the main centre of the uprising and mobilize for the suppression of the rebels all the resources of the Deccan, Bengal and Punjab.

Despite the defeat of the uprising, it had great effect. The British colonialists were forced to change their policies in India. Already on August 2, 1858 Parliament passed a law on the elimination of the East India Company and the transition of the government of India to England, and so all the Indians became subjects of the Queen of England as the Empress of India, and India itself was called the British Raj of India. Through a series of laws that reinforced the rights of feudal land ownership, the colonialists tried to make Indian princes and landowners their allies. At the same time the colonial authorities had to take into account the huge discontent of the peasants, and to limit the land rent. Frightened by the Indian Uprising, they began to pay slightly more respect to Indian religions, lifestyles and traditions.

Comprehension questions

1. Reasons of discontent with the British rule in India.
2. Who were the Sepoys?
3. Why did the spirit of disaffection begin to spread in the native army?
4. From mutiny to uprising. The Great Mogul, Bahadur Shah heads the uprising.
5. Three centres of the concentration of rebel armies.

6. The siege and defence of Delhi.
7. The Defence of Cawnpore, Lucknow, Jhansi (speak about one place at option).
8. The effect of the Indian Uprising.

Names and expressions

the Crimea [krai' mi:ə] — Крым

Dalhousie [ˌdæl hau'zi]

Rajah of Jhansi [dʒæn'si] — Джанси, провинция в Индии

Oudh [u:d] — город

the high-caste man — человек, принадлежащий к высшей касте

Nana Sahib [sa:b, 'sa:(h)ib]

Meerat ['mi'ræt]

Delhi ['deli] — Дели

Bengal [beŋ'go:l] — Бенгалия

Persia ['pɜ:ʃə]

the Ganges ['gændʒi:z] — р. Ганг

the Jumna [dʒʌmnə] — р. Джамна

Mogul ['məʊg(ə)l] — могол, верховный правитель

Bombay [bɒm'bei] — Бомбей

Madras [mæ'dræs] — Мадрас

Cawnpore [ko:n'po:] — Канпор (Канпур)

all men but two — всех, кроме двоих

Lucknow [lʌknau] — город

it was to be taken — его (место) необходимо было взять

or little advance could be made elsewhere — иначе никакое продвижение было бы невозможно

Lawrence ['lɔ:(ə)ns]

Havelock ['hævlɒk]

Hugh Rose [hju: rəʊz]

to that of a nation = to the control of a nation

36. AMERICAN CIVIL WAR (1861–1865). ABRAHAM LINCOLN. RUSSIA'S ROLE IN AMERICAN CIVIL WAR

General outlay

The American Civil War (1861-1865), widely known in the United States as simply the Civil War, was a civil war fought from 1861 to 1865 between the union of 20 non-slave states and four slave states of the North and eleven slave states of the South. In January 1861, Southern slave states individually declared their secession from the United States and formed the Confederate States of America. The Confederacy, often simply called the South, included eleven states. They were confronted by the states that formed the Union or the North. After four years of combat, which left over 700,000 Union and Confederate soldiers dead and destroyed much of the South's infrastructure, the Confederacy collapsed, and slavery was abolished. Then began the Reconstruction and the processes of restoring national unity.

In the 1860 presidential election, Republicans, led by Abraham Lincoln (1809–1865), opposed the expansion of slavery into U.S. territories. The Republican Party, dominant in the North, secured a majority of the electoral votes, and Lincoln was elected the first Republican president, but before his inauguration on March 4, 1861, seven slave states with cotton-based

economies formed the Confederacy. The first six to secede had the highest proportions of slaves in their populations, a total of 48.8% for the six. Outgoing Democratic President James Buchanan and the incoming Republicans rejected secession as illegal. Lincoln's inaugural address declared his administration would not initiate civil war. Confederate forces seized numerous federal forts within territory claimed by the Confederacy. A peace conference failed to find a compromise, and both sides prepared for war.

Hostilities began on April 12, 1861, when Confederate forces fired upon Fort Sumter, a key fort held by Union troops in South Carolina. Lincoln called for every state to provide troops to retake the fort; consequently, four more slave states joined the Confederacy, bringing their total to eleven. The first bloodshed of the Civil War occurred in Maryland during the Baltimore riot of 1861 on April 19. Lincoln soon controlled the border states, after arresting state legislators and suspending habeas corpus, ignoring the ruling of the Supreme Court's Chief Justice that such suspension was unconstitutional, and established a naval blockade that crippled the southern economy. The Eastern Theatre was inconclusive in 1861–62. The autumn 1862 Confederate campaign into Maryland (a Union state) ended with Confederate retreat at the Battle of Antietam, dissuading British intervention. Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, which made ending slavery a war goal. To the west, by summer 1862 the Union destroyed the Confederate river navy, then much of their western armies, and the 1863 Union siege of Vicksburg split the Confederacy in two at the Mississippi River.

In 1863, Robert E. Lee's Confederate incursion north ended at the Battle of Gettysburg. Western successes led to Ulysses S. Grant's command of all Union armies in 1864. In the Western Theatre, William T. Sherman drove east to capture Atlanta and marched to the sea, destroying Confederate infrastructure along the way.

The Union marshalled the resources and manpower to attack the Confederacy from all directions, leading to the protracted Siege of Petersburg. The besieged Confederate army eventually abandoned Richmond, seeking to regroup at Appomattox Court House, though there they found themselves surrounded by union forces. This led to Lee's surrender to Grant on April 9, 1865. All Confederate generals surrendered by that summer. While the military war had ended, and there was no insurgency, the political reintegration of the nation took another 12 years, known as the Reconstruction Era.

The American Civil War was one of the earliest true industrial wars. Railroads, the telegraph, steamships, and mass-produced weapons were employed extensively. The mobilization of civilian factories, mines, shipyards, banks, transportation and food supplies all foreshadowed the impact of industrialization in World War I. It remains the deadliest war in American history, resulting in the deaths of an estimated 750,000 soldiers and an undetermined number of civilian casualties. One estimate of the death toll is that ten percent of all Northern males 20–45 years old, and 30 percent of all Southern white males aged 18–40 died. From 1861 to 1865 about 620,000 soldiers lost their lives.

Abraham Lincoln

Abraham Lincoln was the 16th President of the United States, serving from March 1861 until his assassination in April 1865. Lincoln led the United States through its Civil War — its bloodiest war and its greatest moral, constitutional, and political crisis. In doing so, he preserved the Union, abolished slavery, strengthened the federal government, and modernized the economy.

Born in Hodgenville, Kentucky, Lincoln grew up on the western frontier in Kentucky and Indiana. Largely self-educated, he became a lawyer in Illinois, a Whig Party leader, and a member of the Illinois House of Representatives, where he served from 1834 to 1846. Elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1846, Lincoln promoted rapid modernization of the economy through banks, tariffs, and railroads. Because he had originally agreed not to run

for a second term in Congress, and because his opposition to the Mexican–American War was unpopular among Illinois voters, Lincoln returned to Springfield and resumed his successful law practice. Re-entering politics in 1854, he became a leader in building the new Republican Party, which had a statewide majority in Illinois. In 1858, while taking part in a series of highly publicized debates with his opponent and rival, Democrat Stephen A. Douglas, Lincoln spoke out against the expansion of slavery, but lost the U.S. Senate race to Douglas.

In 1860, Lincoln secured the Republican Party presidential nomination as a moderate from a swing state. With very little support in the slaveholding states of the South, he swept the North and was elected president in 1860. His victory prompted seven southern slave states to form the Confederate States of America before he moved into the White House - no compromise or reconciliation was found regarding slavery and secession. Subsequently, on April 12, 1861, a Confederate attack on Fort Sumter inspired the North to enthusiastically rally behind the Union in a declaration of war. As the leader of the moderate faction of the Republican Party, Lincoln confronted Radical Republicans, who demanded harsher treatment of the South, War Democrats, who called for more compromise, anti-war Democrats (called Copperheads), who despised him, and irreconcilable secessionists, who plotted his assassination. Politically, Lincoln fought back by pitting his opponents against each other, by carefully planned political patronage, and by appealing to the American people with his powers of oratory.

His Gettysburg Address became an iconic endorsement of the principles of nationalism, republicanism, equal rights, liberty, and democracy. Lincoln initially concentrated on the military and political dimensions of the war. His primary goal was to reunite the nation. He suspended Habeas Corpus, leading to the controversial *ex parte Merryman* decision, and he averted potential British intervention in the war by defusing the Trent Affair in late 1861. Lincoln closely supervised the war effort, especially the selection of top generals, including his most successful general, Ulysses S. Grant. He also made major decisions on Union war strategy, including a naval blockade that shut down the South's normal trade, moves to take control of Kentucky and Tennessee, and using gunboats to gain control of the southern river system. Lincoln tried repeatedly to capture the Confederate capital at Richmond; each time a general failed, Lincoln substituted another, until finally Grant succeeded. As the war progressed, his complex moves toward ending slavery began with the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863; subsequently, Lincoln used the U.S. Army to protect escaped slaves, encouraged the border states to outlaw slavery, and pushed through Congress the Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, which permanently outlawed slavery.

An astute politician, deeply involved with power issues in each state, Lincoln reached out to the War Democrats and managed his own re-election campaign in the 1864 presidential election. Anticipating the war's conclusion, Lincoln pushed a moderate view of Reconstruction, seeking to reunite the nation speedily through a policy of generous reconciliation in the face of lingering and bitter divisiveness. On April 15, 1865, six days after the surrender of Confederate commanding general Robert E. Lee, Lincoln was assassinated by John Wilkes Booth, a Confederate sympathizer.

Lincoln has been consistently ranked both by scholars and the public as one of the three greatest U.S. Presidents.

Attitude to American Civil War in various strata of the British society

The British society in general supported the South in the American Civil War. The Tories were with the Confederacy, so too were the Whigs, but among Liberals there were deep divisions, enough to undermine the unity and strength of the party. After some initial hesitation, Cobden and Bright took up the cudgels for the Union. Free traders were alienated by the Morrill tariff, while abolitionists were unhappy with Lincoln, especially until the end of 1862. British Garrisonians split over whether the Union was worth saving. There was a crisis in the British

anti-slavery movement over whether they had lost their old vim of the West Indies abolition era. Literary men like Trollope endorsed the government in Richmond, and Thomas Carlyle's racism made him a CSA sympathizer; some others backed the Union. Chartists split, with Ernest Jones supporting the Union, while most Chartist leaders favoured the South. The Church of England went with the South, while some dissenting ministers favoured the North. Quakers divided over whether slavery could be extirpated by violence. In general, the American war stimulated an active politicization which the privileged orders could hardly have welcomed.

British and Russian policies in American Civil War

The Russian-British rivalry was of course the central antagonism of European history after the Napoleonic era, and the Russian attitude towards London coincided with the traditional American resentment against the former colonial power.⁹⁹ Benjamin Platt Thomas's study shows that the US-Russian convergence became decisive during the Crimean War; while Britain, France and the Ottoman Empire attacked Russia, the United States was ostentatiously friendly to the court of St. Petersburg. There was even a perceptible chance that the United States might enter the Crimean War on the Russian side. The US press and public were all on the side of Russia, and hostile to the Anglo-French, to the chagrin of the erratic US President Pierce (who had been close to Admiralty agent Giuseppe Mazzini's pro-British Young America organization) and the doughface politician James Buchanan. The latter, at that time US envoy to London, embraced the British view of the Russian Tsar as "the Despot." The American historian and biographer Benjamin Platt Thomas finds that "the Crimean War undoubtedly proved the wisdom of Russia's policy of cultivating American friendship, and in fact, drew the two nations closer together." But Thomas glosses over some of the more important US-UK frictions during this phase, which included British army recruiting in the US, and the ejection of the British ambassador as *persona non grata*.

Turning to the conflict of 1861-65, Thomas points out that "in the first two years of the war, when its outcome was still highly uncertain, the attitude of Russia was a potent factor in preventing Great Britain and France from adopting a policy of aggressive intervention." He shows that the proposed British-French interference in the American Civil War on the side of the North promoted by Lord Russell, the Foreign Secretary, in October 1862 was "deterred at this time mainly" by the Russian attitude, and cites Russell's note to Palmerston concluding that Britain "ought not to move at present without Russia."

The critical importance of Russian help in deterring the British and Napoleon III as well is borne out by a closer analysis. As early as 1861, Russia alerted the Lincoln government to the machinations of Napoleon III, who was already scheming to promote a joint UK-France-Russia intervention in favour of the Confederacy. As Henry Adams, the son and private secretary of US Ambassador to London Charles Francis Adams, sums up the strategic situation during Lee's first invasion of Maryland, on the eve of the Battle of Antietam: Palmerston, on September 14, under the impression that the President was about to be driven from Washington and the Army of the Potomac dispersed, suggested to Russell that in such a case, intervention might be feasible. Russell instantly answered that, in any case, he wanted to intervene and should call a Cabinet for the purpose. Palmerston hesitated; Russell insisted...."

On March 3 (Feb. 19), 1861, Alexander II signed the manifesto on the granting to serf people the rights of free rural inhabitants and the Regulations on the peasants emerging from serfdom, consisting of 17 pieces of legislation. Based on these documents the 23 million Russian peasants received personal freedom and the right to dispose of their property. On September 22, 1862, Lincoln used the Confederate repulse at Antietam to issue a warning that slavery would be

⁹⁹From "U.S. Civil War: The US-Russian Alliance that Saved the Union" by Webster G. Tarpley.

abolished in areas still engaged in rebellion against the United States on January 1, 1863. The Emancipation Proclamation was also an important political factor in slowing Anglo-French meddling, but it would not have been decisive by itself. The British cabinet, as Seward had predicted, regarded emancipation as an act of desperation. The London Times accused Lincoln in lurid terms of wanting to provoke a slave rebellion and a race war.

On October 7, 1862, despite the news that the Confederates had been repulsed at Antietam, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer William Gladstone, who spoke for Lord John Russell, pressed for British intervention against the Union and on the side of the Confederacy. It was the expression of open hostility to the United States and the Lincoln government. On October 13, 1862 Lord John Russell called a meeting of the British cabinet for October 23, with the top agenda item being a deliberation on the “duty of Europe to ask both parties, in the most friendly and conciliatory terms, to agree to a suspension of arms.” Russell wanted an ultimatum to Washington and Richmond for an armistice or cease-fire, followed by a lifting of the Union blockade of southern ports, followed then by negotiations leading to Washington’s recognition of the CSA as an independent state. If the Union refused, then Britain would recognize the CSA and in all probability begin military cooperation with the Confederates. Henry Adams believes



Russian Emperor Alexander II and U.S. President Abraham Lincoln

that “every act of Russell, from April 1861, to November 1862, showed the clearest determination to break up the Union.”

At this point, Napoleon III of France invited London to join him in a move against the Union. Napoleon III had conferred with the Confederate envoy Slidell and proposed that France, England, and Russia impose a six-month armistice on the US and CSA. Napoleon III believed that if Lincoln did not accept his intrusion, this would provide a pretext for Anglo-French

recognition of the CSA, followed by military intervention against the Union.

The clouds of world war gathered densely over the planet. Russell and Gladstone, now joined by Napoleon III, continued to demand aggressive meddling in US affairs. This outcome was avoided because of British and French fears of what Russia might do continued to launch bellicose gestures against the Union. On October 29, 1862 there occurred in St. Petersburg a cordial meeting of Russian Foreign Minister Gorchakov with US charge d’affaires Bayard Taylor, which was marked by a formal Russian pledge never to move against the US, and to oppose any attempt by other powers to do so. The Journal de St. Petersburg, the official gazette of the Tsarist government, denounced the Anglo-French intervention plan against the US, which had been inspired by Russell. This article helped prevent a wider war: the British cabinet, informed of the Russian attitude by telegraph, voted down Russell’s aggressive project. Russell made his last bid to swing the British cabinet in favour of a policy of interference together with Napoleon III against the Union on November 12, 1862, but he was unable to carry the day, and this turned out to be his last chance for the year.

In 1863 that US Ambassador Charles Francis Adams told Lord Russell that if the Laird rams – powerful ironclad warships capable of breaking the Union blockade which were then under construction in England — were allowed to leave port, “It would be superfluous in me to point out to your Lordship that this is war.” Lord Russell had to pause, and then backed off entirely. The Laird rams were put under surveillance by the British government on September 9, and

finally seized by the British government in mid-October 1863. They never fought for the Confederacy.

A revolt against the Russian domination of Poland, not without a British influence, started in 1863 and lasted into late 1864. Lord Russell said that the Polish issue had the potential to create a Russo-American common front and thus revolutionize world power relations, evidently to the detriment of London. Such a prophecy was coherent with the then-fashionable ideas of Alexis de Tocqueville about Russia and America as the two great powers of the future.

The most dramatic gestures of cooperation between the Russian Empire and the United States came in the autumn of 1863, as the Laird rams crisis hung in the balance. In September-October, the Russian Baltic and Far East fleets arrived in the US. The Russian admirals had been told that, if the US and Russia were to find themselves at war with Britain and France, the Russian ships should place themselves under Lincoln's command and operate in synergy with the US Navy against the common enemies. It was this moment that inspired the later verses of Oliver Wendell Holmes, one of the most popular writers in America, for the 1871 friendship visit of the Russian Grand Duke Alexis:

Bleak are our shores with the blasts of December,
Fettered and chill is the rivulet's flow;
Thrilling and warm are the hearts that remember
Who was our friend when the world was our foe.
Fires of the North in eternal communion,
Blend your broad flashes with evening's bright star;
God bless the Empire that loves the Great Union
Strength to her people! Long life to the Tsar!

The Russians were pleased in turn by the celebration of their fleets, which stayed in American waters for over six months. The Russian officers were lionized and feted, and had their pictures taken by the famous New York photographer Matthew Brady. Exactly during this time, the Polish revolt, largely instigated by the British, broke out and was quelled. And when an attack on San Francisco by the Confederate cruiser Shenandoah seemed to be imminent, the Russian admiral there gave orders to his ships to defend the city if necessary. As a result, the Confederate raider did not attack.

This exceedingly cordial Russo-American friendship set the tone of much nineteenth-century historiography; Thomas indicates that darker views began to be heard around 1915 with the work of Professor Frank A. Golder. During the American Civil War, the Russian attitude was the most powerful outside factor deterring Anglo-French interference.

Russian friendship provided an economic as well as a military brake on the Anglo-French. In 1861-64, the US and Russia together provided more than a half or more of all Britain's wheat imports (16.3 million cwt out of a total of 30.8 in 1863). Russian friendship also provided a brake on Confederate commerce raiders, which had destroyed 110,000 tons of U.S. merchant shipping.

Soon after the war, Russia sold Alaska to the United States, in part because they felt that an influx of Americans searching for gold was inevitable, and in part to keep the British from seizing control of this vast region.

If the British had attacked the United States during the Civil War, this move might well have ushered in a world war. As it was, however, Lincoln fell victim to an assassination plot in 1865 and Alexander II was assassinated in 1881.

Comprehension questions

1. Political and military outlay of the American Civil War.
2. Abraham Lincoln.

3. Attitude to American Civil War in various strata of the British society.
4. British and Russian policies in American Civil War.

Names and expressions

Outgoing Democratic President James Buchanan and the incoming Republicans rejected secession as illegal - уходящий демократический президент Джеймс Бьюкенен и пришедшие республиканцы отвергли это отделение как незаконное

Lincoln has been consistently ranked both by scholars and the public as one of the three greatest U.S. Presidents - ученые и общественность оценивают Линкольна как одного из трех крупнейших президентов США

Quakers divided over whether slavery could be extirpated by violence - квакеры разделились по поводу того, может ли рабство быть искоренено насилием

the United States was ostentatiously friendly to the court of St. Petersburg - Соединенные Штаты были демонстративно дружелюбны к императорскому двору Санкт-Петербурга

The critical importance of Russian help in deterring the British and Napoleon III as well is borne out by a closer analysis - критическая важность российской помощи в сдерживании англичан и Наполеона III также подтверждается более тщательным анализом

The Emancipation Proclamation was also an important political factor in slowing Anglo-French meddling - прокламация об освобождении рабов в США также была важным политическим фактором задержки англо-французской интервенции

The London Times accused Lincoln in lurid terms of wanting to provoke a slave rebellion and a race war - лондонская «Таймс» в ядовитых выражениях обвинила Линкольна в том, что он хотел спровоцировать восстание рабов и расовую войну.

Napoleon III had conferred with the Confederate envoy Slidell - Наполеон III совещался с посланником конфедерации Слиделлом

a Russo-American common front and thus revolutionize world power relations, evidently to the detriment of London - общий российско-американский фронт, таким образом, революционизировал отношения между мировыми державами, и очевидно, что это происходило в ущерб Лондону

lionized and feted – их хвалили и чествовали

This exceedingly cordial Russo-American friendship set the tone of much nineteenth-century historiography - эта сердечная русско-американская дружба задала тон многим историографическим исследованиям девятнадцатого века

an influx of Americans searching for gold was inevitable - приток американцев, ищущих золото, был неизбежен

fell victim to an assassination plot - стал жертвой заговора с целью убийства

37. FENIAN MOVEMENT, UPRISING OF 1867. HOME RULE (1869)

Beginning with the Cromwellian conquests of the 17th c. the lands in Ireland belonged to British landlords and the Irish peasants were turned into tenants. Those who could not afford to pay the rents had to leave. Rebellions were of no avail and all the blood shed by landless peasantry in the course of the unhappy country's ordeal made no more impression on the English industrialists than if it were so much water.

The trade policy of Britain dictated the fate of Ireland. The small peasant farming was destroyed. Industrial crops were introduced, and large territories were turned into pastures or vast farms producing food for big English cities. The peasants roamed along the roads, the way English peasants did as a result of 16th century enclosures. Since English industrial development dictated the transformation of Ireland into a large wheat-growing farm, a large farm it became. But it did not benefit the Irish working men. In 1835 figures published in the report of the Irish

Poor Law Commission revealed that the total value of Irish Agricultural produce was 36 million pounds. Of this 10 million went in rent, 20 million in taxes, tithes and the profits of middlemen and merchants, and less than 6 million to the actual producers, the small holders and labourers. The peasant grew wheat to pay the rent and potatoes to feed himself and his family. These are the facts, which provide the essential background to the Great Famine, which raged from 1845 to nearly 1850. Hundreds of thousands of Irish people died of starvation and hunger typhus. All this time food was exported to England, with English troops to keep off the desperate hungry crowds.

Class struggle in Ireland was assuming the character of national liberation struggle. There was an armed Rebellion of Young Ireland in 1848, which was suppressed by the police. Soon afterwards, in 1848, the government, in order to improve the condition of the land, passed the Encumbered Estates Act, by which bankrupt owners, whose debts led them to oppress their tenants, might be obliged to sell their lands. But it was little good, in that the new owners showed their tenants no more money than their predecessors. The Habeas Corpus Act was hastily suspended; many conspirators were seized, others fled abroad. But the movement was not crushed.

About 1859 the so-called "Fenian" movement began. Fenians, or Fenian Brotherhood, was the name of an Irish-American revolutionary secret society, founded in America by John O'Mahony (1816— 1877), who was a Celtic scholar and had translated Keating's "History of Ireland" in 1857. After the failing of William Smith O'Brien's attempt to have a rising in 1848, O'Mahony, who took part in it, escaped abroad, and since 1852 lived in New York. The name, which was given to the organization by O'Mahony, has its origin from an anglicized version of *fiann, feinne*, the legendary band of warriors in Ireland led by the hero Find Mac Cumail.

At first a club called the Phoenix National and Literary Society, with Jeremiah Donovan (afterwards known as O'Donovan Rossa) among its most prominent members, was formed, and in 1858, O'Mahony in the United States established the Fenian Brotherhood, whose members bound themselves by an oath of allegiance to the Irish Republic, and swore to take up arms when called upon, and to be obedient to their superior officers. The object of the leaders of the movement was to form a great league of Irishmen in all parts of the world against British rule in Ireland. The organization was modelled on that of the French Jacobins at the Revolution. The societies of Fenians were founded in Australia, South America, Canada and in the United States. The movement was denounced by the priests of the Catholic Church. The Fenians received their chief support from Irish emigrants of America. They aimed to make Ireland independent by revolutionary methods.

The Fenian Brotherhood included workers, artisans, petty bourgeoisie, even the middle class of the towns. It was the bourgeoisie that was in the lead, and that, together with the heterogeneous class-composition, accounted for their failure. They had no ties with the wide masses, the peasants were not involved as a mass, which was strange for it was agrarian discontent that gave strength to the movement, as peasants organized boycott of farms and of landowners who evicted tenants for failure to pay the rent.

In 1865, the information of a hatched conspiracy reached the British government, which led to the arrest of O'Donovan Rossa and several other leaders. Inquiry proved the existence of a dangerous conspiracy, with a secret organization extending all over Ireland. In 1867 the country was alarmed by the discovery of a plot to surprise Chester Castle. Some Fenian leaders were caught and held captive. Three Fenians, William Philip Allen, Michael O'Brian, and Michael Larkin, known as the Manchester Martyrs, were executed in Salford for their attack on a police van to release the captive Fenians.

These acts, reprehensible as they were in themselves, brought to light the desperate passions roused by generations of misery and neglect, and forced Parliament to pay attention, too long deferred, to the grievances of Ireland. The root of the trouble was the land question; but the Established Protestant Church in Ireland, which catered for the Protestants in Ireland, was a

grievance easier to remedy. It was therefore first attacked. In March 1869 the Whig leader Gladstone introduced a Bill to disestablish the Irish Church. It was vigorously opposed by the Tories, but passed by large majorities, and was accepted by the Lords (July). By this act the Protestant Church in Ireland was disconnected from the state and placed on a level with other religious communities; consequently, the Irish Protestant bishops lost their seats in the House of Lords.

The land question, a far most thorny subject, remained. The discontent of the Irish peasantry was chiefly due, it was believed, to the frequency of evictions without compensation for such improvements as the tenants might have made in their land, and to the obstacles which prevented their parting with their right as tenants at a fair price. The Land Act of 1870, which was supported by both parties, helped to remove these difficulties, and also encouraged Irish tenants to purchase their farms, even sanctioning lending them money for that purpose.

Meanwhile the leaders of the Fenians were arrested one after another. In November 1867 Richard Burke, who had been employed by the Fenians to buy arms in Birmingham, was arrested and placed in Clerkenwell prison in London. While he was waiting trial a wall of the prison was blown down by gunpowder, the explosion causing death to twelve persons, and about one hundred and twenty being wounded. In 1870 Michael Davitt was sentenced to fifteen years transportation. Many others were also arrested and put to prisons. (Davitt was released, along with other political prisoners, on 19 December 1877, when he had served seven and a half years, on a "ticket of leave". He and the other prisoners were given a hero's welcome on landing in Ireland.) But the Land Act of 1870 did not succeed in removing discontent in Ireland.

During the latter part of Disraeli's administration — he was made a peer as Beaconsfield in 1876 — public attention was chiefly occupied by two things — foreign affairs and the revival of the Irish Question in a new form. About the year 1869 the Fenians had given place to a new movement of a more constitutional kind, which was going to obtain "Home Rule" — self-government for Ireland — by Parliamentary means. It is worth reminding, that in 1801 the Kingdom of Ireland joined Britain, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland was created. The Home Rule provided for Ireland's own parliament and government bodies, while preserving British sovereignty over the island and giving it the same status as a dominion. Home Rule was launched by the Irish liberal Isaac Butt in 1869. In 1870 he also founded the Association of Self-Government of Ireland, converted in 1873 into the Home Rule League. In 1874, 60 Home Rulers became members of the British Parliament. Their leader was Charles Stewart Parnell (Irish: Cathal Stiúbhard Parnell), an Irish nationalist politician.

Gladstone entered into an alliance with the Home Rulers and put forward Home Rule in Parliament. But Parliament was at this time unanimous against Home Rule. In 1877 a motion in its favour was rejected by 417 to 67, and the more ardent Home Rulers, under the leadership of Charles Stewart Parnell, set to work with the deliberate intention of forming their views upon the House of Commons by obstructing its business in every possible way. All-night sittings became frequent, and the House was forced to adopt new rules to put a stop to these "obstruction".

In 1879 the movement entered on another phase. A period of agricultural distress set in, which led to the formation of the Irish Land League by Davitt. This association wished to obtain for Irish tenants property in the land. Violent agitation against the payment of rent began. A great impulse was thus given to Home Rule, for a practical object was now set before the Irish peasantry.

Looking ahead, we can say that the long struggle for independence of Ireland would end in victory for freedom fighters in the 1920s. Before that, in 1912, the Liberal government re-introduced the Bill of Home Rule, for two years thrice rejected by the House of Lords. The movement for Home Rule led to fierce resistance among the Protestant Ulster Unionists, supporters of the preservation of the Union, who created armed forces. In 1914 it came to serious riots, during which the British troops refused to fire at unionists. After the First World War, the

Royal Assent gave the force of law to the Bill (17 September 1914), but with the proviso that its introduction should be postponed until after the war and accompanied by a new act, withdrawing Northern Ireland from the law. After the pro-independence republican party Sinn Féin came to power in Ireland, which refused to recognize the Act of Home Rule and declared as its goal independence of Ireland. Sinn Féin received overwhelming endorsement in the general election of 1918, and in 1919 it proclaimed an Irish Republic, setting up its own parliament (Dáil Éireann) and government. Simultaneously the Volunteers, which became known as the Irish Republican Army (IRA), launched a three-year guerrilla war, which ended in a truce in July 1921 (although violence continued until June 1922, mostly in Northern Ireland). This was preceded by a serious albeit short persecution of the leaders of the movement, not without the involvement of Winston Churchill.

In December 1921, the Irish Republic was recognized by England and the Anglo-Irish Treaty was concluded between the British Government and representatives of the Second Dáil. It gave Ireland complete independence in its home affairs and practical independence for foreign policy, but an opt-out clause allowed Northern Ireland to remain within the United Kingdom, which it exercised as expected. Additionally, an oath of allegiance to the King was to be taken.

Disagreements over these provisions led to a split in the nationalist movement and a subsequent Irish Civil War between the new government of the Irish Free State and those opposed to the treaty, led by Éamon de Valera. The civil war officially ended in May 1923 when de Valera issued a cease-fire order. During its first decade the newly formed Irish Free State was governed by the victors of the civil war. When de Valera achieved power, he took advantage of the Statute of Westminster and political circumstances to build upon inroads to greater sovereignty made by the previous government. The oath was abolished and in 1937 a new constitution was adopted. This completed a process of gradual separation from the British Empire that governments had pursued since independence. However, it was not until 1949 that the state was declared, officially, to be the Republic of Ireland.

Notably, Gaelic (Irish), the predominant language of the Irish people for most of their recorded history, began to decline under English rule in the 17th century. In the latter part of the 19th c., there was a dramatic decrease in the number of speakers, beginning after the Great Famine of 1845–52 (when Ireland lost 20–25% of its population either to emigration or death). By the end of British rule, the language was spoken by less than 15% of the national population. Since then, Irish speakers have been in the minority. Efforts have been made by the state, individuals and organisations to preserve, promote and revive the language, but with mixed results (74,000 native speakers in Ireland (2016), about 1,154,923 as a second language (17.57% of Ireland (NI & Republic)).

The Education Act of 1870 and Its Amendments. Education in 19th c. Britain

The government fondly hoped that they gave satisfaction to Ireland and turned to other matters. The Education Act of 1870 introduced by William Forster, a Liberal MP, placed national education in England for the first time on a more or less worthy footing. Initially, the law did not require the mandatory school attendance, but it ensured the prerequisites for teaching children up to 10 years of age.

Previously, in 1833, Parliament had approved the first annual allocation for construction and maintenance of schools for the poor. However, in 1839, government subsidies for the construction and maintenance of schools were attached to voluntary contributions of organizations and made dependent on the results of inspections of these institutions. This seriously undermined the attempt to educate the poor.

The Law on Primary Education of 1880 required the compulsory school attendance of children aged 5-10. In 1891, the Law on “free education” was enacted, by which the State assumed tuition of up to 10 shillings a week. In 1893, the law on primary education and school

attendance came into force. Under this law, the minimum age for school leavers was increased to 11 years. Later that year, this law was extended to the blind and deaf children who previously had no means of formal education and provided for the creation of special schools for them. The School Act of 1897 provided tuition subsidies by the State for public elementary schools that were not funded by school boards, mainly for parish schools. An amendment of 1899 increased the minimum age for school leavers to 12 years, and then the bar was raised to 13 years. In practice, however, an attempt to provide compulsory education for children from poor families did not work. Families afflicted by poverty were forced to send their children to work, rather than to school.

As for schools for the rich, in 1840, a law expanded grammar school curriculum, adding to the classical languages science and literature. In 1870, the law required the creation of partially state-funded boarding schools. Boarding schools were governed by elected school boards; they were fee-paying, i.e. tuition was paid by the families of the children. Boarding-schools were to be established in the places where the local rich wished it. These boarding-schools were subjected to general control of the government.

See also Background materials *1. On Grammar Schools* and *2. On Public and Independent Schools*.

We can trace similarities with the development of school education in the Tsardom of Russia and the Russian Empire. As recorded in the Stoglav¹⁰⁰, a network of free parochial schools was already created in the time of Ivan the Terrible. In the years of the reign of Alexander II, there were projects for the introduction of universal education. In the 1880s, the zemstvos obtained from the Ministry of Education purpose loans; the education budget for the decade 1894-1904 grew twice - up to 42 million roubles. By 1916, this figure reached 196 million, about 5% of the State budget. It is worth noting that the State paid 40-45% of costs for education development, funds were also allocated by ministries, zemstvos themselves, city, church, non-governmental organizations and private individuals. In 1909 a school-building fund of the Ministry of Education was created which was given uncollectible loans. Within eight years, the fund managed to build schools for 5 million students. Expenditure per student was also growing: according to P. Sorokin, it reached 3.5 roubles per child - more than in France and Germany translated into their national currency. The teacher education developed rapidly. In 1913, there were more than 150 thousand primary school teachers and 35 thousand teachers of secondary educational institutions. From 1900 to 1914 the number of pupils in elementary schools rose from 2.5 to 6 million children - not counting the 2 million students of parochial schools. The system of secondary education consisted of several types of institutions: seminaries, gymnasiums, real and commercial schools. Despite the fact that Russia still lacked schools and had to step up effort to provide literacy for its population, there were salient achievements Russia could be proud of. Russian secondary education was considered one of the best in Europe, giving excellent opportunities for university and public service. The number of mid-level school pupils in the Russian Empire was significantly ahead of major European countries. Also important is that these secondary (middle) schools were egalitarian, the social structure of students was democratic enough for those times - peasants and burghers prevailed in real schools, schools for girls and teachers' institutes. In general, literacy of the Russian population had grown by 45% by the year 1916. In villages 36% and in towns 64% of the population had the reading and writing skills.

Comprehension questions

1. Fenian movement, uprising of 1867. Causes of failure.

¹⁰⁰ "The Book of 100 Chapters", containing 69 questions asked at and answered by the Great Council at their assembly held in Moscow in 1551.

2. Home Rule. History of enacting.
3. The Irish Land League. Why was its creation consequential? The land question.
4. The root of the trouble with Ireland. The relief measures of Gladstone's government.
5. The struggle for independence of Ireland in the 20th c.
6. Speak briefly of the following realia and personalities:
 - the Encumbered Estates Act;
 - the Phoenix National and Literary Society;
 - John O'Mahony;
 - the Protestant Ulster Unionists;
 - Sinn Féin;
 - the IRA;
 - Éamon de Valera.
7. School education in 19th c. Britain. Similarities and differences with education in the Russian Empire.

Names and expressions

O'Mahony [əu'mah(ə)ni]

the legendary band of warriors — легендарное воинство

Find Mac Cumail [faɪnd mæk kum'eɪl] — герой ирландских саг

O'Brian [o'braɪən]

Jeremiah Donovan [ˌdʒeri'maɪə 'dəʊnə'vən]

to take up arms when called upon — взяться за оружие, как только их призовут

the organization was modelled — эта организация была построена по образцу...

...brought to light the desperate passions roused by generations of misery and neglect — сделало явными отчаянные волнения, причиной которых были нищета и пренебрежение к их нуждам в течение поколений

placed on a level — поставили наравне

a worthy footing — надежное основание

Lord Beaconsfield ['bi:kəns'fi:ld]

"Home Rule" [ˌhəʊm'ru:l] — т. е. местное управление, Гомруль

all-night sittings — заседали ночами (заседания на всю ночь)

38. POLITICS DURING BENJAMIN DISRAELI, 1st EARL OF BEACONSFIELD (1874-1880)

The situation in England in the mid 19th century: trade unions, working class movement, political reforms

In the second half of the 19th c. the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois-minded aristocracy of Britain achieved complete mastery of the skill of dealing with the wealth-creating masses. The monopolistic position of the country as the workshop of the world reigning in the international market, the gigantic size of colonial booty, the success of the neocolonial free-trade policy, the accommodating theories of the bourgeois apologetic philosophers, the corruption of the workingmen's mass by the "devil take the hindmost" principle, splitting it into the better-paid top layer and the slum-dwelling mass, — all this facilitated the industrialists' triumph over the workers of England.

As a development of the trade union movement, "New Model Unions" arose. The first of them, the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, was founded in 1851; it had eleven thousand

members and the fees were high. The second biggest was the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters founded in 1860; then there were smaller ones like the Stone Masons and Iron founders; all in all, there were 1,600 Trade Unions in Britain, all of them small. Soon an unofficial central leadership evolved, called the Junta, with headquarters at London. Those were Allen and Applegarth of the Engineers and Carpenters, Guile of the Ironfounders, Coulson of the Bricklayers, and Odger of Bootmakers. Their political philosophy was vague, and they oscillated between the revolutionaries of the First International after it was organized, and the liberals, radicals like Bright. They believed in possibility of class peace and improvement of the workers' condition within the existing system: their main strategic principle was compromise and economic struggle.

So, the Trade Union movement was taken under control by the bourgeoisie. The Trade-Unions, so revolutionary during the thirties and forties, were getting to be convenient aid in furthering the bourgeoisie's aims. They were getting exclusive, as the entrance and membership contributions were too high for the lower-paid to afford, and their aims were getting narrow — they were mutual aid centres more than anything else, sort of insurance funds guaranteeing those of the workers who could afford to pay the fees, from bankruptcy in times of sickness or unemployment, loss of breadwinner, etc. The leaders lived in London and were paid from the funds of the Union, which made it easy for the bourgeoisie to corrupt them. In their struggle for better conditions of selling the working hands, the new-type Trade Unions were "cautious to the point of being cowardly" as one of the progressive historians of the Trade Union movement put it.

True, they had much to their credit. They helped the workers in their self-education, they paid due attention to organizational technique, etc. They organized Co-operative Societies, which would buy wheat at wholesale prices, grind it at mills they supervised as belonging to the Society and then sell the flour to members of the Society and keep the profit for the Society's use. In other cases, the profits were distributed among members as dividend. In such Societies the workers learnt how to organize and run business enterprises showing they could do it no worse than the capitalists who usually prided themselves on their indispensability as organizers of large scale enterprise doing the organizational work for a community which otherwise might have perished. But the Trade Unions of the 1850s and 1860s were possessed with ideas of economic struggle only, which limited their goals and slackened their activity.

At the end of the 1850s a crisis broke out in many capitalist countries, and England was involved. Again factories closed down and workers were thrown out of employment. The heightened exploitation led to a revival of the militant spirit in Trade-Union movement. Disunity of the multiple Unions was felt to be weakening and in 1858 a Council of Trade Unions was founded in Glasgow. Sheffield, Edinburgh, Liverpool followed suit. The advantage of the councils was the unification of the workingmen of a whole town, and the leaders were there, close to their townsmen and not remote aristocratic-looking London officials of the centralized Trade-Unions. In 1860, the London Council of Trade Unions united all the London Trade Union members.

In 1864, the First International was formed which, under the leadership of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, became the directing force of all the class-conscious workers. It existed for twelve years, and in France and Germany socialist parties were formed under its influence; in England, however, there were no such results though the seed of struggle for a new Parliament reform was planted. A special Reform League was founded early in 1865 by representatives of workers' organizations to press for manhood suffrage and the ballot in Britain; its programme and tactical principles were worked out by the General Council of the International.

In British domestic policy, Palmerston's period of office was remarkable for a political apathy. Palmerston's departure weakened the ministry. Very soon Russell resigned, and Lord Derby, with a Conservative ministry took his place in 1865. Benjamin Disraeli (1804-1881), who

was created Lord Beaconsfield 1876, was included in it. He was a journalist, writer of the "feudal socialism" - guise assumed to win popularity by semblance of criticism of the bourgeois society, who bought his Parliament seat in 1837 and from complete obscurity, helped by his subtle cunning and brilliant ability as orator and political intriguer, rose to be leader of the Tory party. His forte was the "neo-Toryism", a policy of mollifying the wide masses by giving them some reforms thus recruiting their sympathy. Disraeli was quite outspoken regarding the influence of secret societies in politics: "The government of this country has not only to deal with governments, kings and ministers, but also with secret societies, elements which must be taken into account, which at the last moment can bring our plans to naught, which have everywhere their unscrupulous agents, who incite assassinations and can if necessary lead a massacre," - said he in 1876.

When the Tory cabinet was formed the masses saw they had to take the matter in hand or lose every chance of ever getting political rights. Meetings were organized by workers' reform societies. The Derby-Disraeli cabinet got scared. They tried to prevent meetings, among them a Hyde-Park meeting that was planned for July 23. Hyde Park was closed to the public, but half a mile of the fence railings was demolished by the workers who thus forced an entrance, held their meeting and demanded that the reform should be granted immediately. Huge meetings, often over two hundred thousand strong, were held in Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow, then in London and Edinburgh late in 1866 and early in 1867.

The Tory government was badly frightened, so they set about drafting their version of the Reform Bill. They hoped to win the votes of the newly enfranchised voters as soon as the Bill was passed. (Their hopes, by the way, were frustrated at the very first post-reform elections: the newly enfranchised voters returned the Whigs with a triumphant majority). In August 1867 the Bill was passed.

The Tory leaders could only pass their Bill with the aid of the Whig party; because of that it became a much stronger measure than the government had intended. It introduced the right which is called the "household" and "lodger" rules in towns and cities — that is, every occupant of a house paying his own rates, and every lodger paying a rent no less than 10 pounds sterling a year, were admitted to the elections. The same was made for the occupants of counties to represent these in the Parliament; at the same time, a redistribution of places took place, and several of the large towns received an additional member. Reform bills were also passed for Scotland and Ireland. The main outcome of the Reform Act was that the better class of artisans got a share in political power, and that the boroughs — the chief centres of political activity — gained a still larger preponderance over the counties than before.



Benjamin Disraeli

Thus, the 1867 Reform completed the triumph of industrial bourgeoisie in its struggle for accession to power. The power of the aristocracy, who could no longer use their "rotten borough" seats to control the class composition of the House of Commons, was reduced. Agricultural labourers and those industrial workers who did not live in parliamentary boroughs, like miners and others were left voteless, women were completely disregarded. The working masses who had been fighting for universal suffrage drew a blank. Again, the only reward of their efforts was the consciousness of having been used as a tool.

The effects of this great change were soon apparent. The general election of 1868 resulted in an enormous Whig majority. Disraeli, who had taken Derby's place as Prime Minister, resigned, and Gladstone took office at the head of the strongest government that had been in power since 1832.

Foreign policies in the late 19th c.

During and after the years of the Crimean War, great events took place in Europe. The kingdom of Italy was created (1861, with King Victor Emmanuel II) as well as the German Empire (1871, led by Otto von Bismarck). The Britons maintained neutrality during the war between France and Austria in 1859, the Austro-Prussian War of 1866, and the French-German War of 1870-1871. In 1870, Russia repudiated the Black Sea treaty, and thereby nullified the results of the Crimean campaign for Britain. Britain could do nothing but protest.

In the great conflict between the Northern and the Southern States of America (the American Civil War of 1861-1865) the British government did intervene. A Northern cruiser seized two Southern envoys on board of British ship in 1861, and it nearly led to a rupture with the North; while Palmerston's government — which on the whole sympathized with the North — allowed the escape from Liverpool of a Southern privateer, the "Alabama", which afterwards did much damage to Northern commerce (1862). On the other hand, the British bore without protest the blockade of the Southern ports, which, by cutting up the supplies of cotton, inflicted great losses on English mill-owners and terrible distress on the working classes.

In 1874, when a rebellion broke out in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the "Eastern Question" came to the fore again. To appease the rebels, representatives of Russia, Germany and Austro-Hungary drew up a programme of reforms for Turkey, which the latter, with the British support, rejected. In fomenting war in the Balkans, Britain saw an opportunity to distract Russia from the affairs in Central Asia and again funded the intransigence of Turkey. The British diplomats were conducive to igniting a conflict. In April-June 1876 an insurrection broke out in Bulgaria. In the southern part of that land, the Turks had settled rebellious highlanders from the Russian Empire's Caucasus. The latter forced Bulgarians who lived there to work for themselves as slaves. In response, the Bulgarian peasants took up arms, and the highlanders, many of whom were used by the Ottomans as irregular troops - Bashi-bazouks, began to ravage Bulgarian villages. Investigation undertaken by the French ambassador showed that in three months some 20 thousand Christians had been killed. Between a thousand and twelve hundred people, mostly women and children, took refuge in a church at Batak and were then burnt alive. Five thousand out of the seven thousand villagers of Batak were put to death. According to some sources, both Batak and Perushtitsa, where much of the population was also killed, had not participated in the rebellion. Modern historians have estimated the number killed during the suppression of the uprising as 30,000 only in South Bulgaria. In June, Serbia and Montenegro came to the rebels' aid and entered into open confrontation with Turkey.

In August the British ambassador in Istanbul Henry Elliot wrote: "...my conduct here has never been guided by any sentimental affection for them (i.e. the Turks), but by a firm determination to uphold the interests of Great Britain to the utmost of my power; and that those interests are deeply engaged in preventing the disruption of the Turkish Empire is a conviction which I share in common with the most eminent statesmen who have directed our foreign policy, but which appears now to be abandoned by shallow politicians or persons who have allowed their feelings of revolted humanity to make them forget the capital interests involved in the question. We may and must feel indignant at the needless and monstrous severity with which the Bulgarian insurrection was put down, but the necessity which exists for England to prevent changes from occurring here which would be most detrimental to ourselves, is not affected by the question whether it was 10,000 or 20,000 persons who perished in the suppression. We have been upholding what we know to be a semicivilised nation, liable under certain circumstances to be carried into fearful excesses: but the fact of this having just now been strikingly brought home to us all cannot be a sufficient reason for abandoning a policy which is the only one that can be followed with a due regard to our own interests." In September 1876 the opposition leader Gladstone published a brochure "The Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East", which somewhat swung the British public opinion around against the Ottoman policy and Britain joined

the other powers in urging Turkey to reform her government. Still, instead of pressing on Istanbul and putting an end to atrocities, Paris and London continued to formally resent the actions of the Turkish troops.

In December a conference of the great powers was held in Constantinople, but the powers could not agree on common actions, and their discussion therefore produced no result. The conference demanded that autonomy should have been granted to Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as to Bulgaria. The implementation of this decision was to be ensured by international commissioners. It suited everyone, even Turkey was willing to accept it. But apparently Britain was not satisfied with a peaceful solution to the conflict, envisaging a different scenario. "After all, one word from London would be enough to immediately stop a series of murders to be perpetrated by the Turkish government in the Slavic countries," - wrote the Grand Duke Alexander Mikhailovich Romanov in his memoirs. At the closing session of the conference the British choreographed a spectacle where Turkey declared itself to have become a constitutional monarchy. Consequently, the decisions of the conference were meaningless - because the Constitution had allegedly given Turkish Christian subjects all the rights and freedoms. So, in effect Turkey rejected the second peaceful solution. However, Slavs continued to be killed, now in Turkey as the constitutional monarchy.

Alexander II of Russia listened to reason and tried to avoid a conflict by reaching an agreement through diplomatic negotiations, but Turkey, looking to her British friends, refused to comply even with the most lenient requirements. Then there were Serbia and Montenegro, which were suffering a defeat and with renewed vigour appealed to Russia for help. Russia was to get involved in a new war with Turkey, for reasons of conscience and properly prepared public opinion. This last Russian war with Turkey can be rightly called a rehearsal of World War I, a little later, in 1914, Russia would be driven into a similar trap.

As for Britain, courting Turkey, she pursued her own interests. The 1870s were the decade of the further grand expansion of the British Empire. At the end of November 1875, the British bought the entire stake in the Suez Canal, owned by Ismail Pasha, penultimate Khedive of Egypt. Egypt at the time was still part of the Ottoman Empire, but Prime Minister Disraeli did not even advise the Sultan of the transaction. Now Britain controlled the Suez Canal - a vital international waterway, and it was possible then to move on to the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, Syria, Lebanon, Mesopotamia. But in order to tighten grip over the markets of those regions, it was necessary to have a support base. Such a base, according to Disraeli, was supposed to be Cyprus, which belonged to the Ottoman Empire. Hence the line of conduct of the British diplomacy and financing the intransigence of the Sultan. Turkey would persistently reject all demands of Russia and other powers.

The Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878

In April 1877 Russia declared war on the Ottoman Empire (the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78). Romania was the only Russia's ally. Serbia delayed its entry into the war under the pressure of the British cabinet, which hinted that if Serbia entered the war, she should not rely on the good offices of England at the conclusion of peace. After several repulses, the Russians in January 1878 reached Adrianople. Then, after some thought, Serbia went to war, too. The Russian troops crossed the Balkans, took Philippopolis and Adrianople, and came close to Istanbul. The British government immediately warned Russia that even the temporary occupation of the Turkish capital would force England to take precautions. Sultan was forced to sue for peace. December 24, Turkey turned to England asking to mediate. The British Government notified St. Petersburg. The answer from the Russian capital was: "If Turkey wants to end the war and ask for a truce she should refer directly to the Commander in the field of the Russian army." The Sultan followed the advice: the Russian troops stopped at the walls of Istanbul, an armistice between Russia and Turkey was signed. Then, in the suburb of Istanbul,

San Stefano, a peace treaty was concluded.

This event shook the European capitals and permanently deprived the allied diplomats of sleep and appetite. Under the terms of the treaty, Russia received back from the southern part of Romania, Bessarabia, and from Turkey - the port of Batum, the Kars district, the city of Bajazet and the Alashkert Valley. Romania took the Dobrogea region of Turkey. Serbia and Montenegro gained full independence and a number of territories. Bulgaria gained independence, too, and became the largest state in the Balkans. In addition, the San Stefano treaty obliged Turkey to pay Russia a contribution in the amount of 1 billion 410 million roubles.

The Russian victories caused much excitement in Britain. Many who after the Bulgarian massacres had demanded strong measures against Turkey, were now frightened by Russia, and were ready to take the opposite side. This was despite the fact, that public opinion had no wish to fight for Turkey. Parliament granted 6 million pounds for the army and navy; and a popular song, from which the war party got the name of "Jingoes", was enthusiastically sung in the streets of London. Queen Victoria wrote that "if the Queen were a man, she would like to go and give those Russians, whose word one cannot believe, such a beating!" A squadron under the command of Admiral Hornby was sent to the Marmara Sea. Disraeli declared the treaty "incompatible with the interests of the UK," and after that the British forces in Malta received the order to prepare for landing in the Balkans. Beaconsfield demanded that the Treaty of San Stefano should be submitted to a European congress. Austria-Hungary conducted a partial mobilization of the army.

The matter was clearly going to repeat the European aggression against Russia during the Crimean War. The Russian government was preparing for a possible war: powerful artillery was shipped in the southern ports, designed to block the Turkish Straits from the British navy. Kronstadt and the Baltic Fleet were put on an alert. For her part, England in May 1878 began intense formation of a "special squadron" under the command of Admiral Cooper Kay intended to attack Kronstadt. England and Russia were on the brink of war. The hero of the Balkan War, General Mikhail Dmitrievich Skobelev wrote a memorandum to the Emperor, proposing to strike at the most vulnerable spot of the British Empire – India. In May 1878, a relevant order to the troops of the Turkestan Military District was issued.

Alexander II wavered, he did not want a war. Bismarck, who had promised strong support to Russia, offered to convene a congress in Berlin and solve the disputes there. So, after a first refusal, the Russian Government consented to a congress. Disraeli (in 1876 created Earl of Beaconsfield) came to terms secretly both with Turkey and with Russia. In June 1878 the Congress of Berlin took place, at which the Treaty of San Stefano was somewhat modified, but its chief points were the same. By the treaty of Berlin, Serbia, Romania, Montenegro, and northern Bulgaria were declared independent; Russia retained Bessarabia, with Kars and Batoum; eastern Roumelia became a self-governing state under Turkey; Austria occupied Bosnia and Herzegovina. Under a secret treaty with Turkey, Britain occupied Cyprus.

At the same time, the German chancellor withdrew from the active support of the Russian government. His behaviour led to the fact that the Russian society and the Russian government began to treat Germany warily. This sentiment would be used in 1914 to pit Russia against Germany in the First World War. "The Congress of Berlin has been the blackest page in my official career," - Gorchakov wrote in a note to the Tsar. "And in mine as well!" - Alexander II replied. This despite the fact that in his time, the Russian Empire was modernized, it rearmed the army, conducted an independent foreign policy, there was a sharp change in social relations - all this gave the Russian patriots hope for a bright future of the country. Opponents, on the contrary, looked warily on the powerful state that managed by a beautiful political combination to throw off the shackles of the defeat in the Crimean War.

On March 3, 1878, the San Stefan Peace Treaty was signed between the Russian Empire and the Ottoman Empire following the victorious outcome of the 1877-1878 Russo-Turkish war.



After five centuries of foreign rule, the sun of freedom rose over Bulgaria, for which thousands of soldiers of the Russian army and Bulgarian militiamen gave their lives in epic battles at Pleven, Grivitsa, Stara Zagora, Sheinovo and the Shipka Pass. Built in honour of the Russian Emperor Alexander II, who liberated Bulgaria from the Ottoman rule was an equestrian monument in the centre of Sofia, the capital of Bulgaria (Bulgak Pametnik at Tsar Osvoboditel, or Bulgar monument to Liberator Tsar).

Following Russia's decisive victory, the king of England made steps to retain the British influence in Turkey. Russians were forced to leave, and the Sultan paid for his salvation by letting Britain occupy Cyprus, which was placed under British administration based on the Cyprus Convention of 1878 and later formally annexed by Britain in 1914. Critically, on 1 March 1881 Alexander II was murdered in Russia by representatives of the People's Will terrorist organization.

British policies in Afghanistan in the 1850s-1880s

British possessions in the East were geographically separated from Central Asia by Afghanistan, the diplomatic relations with which were interrupted by England after the war of 1838-1842. Since 1843, bribes were paid to different Afghan tribal leaders in the region around Cabul and the Khyber Pass to stay more or less neutral or loyal to the British. However, to create the conditions for a successful penetration into the Central Asian Khanates, British ruling circles sought rapprochement with official Afghanistan. During the Crimean War, the British Empire took action in that region particularly insistently.

The government of Afghan Ameer Dost Muhammad Khan, concerned with the unification of the country, was interested in peace and willing to accept a proposal for the settlement of the Anglo-Afghan relations. In March 1855 in Peshawar, Ameer Dost Muhammad Khan and Punjab High Commissioner John Lawrence signed a treaty of peace between the two countries and mutual respect for their possessions. According to it, Ameer accepted friends and enemies of the British government's as friends and enemies of Cabul. It was not an equitable agreement. It imposed obligations on Afghanistan, which did not apply to the British Empire. This fact was expressly made note by a major British politician the Duke of Argyll, who in 1868-1874 was Secretary of State for India. The terms of the contract gave England the opportunity to influence the foreign policy of Afghanistan. Dost Muhammad was given financial assistance in the fight against small Uzbek and Tajik bekdoms on the left bank of the Amu Darya, which were under the auspices of the Ameer of Bukhara. So, with the assistance of the British expansionists the subjugation of the left bank of the Amu Darya by Afghanistan began, expanding the sphere of influence of England, worsening the Afghan-Bukhara relations and at the same time distracting to some extent the attention of the Afghan ruling circles from the predatory activities of the British colonialists in the Peshawar district and other areas, populated by East Afghani tribes.

In 1877, the hostile attitude of Beaconsfield's government to Russia led the Russian Emperor Alexander III to open secret negotiations with Afghanistan; the British government had a suspicion of that and decided to send their agent to Herat. But Shere Ali, the Ameer, refused to receive a British envoy, while by that time a Russian agent was already at his court. To enforce the British will, three armies immediately invaded Afghanistan and coerced Shere Ali's successor into accepting a British resident. But a few months later the events of the last Afghan trouble in 1839 were repeated. The British resident was killed and Lytton, the Viceroy of India, at once sent General Roberts (Frederick Sleigh Roberts, later 1st Earl Roberts of Kandahar) "to demand

satisfaction.” Cabul was taken, the new Ameer abdicated and was replaced by his cousin, Abdur Rahman. By the following summer (1880) Ripon (George Frederick Samuel Robinson, 1st Marquess of Ripon) was made Viceroy. In 1881 Gladstone became Prime Minister. Afghanistan was to be evacuated. Most of the British troops were withdrawn, when a younger son of Shere Ali, advancing from Herat, cut to pieces an Anglo-Indian army under General Burrows; the survivors retreated to Kandahar, where the English still held with a small force.

To relieve Kandahar General Roberts made a march from Cabul, covering 318 miles of difficult country in twenty-three days. Roberts’ ‘finest hour’ was the battle with the army of the Afghan Ameer Ayub Khan on September 1, 1880, near Kandahar. Before Afghans had successfully waged a guerrilla war and caused a number of sensitive defeats to the British. Apparently under the influence of their initial successes, Afghans overestimated their capabilities. The army of the Ameer met the British in the open field – and was defeated. Under the agreement with the new ruler of the country Roberts established control over the foreign policy of Afghanistan. This victory Roberts was proud of more than all the rest of his achievements. But the policy of British evacuation still continued, and Abdur Rahman was left to subdue Afghanistan as best as he could. The country fell into a state of anarchy, civil war broke out; and Roberts was shut up in his entrenched camp outside Cabul.

British policy in South Africa



Beaconsfield's policy in South Africa raised difficulties with which his successor had to deal. Before the beginning of the Afghan war Beaconsfield's government had found it necessary to interfere in the affairs of South Africa. After Lord Carnarvon's introduced federation in Canada, it was thought that similar political effort, coupled with military campaigns, might succeed with the African kingdoms, tribal areas and Boer republics in South Africa. Among the obstacles were the presence of the independent states of the South African Republic and the Kingdom of Zululand and its army.

In 1874-1876, Bartle Frere was sent as High Commissioner to the Cape to try to bring about a federation between that colony, Transvaal, and Natal. At the same time Shepstone was sent to Transvaal to see the feelings of the Boers there. He declared that the Boer Republic was bankrupt and unable to maintain order either within its own borders or on its frontiers. Then Shepstone declared the annexation of Transvaal to the British Empire (1877), much to the indignation of the Boers. But for the moment the proposed federation and the resentment of the Transvaal dropped out of sight in face of a general unrest that swept over the native tribes, especially the tribe of Zulus. Frere, and with the intent of instigating a war with the Zulu, had presented an ultimatum on 11 December 1878, to the Zulu king Cetewayo with which the Zulu king could not comply. Bartle Frere then sent Lord Chelmsford to invade Zululand after this ultimatum was not met.

Cetewayo's refusal to accept a British resident and to reform his military system led to war. The home government required all the troops it could spare from Afghanistan, and the officers on the spot were inclined to underrate the Zulus, so that the first operations proved disastrous. Chelmsford's camp at Isandhlwana was stormed, and a small force under Rorke Drift only just

managed to hold out by a heroic resistance from behind a barricade of bags and biscuit-tins.

In the following spring (1879) Chelmsford invaded Zululand with a force of 25,000 men and defeated Cetewayo at Ulundi. It was during this campaign that the Prince Imperial of France, the 23-year-old son of Napoleon III, who was on active duty in the British army, was surprised and killed. When Gladstone returned to power, Cetewayo, who had been captured in the war, was sent back to rule the Zulus as a puppet ruler; but he had to accept many restrictions on his power, and his subjects drove him out in 1880. He was succeeded by his son Dinizulu.

So, the aggressive policy of Beaconsfield led to a large apparent increase of British influence in South Africa; but it was strongly condemned by many, and its unfortunate results were yet to be seen.

Comprehension questions

1. How could the bourgeoisie take control over the working masses? What facilitated it?
2. What were the main functions of the new trade unions ("New Model Unions")?
3. The First International, the Reform League.
4. Benjamin Disraeli.
5. Working class meetings organized by the Reform Councils.
6. The 1867 Reform. Who was enfranchised by the Reform Act?
7. The part of Britain in the international affairs in the 1860s-1870s.
8. 1876 April Uprising in Bulgaria.
9. The attitude to the conflict in Britain.
10. Financing the intransigence of Turkey, its purposes. The Russo-Turkish War (1877–78).
11. Russia and Britain on the brink of war. The Berlin Congress. Murder of Alexander II in 1881.
12. British troubles with Afghanistan.
13. British policy in South Africa.

Names and expressions

Duties Bill — закон (билль) о пошлинах

Home Secretary — секретарь по внутренним делам страны

the entrance and membership contributions were too high for the lower-paid to afford - вступительные и членские взносы были слишком высокими для низкооплачиваемых

they had much to their credit - у них было много достоинств

the capitalists who usually prided themselves on their indispensability as organizers of large-scale enterprise - капиталисты, которые обычно гордились своей незаменимостью в качестве организаторов крупных предприятий

factories closed down and workers were thrown out of employment - заводы были закрыты, а рабочие уволены

followed suit - последовали примеру

guise assumed to win popularity by semblance of criticism of the bourgeois society - предполагали завоевать популярность подобием критики буржуазного общества

His forte was the "neo-Toryism", a policy of mollifying the wide masses by giving them some reforms thus recruiting their sympathy - его сильной стороной был «неоконсерватизм», политика умиротворения широких масс путем предложения им некоторых реформ, вызывающих их симпатии

they set about drafting their version of the Reform Bill - они приступили к составлению своей версии законопроекта о реформе

which on the whole sympathised with the North — которое в целом сочувствовало Северу (не симпатизировало!)

mill-owners — владельцы фабрик

Montenegro [ˌmɒntɪˈniːgrəʊ] — Черногория

Constantinople [ˌkɒnstæntɪˈnəʊp(ə)l, kɒnˌstæ-]

Adrianople [ˈeɪdriəˈnəʊp(ə)l]

San Stefano [ˌsæn steˈfæənə] — в 7 милях от Константинополя

Malta [ˈmɔːltə] — Мальта

After he had gained this point, Beaconsfield came to terms secretly both with Turkey and with Russia — после того, как он настоял на своем (выиграл) в этом вопросе, лорд Биконсфилд тайно договорился и с Турцией, и с Россией

Shere Ali [ˈʃɪrəˈli] — Шир Али

to enforce the British will — подчинить силой воле британцев

Herat [heˈra:t] — Герат

Burrows [ˈbʌrəʊs]

Kandahar [ˌkændəˈhɑː]

Bartle Frere [friː]

Transvaal [trænsˈvɑːl, trænz-]

Zulus [ˈzuːlʊːs]

Cetewayo — Сетевайо

all the troops it could spare from Afghanistan все войска, какие оно (правительство) только могло освободить из Афганистана

Chelmsford [ˈtʃelmsfəd]

Rorke Drift - Рорк Дрифт

biscuit-tins — жестянки из-под сухарей

Ulundi [uˈluːndi] — Улунди

its unfortunate results were yet to be seen — неблагоприятные последствия этой политики еще проявятся в будущем

39. POLITICS DURING GLADSTONE'S MINISTRY (1880–1885)



When William Ewart Gladstone succeeded to power in April 1880, he began by announcing a policy of conciliation in Ireland. But the failure of this policy was at once apparent. The agitation against the payment of rent in Ireland was accompanied of so many acts of violence, that in January 1881 the government was forced to introduce a new Coercion Bill introduced by Gladstone in an attempt to establish law and order. It allowed for persons to be imprisoned without trial. In the debate on this bill the conduct of members was so outrageous that thirty-six Irishmen were temporarily expelled from the House. In Ireland a reign of terror was established. The law was set at defiance with Land League, murders and outrages were committed, and the system of "boycotting"¹⁰¹ was fully developed.

Gladstone resolved to remove the grievances which were supposed to lie at the root of these disorders, by passing the Irish Land Act (1881). This Act gave the tenant the right to sell his lease, and to settle the question about his rent by a Land Court

¹⁰¹ Captain Charles Boycott, the land agent of an absentee landlord, Lord Erne, lived in Lough Mask House, near Ballinrobe in County Mayo, Ireland, and was subject to mass social ostracism organized by the Irish Land League in 1880.

which was to act in different regions. The rents were to be settled for fifteen years, and meanwhile the tenant could not be evicted, so long as he paid this rent. Soon afterwards the Land Court got to work.

But the Land Act did not satisfy the League. Charles Stewart Parnell, one of the most powerful figures in the British House of Commons in the 1880s, declared for "prairie-rent", that is, for a rent reduced to the nominal value of uncultivated land. His proceedings led to his arrest, and the proclamation of the League as an "illegal and criminal association". Parnell was relieved, however, shortly afterwards, on condition, as it was understood, that he should help the government to maintain order. A short time after his release the country was horrified by the murder of Frederic Cavendish (the new chief Secretary) and Burke in Dublin, and it was followed by several murders more. These events led to the passing of the Prevention of Crimes Act (1882), the severest coercion law of modern times. In 1883 the murderers of Cavendish were discovered and punished. The number of agitation crimes diminished in 1883 and 1884; but, on the other hand, the attempts to strike terrors by means of dynamite outrages in London rather increased.

During the first four years of the existence the Gladstone government, besides dealing with Ireland, passed several minor domestic measures, but they produced any important results only in 1884. After the quarrel between the two Houses, a Bill for the reform of elections was brought in, but at last the Lords accepted it not to make the quarrel too serious. The effect of this, was to give the vote to all householders. The servants who lived apart from their employers also received a vote. The agricultural labourers got more rights. In the redistribution of seats, London and the great towns obtained a number of additional numbers, and a step was taken in the direction of equal electoral districts.

On taking office in 1880 the Gladstone government found two important foreign questions which waited their solution — those of Afghanistan and the Transvaal. Beaconsfield had already decided to retire from Afghanistan, and Gladstone hastened to adopt his policy.

Unfortunately, before the withdrawal could take place, Ayooob Khan cut to pieces a British force at the battle of Maiwand, and besieged Kandahar. As we have said above, General Roberts at once set out from Cabul, reached Kandahar by forced marches over a difficult country, routed Ayooob's army, and relieved the sieged garrison. Abdurrahman was recognized as Ameer, and the British forces then withdrew, leaving the new Ameer to establish his power as best as he could (1880). It was a very poor result to achieve at the expense of so much blood and means.

Britain in Egypt

Since 1875 Britain and France "had been obliged to interfere in Egypt, in order to check the Khedive's misgovernment, and protect the interests of the numerous bond-holders who had invested money in the country." In 1877, the country's finances were in shambles. Ismail Pasha, Khedive of Egypt, borrowed millions of pounds from European financiers for projects to build the Suez Canal, his personal use, and to cover persistent tax shortfalls. His finances depended on money obtained from Egypt's cotton industry, which flourished during the American Civil War. But after the war, as American cotton entered European markets once again, the price of cotton fell dramatically. As a result, Egypt's cotton was no longer the cash crop it used to be. Ismail Pasha found himself unable to even pay off the interest on his debts.

At first, Ismail attempted to call on his parliament to raise more tax money, but parliament resisted, as it consisted mostly of large landowners, who were lightly taxed. In desperation, Ismail turned to the European powers to help him out of his financial troubles. After some rocky negotiations the Dual Control system was instituted, whereby a French and a British controller were appointed to oversee Egypt's finances. Evelyn Baring was appointed as the British Controller. Egyptian historian Al-Sayyid Marsot considers the desperate attempt on Ismail's part to obtain European help to have opened the floodgates for the British control of Egypt's finances,

and eventual incorporation into their empire.

On the part of Britain, Sir Evelyn Baring was appointed Comptroller General of Egypt and the Suez Canal. Later he became Consul-General and practically the ruler of Egypt. Baring was one of the founders of the Egyptian cotton industry and the initiator of the Egyptian religious and political organization "Muslim brothers."

As the British Controller-General, Baring was enormously successful in serving British interests. He and his fellow controller's de facto control of Egypt's finances meant they wielded considerable influence in both the Egyptian and British governments. Owning a large proportion of Egypt's debt himself, when Ismail refused to declare bankruptcy, Baring pressured his government to depose Ismail, which they did in 1879. The general population of Egypt widely blamed Ismail for the country's financial struggles, and his removal was greeted with relief. Ismail was succeeded by his son Tawfiq, who cooperated with the European consuls.

The Urabi Revolt, led by Ahmed Urabi, a rising Egyptian colonel, endangered the Khedivate. The subsequent intervention by the British in Alexandria (the 1882 Anglo-Egyptian War) was preceded by bombardment and invasion that deposed Urabi and his allies in favour of a British occupation. The British fleet bombarded Alexandria from 11–13 July and then occupied it with marines. The British did not lose a single ship, but much of the city was destroyed by fires caused by explosive shells and by Urabists seeking to ruin the city that the British were taking over. The troopers and naval artillery crushed all resistance, and by September 1882 the rich ancient country became a British colony.



Baring returned from India to Egypt as the British agent and consul-general, "with a mandate for minor reforms and a prompt withdrawal of British troops. «Baring's requests to withdraw were "thwarted by British public outcry when the 1881 uprising of the Mahdi Muhammad Ahmad¹⁰² and the ensuing War caused the successive defeats and deaths of the popular Colonel William Hicks and General Charles Gordon."»

Baring's first act as Consul-General was to approve of the Dufferin Report, which essentially called for a puppet parliament with no power. In addition, the report asserted the need for British supervision of reforms deemed necessary for the country. Furthermore, it stated the interests of the Suez Canal zone should always be maintained. Baring believed that because of Egyptian administrative incompetence, a long occupation was essential to any sort of reform. Moreover, he established a new guiding principle for Egypt known as the Granville Doctrine (named for the Foreign Secretary, Lord Granville). The doctrine enabled Baring and other British officials to dismiss Egyptian ministers who refused to accept British directives.

Under Baring, British officials were positioned in key ministries and a new system, known as the Veiled Protectorate, was introduced. Essentially, the government was a façade. Egyptian ministers were the outward form, yet British officials held the actual power. Baring thus

¹⁰²Mahdi Muhammad Ahmad was the leader of the Sudan Liberation Movement, the founder of the Sudanese Mahdi States. His uprising grew into the Mahdist War (1881–99) in the area of Sudan. The Mahdist Sudanese defeated the Anglo-Egyptian forces and established the Mahdiyyah, or the Mahdi States. In 1898, the British reconquered Sudan. The Khalifa of the Mahdiyyah committed his 52,000-man army to a frontal assault against the Anglo-Egyptian force, which was massed on the plain outside Omdurman. The outcome never was in doubt, largely because of superior British firepower. During the five-hour battle, about 11,000 Mahdists died, whereas Anglo-Egyptian losses amounted to 48 dead and fewer than 400 wounded.

remained the real ruler of Egypt until 1906, and this arrangement worked well for the first ten years of British control because Tawfiq Pasha was a weak man more than happy to abdicate any governmental responsibility. The Egyptian army, which Baring considered utterly untrustworthy due to its previous mutinies against the Khedive, was disbanded and a new army organized along with British lines (much like in India). With Egyptian finances stabilised by 1887, Baring also compelled the government in Cairo to abandon any pretension of reconquering the Sudan, which Egypt had lost control of following the Mahdist Rebellion. Careful (and often stingy) handling of the budget, plus promotion of irrigation projects, brought considerable economic prosperity to Egypt. Baring believed that at some point in the future, British control of Egypt would end, and full independence would be restored, but only once the Egyptian people learned proper self-governance.

Afaf Lutfi Sayyid-Marsot contends that under Baring, Egyptian nationalists were inert and many Egyptians believed in Britain's policy of "rescue and retire", but that Baring had no intention of doing so as, Marsot says, "Baring believed that 'subject races' were totally incapable of self-government, that they did not really need or want self-government, and that what they really needed was a 'full belly' policy which kept it quiescent and allowed the elite to make money and so cooperate with the occupying power."

In 1892, Tawfiq died and Abbas Hilmi II succeeded him. The young, ambitious khedive wanted to throw off British rule and to that end encouraged a nationalist movement, but he had not reckoned with Baring, who quickly bullied him into submission. Baring was in August 1901 created Viscount Errington, of Hexham, in the County of Northumberland, and Earl of Cromer, in the County of Norfolk. In 1906, Baring was made a Member of the Order of Merit by King Edward VII.

Baring was embroiled in controversy in both Egypt and Britain in the wake of severe punishments meted out to Egyptian peasants following the 1906 Denshawai Incident, even though he was out of the country at the time and had no direct involvement. The new Liberal government under Prime Minister Henry Campbell-Bannerman decided to adopt a more lenient policy towards Egypt, and Baring, sensing the end was near, offered his resignation in April 1907. The official reason given for his departure was health issues. In July 1907, Parliament awarded him £50,000 in recognition of his "eminent services" in Egypt.

First Boer War (1880 - 1881)

The Boer Republic of Transvaal and the Orange Republic (the Orange Free State) was founded in the 17th c. by the descendants of the Dutch settlers - the Boers. The discovery of deposits of diamonds and gold in South Africa in the 1860s led to the activation of British politics around Transvaal and the Orange Republic. The De Beers Diamond Empire was founded by an industrialist Cecil John Rhodes. (In the 1890s he became Prime Minister of the British Cape Colony).

In the late 70s of the 19th century, Britain tried to join the Transvaal to its colonial possessions, resulting in the First Boer War 1880-1881. In the first days of his power Gladstone spoke of the Conservative policy in regard of Transvaal in a way which the Boer leaders considered favourable to their claims for independence; but very soon he, in spite of the remonstrances of the Boers, decided to maintain the annexation of the Transvaal. In December 1880 the Boers revolted, proclaimed a republic, and invaded Natal. The First Boer War, also known as the First Anglo-Boer War or the Transvaal War, began (1880-1881).

In January 1881, George Colley attempted to dislodge the Boers from their position, and was defeated soon afterwards near the Ingogo river. In February 1881 the British had a disgraceful defeat at Majuba Hill. Thereupon Gladstone tried to come to terms in the negotiations with the Boers, revoke the annexation, but he insisted that some native territories should be still annexed. A truce was arranged in order that these conditions might be considered; but while it lasted the

Boers were entrenching Laing's Nek, and so Colley decided to occupy Majuba Hill; which dominated their position. Next morning the Boers stormed the hill and routed the British force. The news of this was received with indignation and dismay in England; but the government continued its negotiations; at last the Boers accepted terms which gave them complete self-government under British suzerainty. This arrangement was modified two years later in 1883, when the title of the South-African Republic was restored to the Transvaal State, and for the time being (till the Second Boer War (1899 – 1902)), the British left the Boers for a while to govern themselves under the suzerainty of Britain.

Comprehension questions

1. Gladstone's government: the Irish Land Act and other Irish matters, foreign and domestic policies.
2. Britain in Egypt.
3. The First Boer War (1880 - 1881).

Names and expressions

at the root of these disorders — в основании этих беспорядков

Land Court — земельный суд, земельное управление

Cavendish ['kæv(ə)ndiʃ]

domestic measures — местные меры

Ayoob Khan [aijəb ka:n] — Айюб Хан

Maiwand ['mɔivənd]

it was a very poor result to achieve at the expense of so much blood and means — результат был достигнут весьма скудный, если учесть, сколько было пролито крови и затрачено средств

when the consequences of Beaconsfield's South Africa policy appeared — когда проявились последствия политики лорда Биконсфилда в Африке

Ingogo ['ingəgou]

Majuba Hill [ma'ju:bə hil] (в Натале)

to come to terms — прийти к соглашению

Laing's Neck [leɪnz nek]

if it was to be the end, independence should have been granted before rather than after British defeat — если должен был наступить конец, следовало бы признать независимость скорее до начала, чем после поражения Британии

a harvest of troubles was growing up — неприятности созрели

Khedive [ki'di:v] — хедив, верховный правитель Египта (титул)

Tewfic ['tju:fik]

this plan worked fairly well — этот план осуществился с весьма хорошими результатами (не сработал!)

Arabi [ə'ra:bi]

Wolsely ['wəʊlsli]

Tel-el-Kebir [tel el kə'bi:r]

enabled Wolsely — дало Уолсли возможность, позволило

Evelyn Baring [i:vlin 'be(ə)rɪŋ]

Sudan [su:'dæn]

Mahdi [ma:di]

Baker Pasha [bake:r pa'ʃa:]

Khartum [ka:'tu:m]

Suakin ['swa:əkən]

40. SALISBURY'S MINISTRY (1885-1890)

In 1885 Lord Salisbury (1830-1903) succeeded Gladstone as Prime Minister, but in the following year the latter returned to power. If the policy of Beaconsfield had been rash and aggressive, that of Gladstone, except his actions in Egypt in 1882, had been vacillating and weak. His Irish policy also failed, and he had no more majority, so in the summer of 1885 he resigned, and Salisbury took office.



The change of ministry was followed by a general election, the results of which made neither Liberals nor Conservatives a leader. Already mentioned Charles Stewart Parnell, the Irish leader, became master of the situation in new Parliament. Neither party could hold office without his assistance.

Soon afterwards it was said that Gladstone had made his mind to adopt Home Rule, as the only chance of satisfying Ireland and getting rid of the Irish question. Early in 1886 these rumours were confirmed. In February 1886 Gladstone again took office. He was anxious to settle the Irish question once and for all.

He at once introduced two Irish Bills, one for Home Rule — establishing a separate Parliament for Ireland, with full control over Irish affairs, and removing the Irish members from the Parliament at Westminster. The other was a Land Purchase Bill — it was to help Irish tenants to buy their lands. These proposals created intense excitement in the country and grave discussions in the cabinet. Several of Gladstone's leading colleagues were against his proposals concerning Ireland, and they were followed by a number of Liberal members.

Gladstone at once appealed to the country, and the general election showed a strong feeling against Home Rule. Gladstone, therefore, resigned, and Salisbury, at the head of a purely Conservative government, took office. The Liberals promised their support but did not enter the ministry. At the head of the Liberal Unionists there were Harrington and Chamberlain, and they had refused to vote for the Irish Home Rule Bill.

Salisbury remained for six years at the head of affairs. During the earlier part of this period the difficulty of governing Ireland was very great.

The tenants in Ireland, doubtless, in past times suffered grievous wrongs, and cases of hardship still occurred, but it is difficult to defend the situation after the Land League, or, as it was then called, the "Plan of Campaign". The first business of a government is to maintain the law, and Balfour, as Irish Secretary, tried to help it, though with remarkable coolness. The judges declared the Plan of Campaign to be illegal, and they were supported by the Pope, who in 1888 issued a letter, condemning both the system of "boycotting" and the Plan of Campaign.

Until 1890 Parnell remained undisputed head of the Home Rule movement. A special commission, consisting of three judges, had been appointed in 1888 to examine the working of the League, and to decide whether its leaders were to blame for the outrages which had occurred. After an inquiry, which lasted for two years, the commission published a report which was hailed by some as an acquittal, by others as a verdict of guilty.

In the same year (1890) Parnell's implication in a divorce case caused a split in the Irish party. The majority of the Irish members, acting on a published letter of Gladstone, revolted from Parnell's leadership. Parnell died in 1891. A severer blow could hardly have fallen on the Home Rule cause.

The most important domestic measure of Salisbury's government was the Local Government Act in 1888. This Act established new elective bodies, called County Councils, in London and the counties rights of self-government.

In the department of foreign affairs few events of importance took place during Salisbury's administration. France, which about this time began to draw closer to Russia, continued to protest against British occupation of Egypt, while the British government regarded it as only temporary. The French Government continued to be hostile to development of England, but their hostility had no result except to produce a closer understanding between Britain and Italy, and these two countries had something like an alliance in 1887.

Meanwhile, the relations between Germany and Russia began to deteriorate. With an economic leverage over Petersburg, Bismarck did not fail to use it. He forbade German banks to issue loans secured by the Russian government securities. At the same time the German press campaign was launched, the aim of which was to discredit Russian financial and economic situation in Russia in general. Because of this, Russian securities began to rapidly fall in price on the German money market. Russia raised import duties on goods from Germany, and Germany - on the import of Russian products. In 1890, the new German chancellor Caprivi did not renew the "reinsurance" agreement. At the same time, Germany began its rapprochement with England. On the British and French part this was a bluff - the main task of the British was to put an end to the union of Germany and Russia, as for France, we remember, that already from the time of Napoleon III France had lost its diplomatic sovereignty and obediently carried out the will of the English cabinet. In order to somehow balance the scales, the Tsar began intensive diplomatic contacts with France. Paris officials had long made clear hints about the desirability of rapprochement between the two countries. In reality, this elaborate combination brought Russians and Germans in the two opposing military blocs. The Russian Prime Minister Witte wrote: "Thus, a political agreement has been reached between the two countries in August 1891. It provided for the "entente cordiale" between the two States, consultations in the event of a threat to peace and the commitment to agree on joint measures of protection and possible counter-offensive. "

From the moment when Germany closed its financial markets, since 1887, Russia began to receive regular loans from the Paris bankers. In a situation of constant shortage of credit in Russia, the French capital became one of its main sources of funding. Later the Emperor Alexander III gave way to the pressure of the French diplomacy to sign something more substantial. The fact is that consultations between Russia and France did not guarantee Russia's entry into the struggle for the interests of France. In 1892, when the General Staffs of the two states discussed the numbers and details of a possible military alliance, the French offered the Russians to put up an army of 800 thousand soldiers against Germany. In response, the Emperor Alexander III declared that "in principle, we agree to his proposal, however, we reserve the right not to join any military action until the moment when we find it convenient." The French began to get nervous. Only after a one-year delay caused by the Russian side, on 5 (17) August 1892 the military convention was drafted. And through this convention Russia was later drawn into an alliance with England.

Obviously, Alexander III was going to live a long time, to enter into new contracts and build new alliances. He could sign any document, but he would never have been drawn into an adventure for the interests of other powers. That was the main mistake of Alexander III, for soon his death followed.

During this time the British annexed Cyprus and occupied Upper Burma. The country was colonised by Britain following three Anglo-Burmese Wars (1824–1885). Before Gladstone's resignation in 1885 the third war with Burma began. It was successful for England and led to the annexation of Upper Burma early in 1886. In 1887 Quetta, a strong place on the south-west frontier of India, was annexed. About the same time East Zululand was added to Natal. But far the most important achievement outside Europe during this period was the series of conventions with Germany, France, Italy, and Portugal concerning Africa, which Salisbury completed in 1890 and 1891. By these conventions the unoccupied regions of Africa were divided into

"spheres of influence", allotted to the different powers — a peaceful settlement of disputed claims which, if unsettled, might at any time have given rise to war. In those years, the British also captured the Malay Peninsula, as well as most of the islands in the Pacific.

In 1892 the Parliament of 1886 came to a natural end. A list of required reforms, drawn up in 1891 by the National Liberal Federation, and called the "Newcastle Programme", was put forward as the manifesto of the Liberal Party. At the very first place stood Home Rule; but so many other changes were declared necessary that the general election, unlike that of 1886, gave complicated results; Gladstone with the aid of Home Rulers had not a strong majority. Soon afterwards Gladstone became Prime Minister for the fourth time. He was then nearly eighty-three years of age.

In 1893 the Prime Minister introduced his second Home Rule Bill. It differed from the first principally in that the Irish members were to have seats in Westminster as well as in Dublin. By this rule they had to have control over English and Scottish affairs as well as over their own. The bill, after a long discussion, was passed in the Commons by a majority only of 34. It was, however, rejected by the House of Lords by a majority of ten to one. Next year the government brought in and passed the Local Government Act, a measure, which completed the Act of 1888; it permitted in parishes, or groups of parishes, of elective bodies with restricted control over different local affairs.

This was Gladstone's last important measure. He was now too old of age, and had infirmities of sight and hearing, and these reasons made him to have a complete retirement. Rosebery, previously Foreign Secretary, became Prime Minister in his stead. Under his leadership two other Bills were introduced — one to determine the liability of employers for accidents happening to those whom they employ; the other was to replace to their lodgings the Irish tenants evicted for refusal to pay their rent. But the House of Lords was against these both measures, and these events led to a campaign against the Upper House, headed by Rosebery; but he and his followers divided on the question whether the House of Lords should be amended or abolished altogether. Meanwhile little was heard of Home Rule, and the Irish party was still further weakened by personal dissensions.

In the department of foreign affairs, the Liberal government had no heavy tasks to perform. A discussion about Siam with France was happily compromised in 1893 but Rosebery's attempt to intervene in the quarrel between China and Japan (1895) met a decided rebuff.

When Salisbury returned to office in the summer of 1895, the world in general was tranquil, and there seemed little prospect of serious disturbance in any place. Armenia, it is true, was still unquiet; but the Turkish Empire was seldom free from trouble. There was discontent among the foreign settlers in the far-off Transvaal, and an insurrection against the Spanish Government was beginning in Cuba; but few persons then understood what storms were foreshadowed by these little clouds. The last five years of the 19th c. proved, indeed, to be one of its most disturbed periods, and the British Empire in particular had to pass through some severe trials.

During the session of 1895 the parliament carried the second reading of a Bill for the disestablishment of the Church in Wales; but soon afterwards it was closed as a question of light importance, and Rosebery at once resigned. Salisbury again became Prime Minister, and this time the leading Liberal Unionists joined the minority. The Parliament elected in 1895 showed the majority of over 150 for the Conservatives and Unionists — a larger difference than had been seen since the election of 1832.

The adoption of Home Rule policy had, as it appeared, broken up and weakened the Liberal Party; but, on the other hand, the Conservatives were leavened by their junction with their Liberal allies. This union continued intact till it was loosened, and in some questions broken, by the problem of Tariff Reform, raised by Chamberlain in 1903.

Comprehension questions

1. Events during Salisbury's office. Charles Stewart Parnell and the Home Rule cause.
2. Russia's estrangement from Germany and rapprochement with France.
3. The annexation of Burma and division of Africa into "spheres of influence."

Names and expressions

List of Prime Ministers of Queen

Victoria

Year

Prime Minister (party)

1835

Viscount Melbourne (Whig)

1841

Sir Robert Peel (Conservative)

1846

Lord John Russell (W)

1852 (Feb.)

Earl of Derby (C)

1852 (Dec.)

Earl of Aberdeen (Peelite)

1855

Viscount Palmerston (Liberal)

1858

Earl of Derby (C)

1859

Viscount Palmerston (L)

1865

Earl Russell (L)

1866

Earl of Derby (C)

1868 (Feb.)

Benjamin Disraeli (C)

1868 (Dec.)

William Gladstone (L)

1874

Benjamin Disraeli (C)

1880

William Gladstone (L)

1885

Marquess of Salisbury (C)

1886 (Feb.)

William Gladstone (L)

1886 (July)

Marquess of Salisbury (C)

1892

William Gladstone (L)

1894

Earl of Rosebery (L)

1895

Marquess of Salisbury (C)

Salisbury ['sə:lzb(ə)ri]

that of Gladstone = the policy of Gladstone

Gladstone had made his mind — Гладстон настроился (решил)

once and for all — раз и навсегда

removing the Irish members from the Parliament at Westminster — исключить ирландских делегатов из парламента в Вестминстере

showed a strong feeling against Home Rule — продемонстрировали сильную оппозицию Гомрулю

Harrington [hæringtən]

Chamberlain, Joseph (1836-1914) [tʃeimbəlin]

remained at the head of affairs — продолжал возглавлять государственные дела

the difficulty of governing Ireland — трудности управления Ирландией

suffered grievous wrongs — страдали от мучительных несправедливостей

Balfour ['bælfuə]

remained undisputed head — оставался бесспорным главой

whether its leaders were to blame — следует ли винить ее вождей

Burma [bɜ:mə] — Бирма

far the most achievement — значительно большее достижение

which, if unsettled, might at any time have given rise to war — которые (вопросы), если их не разрешить, могли бы вызвать войну

Home Rulers — сторонники Гомруля

he had infirmities of sight and hearing — он стал плохо видеть и слышать

Rosebery [rəʊzbəri]

Siam [ʃi'am]

a question of light importance — вопрос не первостепенного значения

41. THE LAST YEARS OF QUEEN VICTORIA.

ECONOMY AND DOMESTIC AFFAIRS IN BRITAIN IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19TH C. THE WORLD IN THE 1890s

Last years and death of Queen Victoria

Queen Victoria was on the throne since 1837 to 1901. She celebrated her Diamond Jubilee in June 1897 (while in September 1896 the queen's reign had reached a point at which it exceeded

in length that of any other English sovereign, but she herself preferred to have a festival on her birthday). Chamberlain, the secretary for the colonies, persuaded his colleagues to use the opportunity of making the Jubilee a festival of the British Empire. Accordingly, the prime-ministers of all the self-governing colonies, with their families, were invited to come to London as the guests of the country to take part in the Jubilee procession; and representatives of the troops from every British colony and dependency were brought to England for the same purpose. Here was a display, not only of Englishmen, Scotsmen, Irishmen, Welshmen, but of the Mounted Rifles from Victoria and New South Wales, from the Cape and from Natal, and from the Dominion of Canada. Here were inhabitants of Niger and the Gold Coast, coloured men from West India regiments, people from Cyprus, Chinamen from Hong Kong — now made military police — from British North Borneo. Here, most brilliant sight of all, were the Imperial Service Troops sent by the native princes of India; while the detachments of Sikhs who marched earlier in the procession, received their full portion of admiration and applause. The queen was in her carriage for more than four hours, an extraordinary physical burden itself for a woman of seventy-eight. The illuminations in London and the great provincial towns were magnificent, and all the hills from Ben Nevis to the South Downs were crowned with bonfires. The queen herself held a review at Aldershot; but a much more significant display was the review by the prince of Wales of the fleet at Spithead on Saturday, the 26th of June. No less than 165 vessels of all classes were drawn up in four lines, extending altogether to a length of thirty miles.

The two years that followed the Diamond Jubilee were, as regards the queen, comparatively without important events. Her health remained good. In spring of 1898 and 1899 queen Victoria visited the Riviera, as usual; and her last ceremonial function in London was laying the foundation stone of the new buildings completing the Museum — henceforth to be called the Victoria and Albert Museum — which had been planned more than forty years before by the prince consort. In the autumn of 1900, however, her health began definitely to fail, and though arrangements were made for another holiday in the South, it was plain that her strength was seriously affected. Still she continued the ordinary routine of her usual duties and occupations. On the second of January she received Roberts on his return from South Africa and handed him the Order of the Garter. Until a week before her death she still took her daily drive. She felt a sudden loss of power, and on Friday evening, the 18th of January, the "Court Circular" published an announcement of her illness. On Tuesday, the 22nd, of January 1901, Victoria died.

As the authors of "Encyclopaedia Britannica Dictionary" write, in a most laudatory way: "Queen Victoria was a ruler of a new type. When she ascended the throne the popular faith in kings and queens was on the decline. She revived that faith; she consolidated her throne; she not only captivated the affections of the multitude, but won the respect of thoughtful men; and all these she achieved by methods which would have seemed to her predecessors impracticable — methods which it required no less shrewdness to discover than force of character and honesty of heart to adopt steadfastly... By her long reign and unblemished record her name had become associated inseparably with British institutions and imperial solidarity..."¹⁰³

However, Queen Victoria, shown all the marks of respect and reverence, did not really matter so much. The cabinet of ministers responsible to Parliament with members from the party which had the majority in Parliament, was the real — and only — power expressing the interests of that layer of the population which the party represented (industrial and trade bourgeoisie in the 1850s and 1860s). It was Palmerston (1784-1865), the British foreign minister of that time, who headed the foreign office with only slight interruptions from 1830 to 1865. The most rapacious, expansionist and cruel features of the British colonial policies were revealed precisely in Queen Victoria's times.

¹⁰³11th Ed. Chisholm. 1910-1911-1922. 33 vols. V. 28.

Economy and domestic affairs in Britain in the late 19th c.

The "metropolis of capitalism", as Karl Marx called England, increased the number of its cotton-spinning and weaving factories from 1932 to 2483 in the course of the first two decades of the second half of the century. Mechanical spindles from two million rose to thirty million; the numbers of workers rose from 330 thousand to 450 thousand.

The woollen cloth factories, not to be outdone, increased their number from 1998 to 2579 in the course of this period of industrial upsurge.

But it was heavy industry that took a truly gigantic leap. The output of pig-iron rose from two million to six million tons. Its output constituted more than half of the world output figure, and the produce of British factories taken together surpassed that of all the rest of the world.

In the middle of the 1860 the output of coal was 92 million tons, in fact more than half of the world output. The two decades, thus, brought Britain to the peak of its industrial might: iron was in great demand for railways were constantly spinning their web making a network of 12.789 miles as compared to the eight thousand odds of the middle of the century.

The fleet was being transformed too, the iron and steam of the new era replacing the wood and sail of the old. In the middle of the century the number of "big steamships" (that Kipling would soon glorify as the bread-winners of the country bringing colonial food for the hungry mouths of the little island with long grabbing hands spread nearly all over the world by the end of the century) was about two thousand while in the sixties it rose to five thousand and continued to grow.

The trade turnover of England and her colonies alone was nearly one third of the world trade turnover; the exports and imports at the end of the two decades became thrice as large as they were in the middle of the century. The nature of imports and exports spoke for itself: raw materials were imported and industrial produce exported, cotton fabrics (71 million pounds' worth in 1870, as compared to 28 million pounds' worth in 1850), woollen cloth (26,7 million pounds worth in 1870 as compared to ten millions' worth in 1850), machinery — an ominous item of exports, arming future rivals, only one million pounds' worth in 1850 and over five million pounds' worth in 1870.

The ancient economic theory of mercantilism, and then protectionism that formed the basis of British trade up to the middle of the fifties, gave way to the Free Trade doctrine because now Britain could afford it with her industry much better developed than that of any other country which implied lower prices able to oust the goods of any other country. The free access of British goods to all countries was achieved by hook or by crook, economic pressure was resorted to, that is, Britain refused buying any goods the country had to sell and she also refused to sell goods that were essential to that country thus leaving no alternative until the custom duties and tariffs were lowered and free access for all British goods was granted on terms stipulated by British merchants. If economic pressure did not work, the navy and army were used until the markets of all the world were open to Britain.

Friedrich Engels wrote: "The years immediately following the victory of Free Trade in England seemed to verify the most extravagant expectations of prosperity founded upon that event. British commerce rose to a fabulous amount; the industrial monopoly of England on the market of the world seemed more firmly established than ever; new iron works, new textile factories, arose wholesale; new branches of industry grew up on every side. The unparalleled expansion of British manufactures and commerce between 1848 and 1866 was no doubt due, to a great extent, to the removal of protective duties on food and raw materials. But not entirely. Other important changes took place simultaneously and helped it on. The above years comprise the discovery and working of the Californian and Australian goldfields which increased so immensely the circulating medium of the world; they mark the final victory of steam over all other means of transport; on the ocean, steamers now superseded sailing vessels; on land in all civilized countries, the railway took the first place, the macadamized road the second; transport

now became four times quicker and four times cheaper. No wonder that, under such favourable circumstances British manufactures based on steam should extend their sway at the expense of foreign domestic industries based upon manual labour".

The affairs which are called "imperial" — that is, questions touching the British Empire at large — began to be discussed with almost much eagerness as the adoption of Corn Laws and the general elections in the previous century. Though popular attention was inverted largely to imperial questions, some domestic reforms were introduced under the government of Salisbury.

Ireland made some material progress, especially in agriculture. As we have known, Gladstone's Land Act (1881) settled rents for fifteen years. In 1896 a new Land Law was passed, which continued and extended the provisions of the former Act, in favour of the tenants. Two years later, in 1898, the Irish Local Government Act gave to Ireland the privilege of local self-government by means of County and District Councils, such as it was established in England by the Act of 1888. In 1889 a new department of government was created in Ireland; wide powers and a large grant of money were given to her for the encouragement of agriculture and the improvement of technical instruction.

However, as the English historians write, "the animosity of the Irish members of Parliament towards the English government, and their determination to be content with nothing but Home Rule continued to exist."

Perhaps, the chief of the few Acts of importance affecting Britain, which were passed in 1895-1900, was the London Local Government Act (1899). It divided London (outside the "City") into sixteen districts or "boroughs", and established in each of these a municipal council, with a mayor and alderman. The London County Council, created in 1888, was left to manage, as before, the affairs of London as a whole.

Other important Acts were mainly concerned with social or economic matters, and with education. The Employers' Liability Act (1897) secured to almost all classes of workmen compensation in case of accident, and it was extended in 1900 to agricultural labourers. In the same year (1900) local authorities began to take care of the improvements of the dwellings of the working classes.

Other Acts were passed to help the Voluntary Schools and the poorer Board Schools (1897), while a new university for London was established by an Act of 1898. Universities were also set up in Birmingham and in Wales. The Government, however, failed to take care of the great question of general education; and a Bill concerning elementary and secondary education, which was introduced in 1896, met with so much criticism that it was withdrawn.

The federation of the six colonies in Australia was sanctioned by Act of Parliament in 1900, and thus a new state, comparable with the Dominion of Canada, began to exist. The population of people hoping to find their fortune in Australia grew rapidly, they came here to have their own land, to make new pastures, to grow up cattle and sheep, and, of course, to work in the golden mines.

In 1898 uniform penny postage had been extended throughout the British Empire, and thus another link was added to the chain "which united the mother country to her children oversea."

There were disastrous strikes in Britain, such as those of the engineers in 1897 and the coal miners in 1898, but on the whole the country during this period enjoyed commercial and industrial prosperity. On the other hand, the cost of army and navy amounted very high, without counting the enormous expenses of the Transvaal War. It was clear that Britain "had to bear those great and increasing gardens" and not to be allowed her industry and commerce — the chief sources of her wealth — to decay.



Situation in the world in the late 19th c.

Since 1871 France and Germany, spared political revolutions and great wars, were enabled to devote their attention to internal development, especially Germany, which had made rapid progress in trade and manufacturers. In these countries colonial expansion and commercial enterprise have gone hand in hand, and the consequence is that British merchants met with keen and clever rivals in many parts of the world where they met none before.

The United States, already one of the strongest powers in the world, and rapidly growing in population and resources, had shown a determination to make its influence felt in foreign affairs, from which it used formerly to shrink. America had started in the race for colonial possessions, and American manufacturers began to compete with British all over the world.

As for Britain's relations with the Russian Empire, there was an atmosphere of distrust and constant threat of war between the two countries. The expansion and strengthening the influence of the Russian Empire had affected British interests in more than one direction. Against Russia, Britain began what was called "the Great Game" - a term first used by R. Kipling and then by historians to describe a political and diplomatic confrontation that existed for most of the 19th c. between Britain and Russia over Central and Southern Asia and Afghanistan. Russia was fearful of British commercial and military inroads into Central Asia, and Britain was fearful of Russia adding "the jewel in the crown", India, to the vast empire that Russia was building in Asia. As the British historians write, "the Russian frontier in central Asia was quite close to that of English greatest dependency, India, from which it was separated, a generation before, by many hundreds of miles." Russia, for her part, strengthened her borders and extended her influence in view of her concern over the increased activity and expansion of the Western powers, primarily Britain, in East Asia and the Far East in the 19th century. A significant part of the territories of Siberia and the Far East were virtually cut off from the central part of the country. The task was to implement a set of urgent measures to associate the Russian borderlands with the centre by stable and comfortable transport communications. In 1891 a decision was made on the construction of the Trans-Siberian Railway (Transsib). Its construction began at the same time from Vladivostok and Chelyabinsk, conducted on public funds, and demonstrated unprecedented pace of railway construction – in 10 years 7.5 thousand km of new railway lines were laid. On the eastern side the Trans-Siberian Railway from Vladivostok to Khabarovsk was connected by a huge bridge across the Amur River. On the western side the railway tracks were brought to the Trans-Baikal.

In 1896, a Russian-Chinese treaty of alliance against Japan (the so-called Treaty of Moscow) was signed by Sergey Witte, Prince Lobanov-Rostovsky and Li Hongzhang. Later the Chinese ambassador to the Russian Empire Xu Zengcheng signed with the board of the Russian-Chinese Bank an agreement, valid for 80 years, on entitling the bank to the construction of a railway across Manchuria. So, the groundbreaking Chinese Eastern Railway (KVZhD, or CER) was built by Russia in 1897-1903 as the southern branch of the Trans-Siberian Railway. It provided the shortest route to Vladivostok via Harbin. An outstanding Russian engineer Nikolay Sergeevich Sviyagin was one of those who organized this construction. In 1901 the passage of trains and transportation of goods along the length of the KVZhD began.¹⁰⁴

In the 19th century, Asia became more and more attractive to Europeans. The Western countries sought to dominate China as a country still rich, but largely degraded and undermined by opium trade. Germany acquired a footing in central China, France in southern China; and though the British trade with the Chinese was more than that of all other European nations, these states, together with the United States of America, entered into active commercial rivalry with

¹⁰⁴In 1950 in Moscow a Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance between the USSR and China was signed, which conceded the KVZhD (Chinese Changchun Railway), Port Arthur and Dalny to China, and in 1952 the transfer of the railway from Russia to China was effected.

Britain. In northern Asia, Russia took control over some of the Chinese territory; and up to the time of the war with Japan (1904-1905) her influence in Manchuria was supreme.

As China was greatly weakened, the old East Asia world order no longer functioned, Western countries demanded that Japan begin to participate in trade with them, and eventually Japan had no choice but to agree. In the 1850s and 60s Japan signed various treaties with Western nations. In 1858, Britain forced the Japanese government to open a number of ports for British trade, allow extraterritorial privileges to British subjects; in 1866 after a civil war in Japan, an agreement was signed according to which the custom tariffs for foreign goods, British goods included, were lowered to amount to only 5% of their value. At the time, imperialism and colonization were the main institutions that defined international relations, and Japan soon became a colonizing power of its own right, governing both Taiwan and Korea. Japan was recognized by Western powers as a force to be reckoned with and became a member of the League of Nations. It became a serious competitor in commerce for Britain, though its ally in political affairs.

In 1895 more massacres of Armenians occurred, both in Asia Minor and in Constantinople. In 1896 the insurrection in Crete was renewed, and atrocities were committed on both sides. Next year the Greeks sent troops to Crete to help their compatriots, upon which the powers transferred in order to settle the dispute. The Greek government rejected their terms and attacked Turkey, but in the war that followed the Turks were completely victorious. The powers again intervened, made peace between Turkey and Greece in November 1897, and eventually declared Crete "autonomous" that is, a self-governing state under the nominal sovereignty of the Sultan (1898).

While Salisbury was engaged in attempts to settle the Eastern Question, Britain had a threat of war from the United States. For many years there had been difficulties with the Republic of Venezuela about the frontier between that state and British Guiana. Few persons in this country knew that such a dispute existed, but the people of the United States became excited with the thought that Britain was oppressing Venezuela, and the American Government demanded that the Britain should submit the question to arbitration.

Salisbury denied the right of the United States to interfere, on this President Cleveland announced that the American Government would appoint a commission of its own to decide the boundary question, and would, if necessary, force its decision upon Britain (1895). This threat seemed at a certain moment very likely to lead to war, but both parties wished to have a compromise, and in February 1897 there was appointed a joint court of arbitration, which agreed to conditions which secured the most important interests of colonists in British Guiana. This court sat in Paris, and it gave its decision in October 1899, in favour of a boundary nearly corresponding with that which the British Government had previously demanded. A general treaty of arbitration was agreed on by the British and American Governments in January 1897 but was rejected by the American Senate. Nevertheless, a good understanding with America took the place of the former ill-feeling; this understanding was strengthened by their attitude towards Spain during the war between Spain and the United States, which broke out in 1898, over the question of Cuba. A successful conclusion of the war for America has been largely due to the fact that Salisbury let it be known that if other European states joined Spain, Britain would throw her weight into the opposite side. To complete the history of British-American relations, it should be added that in November 1899 Salisbury came to an agreement with Germany and the United States, by which Britain got the rights, almost without compensation, in the Samoan Islands.

In August 1898, while events in China were causing anxiety, Nicholas II of Russia issued seminal proposals for a general disarmament, or at least a large reduction of European armies. In 1899, a Peace Congress, to which all the great powers sent delegates, met at the Hague. It was agreed to establish there an International Court of Arbitration there, though so far no progress was made towards general disarmament. A Second Congress, in 1907, discussed many points which had become prominent during the Russo-Japanese War. These Congresses were

prototypes of the future League of Nations and eventually the United Nations Organization.

Comprehension questions

1. Capitalist development of 19th c. Britain.
2. How did Victoria celebrate her Diamond Jubilee (the 60th anniversary of her accession)?
3. What were the circumstances of her death?
4. How is Queen Victoria's reign assessed?
5. What were the more important changes which had passed over the world beyond the British shores?
6. Speak about the domestic events in Britain in the 1890s.

Names and expressions

- Ben Nevis** [ben' nevis] — Бен Невис, самая высокая вершина Англии
- South Downs** ['sauθ 'dauns] — меловые холмы на юге Англии
- methods which it required no less shrewdness to discover than force of character and honesty of heart to adopt steadfastly** — методы, для которых требуется не меньше проицательности, чтобы их найти, чем силы характера и внутренней честности, чтобы постоянно их применять
- for the good of her people** — на благо своего народа
- to smooth the rugged places** — сглаживать острые углы
- your majesty was returning them change for their pounds in half-pence** — ваше величество возвращает им сдачу с даваемых ими фунтов полупенсовиками
- Armenia** [a:'mi:niə] — Армения
- Cuba** ['kju:bə] — Куба
- have gone hand in hand** — шли рука об руку, т. е. одновременно
- to make its influence felt in foreign affairs, from which it used formerly to shrink** — заставить, чтобы ее (Америки) влияние чувствовалось во всех иностранных делах, от которых она прежде отстранялась
- America has started in the race for colonial possessions** — Америка начала принимать участие в соревнованиях за колониальные владения
- Manchuria** [mæn'tʃu(ə)riə] — Манчжурия
- The "Board of Agriculture"** — управление сельским хозяйством
- with nothing but Home Rule** = only with Home Rule
- the London Local Government Act** — Акт (постановление) о местном самоуправлении Лондона
- single-handed** — в одиночку
- Crete** [kri:t] — Крит
- Venezuela** [, venə 'zwi:lə, -zweilə] — Венесуэла
- Guiana** [gi'a:nə] - Гвиана
- Cleveland** ['kli :vlənd], Stephen Grover(1837-1908) — Кливленд
- Samoa Islands** [sə'məuən ailənds] — Самоанские острова
- Hague** [heig] — Гаага

44. THE FAR EAST. BRITAIN IN AFRICA

Take up the White Man's burden,
Send forth the best ye breed
Go bind your sons to exile,
to serve your captives' need;
To wait in heavy harness,

On fluttered folk and wild—
Your new-caught, sullen peoples,
Half-devil and half-child...

Rudyard Kipling "The White Man's Burden"

Kipling extols those persevering patriotic British who travelled to conquer the "backward" Eastern peoples – "half-devil and half-child". But when one reads "to seek another's profit, and work another's gain" one cannot fail to recall Clive and other officers' huge "private fortunes" gained in India; the words "Take up the White Man's burden - the savage wars of peace" call to mind the native wars that Britain ignited to weaken strong tribes and their influential leaders, then come as a peacemaker and eventually – the ruler; "Fill full the mouth of Famine And bid the sickness cease" evokes the "bones of weavers that bleached the plains of India" and Jeffrey Amherst's smallpox blankets. The facts described below to some extent reflect and at the same time - contradict the imperial fanfare.

The British Raj of India at the turn of the century passed through serious troubles. In 1897 and 1900 large districts of the country suffered from the failure of crops, which caused terrible famines, affecting more or less eighty-five million people. The plague also carried away a great number of lives, especially in Bombay and its outskirts. As English historians claim, the Indian Government took active measures to struggle with both evils. The distress caused by famine was greatly diminished by the distribution of food; but the plague has resisted all attempts to win it.

One of the first questions which Salisbury's government had to settle was whether it was necessary to retain or give up the hold of a small mountain state on the borders of Afghanistan, called Chitral, which had been temporarily occupied on account of some disturbances on the frontier early in 1895. It was decided not to withdraw, but, on the contrary, to make road from Peshawar, the chief British outpost in those parts, to Chitral.

This decision irritated the "wild" tribes on the north-west frontier. Early in 1897 they rose one after the other, attacked the English forts, and seized the chief road from India to Afghanistan. Several expeditions had to be made. There was severe fighting with much loss of life; but in the end the tribes submitted, peace was made (1898), and order was restored.

Still farther east, in the vast and ancient empire of China, changes of importance were taking place. In April of 1895 peace was made between China and Japan. Japan had to give up her hold upon the Liaotung peninsula, which she had occupied. In 1896, as has been said above, a convention was signed between Russia and China, and Port Arthur was taken by Russia for her Trans-Siberian railway and a stronghold for her fleet. Early in 1898 Russia took possession of Port Arthur, which they soon transformed into a great naval station, and which they held until its capture by the Japanese in 1904.

The European powers now demanded and obtained from China various "concessions" or permissions to build railways, to sink mines, etc., on Chinese territory. The rivalry between the powers and the weakness of China induced Germany, late in 1897, on the pretext of compensation for the murder of two German missionaries, to seize the harbour of Kiau-Chau. Britain took possession of Wei-hai-wei, on the southern shore, and of an important piece of land opposite the island of Hong-Kong. But a large loan which the British Government was ready to make China was refused by the Chinese Government.

These events led to a revolution at the Chinese court – the Boxer Uprising (Boxer Rebellion, or Yihequan Movement) – an anti-foreign and anti-Christian uprising that took place in China between 1899 and 1901, towards the end of the Qing dynasty. The Emperor, who was anxious to introduce reforms, was practically dethroned; the dislike of foreigners, always very strong in China, ripened into wrath; and patriotic societies were organized to drive foreigners out of the country. It was initiated by the Militia United in Righteousness (Yihetuan), known in English as the "Boxers."

The uprising took place against a background of severe drought and the disruption caused by

the growth of foreign spheres of influence. After several months of growing violence against both the foreign and Christian presence in Shandong and the North China plain in June 1900, Boxer fighters, convinced they were invulnerable to foreign weapons, converged on Beijing with the slogan "Support Qing government and exterminate the foreigners." Foreigners and Chinese Christians sought refuge in the Legation Quarter. In response to reports of an armed invasion to lift the siege, the initially hesitant Empress Dowager Cixi supported the Boxers and on June 21 issued an Imperial Decree declaring war on the foreign powers. Diplomats, foreign civilians and soldiers as well as Chinese Christians in the Legation Quarter were placed under siege by the Imperial Army of China and the Boxers for 55 days.

Chinese officialdom was split between those supporting the Boxers and those favouring conciliation, led by Prince Qing. The supreme commander of the Chinese forces, the Manchu General Ronglu (Junglu), later claimed that he acted to protect the besieged foreigners. The Eight-Nation Alliance, after being initially turned back, brought 20,000 armed troops to China, defeated the Imperial Army, and captured Beijing on August 14, lifting the siege of the Legations. Uncontrolled plunder of the capital and the surrounding countryside ensued, along with the summary execution of those suspected of being Boxers. The Boxer Protocol of 7 September 1901 provided for the execution of government officials who had supported the Boxers, provisions for foreign troops to be stationed in Beijing, and 450 million taels of silver—more than the government's annual tax revenue—to be paid as indemnity over the course of the next thirty-nine years to the eight nations involved. The Empress Dowager then sponsored a set of institutional and fiscal changes in an attempt to save the dynasty by reforming it.

During the Boxer Uprising, the district of the Chinese Eastern Railway (KVZhD, or CER) in Manchuria was occupied by Russian troops in 1900. It was because of the Chinese Boxer rebels' attack in June 1900 against Russian builders and military guards, killing about 240 people and injuring more than 1200. In 1903, the CER opened; passenger and freight trains began to run between Port Arthur and Moscow. In Vladivostok, the Steamship Company provided sailings to Korea, Japan and China. Russia established the Wardenship the Far East in Port Arthur, and the Russian government was considering a project of establishing a Cossack troop and a Russian colony in Manchuria, the basis of which was the Kwantung area.¹⁰⁵

As a result of Boxer Uprising, China became even more dependent on foreign countries that affected its political and economic development in the first half of the 20th century, one of its consequences being that the opium sale to China became an almost legal source of profit to Britain, Germany and America.

Let us now pass from Asia to Africa, which in these years witnessed other events of great importance. Both in eastern and in western Africa, on the Nile and on the Niger, the British claims came into collision with those of France, and these disputes at one moment threatened to lead to war.

The first difficulty with which Salisbury's government had to deal was that on the Gold Coast, which had to be guarded as the Ashantis, under King Prembeh, had for some time committed raids and acts of violence against the British. Late in 1895 an expedition was sent up against the

¹⁰⁵ The claims of Japan to Manchuria and Korea, and the refusal of the Russian Empire to withdraw Russian troops in violation of the treaty of alliance with China and Korea led to the Russian-Japanese War of 1904-1905, the theater of which was the entire southern Manchuria to Mukden. According to the Treaty of Portsmouth, the Liaodong Peninsula with the Kwantung area and the Russian Railways from Kuanchentszy (Changchun) to Port Arthur moved to Japan. In the period between 1905 and 1925, Japan strengthened its influence in Inner Manchuria. Later, Japan did not allow the establishment of Chinese control over Manchuria, occupied it and established there a pro-Japanese state of Manchukuo. Since 1933, when Japan withdrew from the League of Nations, giving herself a completely free hand, Manchuria became the springboard for her attack on the USSR, Mongolia and China. The Far East became the first seat of World War II. Manchukuo ceased to exist August 19, 1945, when the plane with the emperor Pu Yi was captured by the paratroopers of the Red Army at the airport of Mukden.

king. He submitted, his people made no resistance, and the country was placed under British control (1896).

Shortly afterwards a British protectorate was declared over the land of Sierra Leone. This country was inhabited by "savage tribes who lived by slave-raiding." Now these tribes made a rising, which was, however, easily suppressed.

About the same time (1897) more serious fighting took place in the Niger valley. As the British historians write, "the massacre of a peaceful mission by the troops of the king of Benin led to the destruction of his power and the abolition of one of the most barbarous governments in Africa." Farther up the river the forces of the Niger Company put an end to another slave-raiding tyranny.

Meanwhile, French explorers, accompanied by small bodies of troops, were penetrating central Africa from various directions — from Algeria, Senegal, and Dahomey. They were anxious to extend the colonial possessions of France, and, like the British, to annex as much as possible of the fruitful Niger valley. It was natural that disputes should arise as to the respective rights and frontiers which had not been established by the treaties made six or seven years before. The question was a complicated one, but at last France and Britain came to an understanding in June 1898, and a large territory of the Lower Niger was given to Britain. The ratification of this treaty, however, was for some time delayed by a still more serious dispute which broke out concerning the upper valley of the Nile.

It is necessary to remember that joint French and English control over Egypt came to an end; that Egypt became a sort of "protectorate" under Britain; and that in 1885 the attempt to reconquer the Sudan — that is, the old dominion of Egypt on the upper Nile — was abandoned.

Since Egypt depends for its prosperity, and even for its existence, on the fertilizing Nile, it was evident that, sooner or later, the reconquest of the Sudan must be undertaken. Wishing to have those lands to themselves, the British claimed that "the control of the upper valley could not be left for ever in the hands of a barbarous power; still less could it be handed over to a powerful European state, which would thus have Egypt at its mercy." It was known that France, never ceasing to regret the mistake she made in 1882, was preparing an expedition with the object to place the French flag on the shores of the Nile. This, Rosebery's government had warned her, could not be allowed.

The event which made the British Government to act was a strong defeat which, in March 1896, the Italians — who had formed a colony on the shores of the Red Sea — suffered at the hands of Menelik, King of Abyssinia. It was such a danger that the Dervishes would be encouraged to attack Egypt, and that Menelik might support the French, and thus prevent British advance up the Nile, and permanently cut off Egypt from the British Empire possessions in Uganda. Accordingly, Rennell Rodd was sent on an embassy to Abyssinia to prevent French negotiations with Menelik.

The Italian outpost was taken over by the British troops, and in the spring of 1896 a large Egyptian force moved southward. In June the Egyptian troops, trained and led by the British, gave a sound beating to the Sudanese Dervishes at Firket. Next year a farther advance was made to Abu Hamed, which place was occupied after a strong fight (August 1897). The railway was built rapidly across the desert, and later in the autumn it was continued as far as Berber. Here gunboats were brought up the river, and preparations were made for the final attack on the "Dervish stronghold." In the spring of 1898 all was ready, and a considerable force of British troops was sent out.

Late in August the final advance began, and on September 2 the Egyptian forces together with the British overthrew the large army. The Arabs and Sudanese fought with splendid courage, but modern arms and military skill were all on the side of their opponents, and the Dervish army was almost annihilated. The few of them who were not killed fled into the desert.

While all Britain was rejoicing over this victory, which, as the British saw it, "restored to

Egypt and to civilization a great and fertile province”, they heard with no little surprise and annoyance that a small French expedition under Captain Marchand, had crossed Africa from the west coast and planted itself on the Nile. Salisbury at once gave the French Government to understand that Captain Marchand must withdraw.

France tried to make his withdrawal conditional upon obtaining concessions elsewhere, but Salisbury refused to discuss the question. Rosebery supported him. This firmness had a proper effect. After two months of anxiety, during which war with France seemed inevitable, the French Government gave way, and Captain Marchand retired by way of Abyssinia.

When this critical question was once settled, and the whole of the upper Nile valley was recognized as being within the "sphere of the British influence", it was not very difficult to come to an understanding on other points. The agreement about Nigeria was ratified in March 1899, and the limits were marked out of the French and British "spheres" in the western Sudan — that is, between the Nile valley and Lake Chad. In the autumn of the same year the Dervish resistance in the Sudan was crushed, and “the work of peaceful development was from that moment carried on without interruption from other internal or external enemies”.

While these things were happening in Egypt and the Sudan, a hard struggle was being carried on by British officials in Uganda, with not very big forces, against several of the native chiefs and some Sudanese troops. That began in 1895, did not end till December of 1898. Meanwhile a railway was being built across deserts and difficult mountains. When this railroad was finished, and peace was established, the great natural resources of Uganda came to be exported from that colony.

In western Africa one more conflict, short but sharp, had still to be fought before the British possession of the Gold Coast became secure. In the summer of 1900 the Ashantis, who had offered no resistance in 1896 revolted, and besieged the British governor with an overwhelming force. A relief column was speedily organized, under James Willcocks, and in the middle of the rainy season fought its way up from the coast in July 1900. The Ashantis were well armed and fought bravely behind stockades; but they were routed in a series of fighting, though not without severe loss on the British side. Order was restored at the end of the summer. One of the most satisfactory features of this affair was that the troops of the British side consisted entirely of the natives, who, trained and led by British officers, dared to meet the Ashantis in the field.

Comprehension questions

1. What was the situation in India and in Afghanistan at the turn of the century?
2. Events in China. The Boxer Uprising and its consequences.
3. The British in Africa: The Gold Coast, Sierra Leone. Niger and the contest of France and Britain for their Nigerian possessions.
4. The British intrigues against France in Egypt and Abyssinia.
5. The British conquest of the upper valley of the Sudan. The division of the French and British "spheres" in the western Sudan between the Nile valley and Lake Chad.
6. The British suppression of the uprising in Uganda.
7. The British crush the resistance of the Ashantis.

Names and expressions

the failure of crops — неурожай

Bombay [bom'bei] — Бомбей

Chitral [tʃit'ra:l] — Читрал

on account of — из-за

Peshawar [pə'ʃɑ:və, pə'ʃauə] — Пешавар

Liaotung ['ljau'duŋ]

Port Arthur ['po:t'a:θə]

with this end in view — имея в виду такой результат
Kiau-Chau [ki'au tʃi'au]
Wei-hai-wei [wei hei wei]
Hong-Kong ['hoŋ'koŋ]
dethroned — лишен трона
Peking [pi:'kiŋ]
Sir Claude Macdonald [mæk'donld]
came to terms — договорились (об условиях)
the Niger ['naɪdʒə] — р. Нигер
Prembeh ['prembih] — Прембех
Sierra Leone ['siərə li'eun] — Сьерра Леоне
Benin [be'ni:n] — Бенин
Algeria [æl'dʒi(ə)riə] — Алжир
Senegal [,seni'go:l] — Сенегал
Dahomey [də'həumi] — Дагомея
still less could it be handed over to a powerful European state - еще хуже было бы, если бы она оказалась в руках могущественного европейского государства
Menelik [mene'lik] — Менелик
Abyssinia [æbi'sniə] — Абиссиния
Firket [fə:kot]
Abu Hamed [ə'bʌ hə'med] — Абу Хамед
Berber [bɜ:bə]
Marchand ['ma:tʃənd] — Марчанд
the French Government gave way — французское правительство уступило
Nigeria [nai'dʒi(ə)riə] — Нигерия
Lake Chad [tʃæd] — оз. Чад
Uganda [ju'gændə] — Уганда
the Ashantis [ə'ʃɑ:ntɪz] — негритянское племя (ашанти)

45. THE SECOND BOER WAR (1899–1902)

As we remember, England had to recognize the independence of the Transvaal Republic. However, it was too coveted a prize to let go. In 1886, the world's richest gold deposits were found in the Transvaal in addition to its diamonds. The country was flooded with immigrants, mostly British, who wanted to work in the mining industry. They were called the "Outlanders" (foreigners). By 1899, the number of Outlanders in the Transvaal reached 200 thousand people (including 159 thousand British, about 15 thousand Germans, the rest of the Dutch, French and others). While the Boers were still living on the farms engaged in agriculture and cattle breeding, the Outlanders concentrated in their hands the gold mining industry and trade in the Transvaal. The diamond mining industry was also in the hands of the British – it had been taken under control by De Beers Consolidated Mines, launched in 1888 after the amalgamation of a number of individual claims. One of its founders was Cecil Rhodes, a British businessman, mining magnate and politician, who served as Prime Minister of the Cape Colony from 1890 to 1896. An ardent believer in British imperialism, Rhodes thought that the English-speaking peoples were "the first race in the world", he advocated vigorous settler colonialism, and ultimately a reformation of the British Empire so that each component would be self-governing and represented in a single parliament in London. Rhodes is known to be an architect of apartheid, as he advocated the governance of the black people as a "subject race". Later Rhodes' British South Africa Company founded the southern African territory of Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe and Zambia), which the company named after him in 1895.



The Government of the Republic of South Africa levied taxes on the Outlanders, in consequence of which the state, which had formerly constantly teetered on the brink of bankruptcy, in ten years increased its revenues more than 11 times. But the Outlanders were displeased with the Boer Government taxation.

In 1895, a plot was hatched in Johannesburg for overturning the Boer Government and securing by force the rights, which the Outlanders were refused. It was arranged with the connivance of Rhodes, then Prime Minister of Cape Colony and

head of the South Africa Company. Dr. Jameson, one of the Company's officials, with a force of police in the service of the South Africa Company, should have been stationed on the western border of the Transvaal to help the insurgents in case of need. The affair, however, was grossly mismanaged, and Dr. Jameson crossed the border on the 29th of December 1895, before the insurgents of Johannesburg were ready. The result was that Jameson and his men — about 500 in number — were defeated and taken prisoners by the Boers on the 2nd of January 1896. The reformers at Johannesburg surrendered, and the whole movement came to a discreditable end.

The Boers gave up Dr. Jameson and his men to the British Government to be tried in England. They were condemned to various penalties, which — at all events in the case of the leaders — seemed scarcely adequate to the offence. The leading reformers were tried at Pretoria and punished by imprisonment and heavy fines. A Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry met in England, and severely asked Rhodes and others for their share in the case; but the inquiry was not so thorough as it might have been, and many persons were dissatisfied with the result.

Meanwhile the Outlanders, in the person of Alfred Milner, who had been made Governor of the Cape, demanded voting rights for the 50,000 British nationals and the 10,000 other nationals in South Africa, even though none of them were at that time South African citizens. The Transvaal's President Paulus Kruger established a nominal five years' franchise — that is, the right to vote after five years' residence in the Transvaal, but there were many limitations in that regulation. For his part, Kruger demanded that Britain should recognize the complete independence of the Republic, submit all disputes to arbitration, and never again interfere in the internal affairs of the Transvaal. Britain, of course, did not wish to accept such conditions. As the British historians put it, in reality the conflict was one between the two races, Dutch and British, for political supremacy in South Africa.

The Second Boer War, or the Boer War of 1899-1902, opened disastrously for Britain, who, thinking the expedition would be a walk-over, sent an army of 28 thousand people, poorly equipped and trained. The Government had entirely miscalculated the forces required to overcome the Boers, armed as they were with the best weapons of that time, able to move on horseback much faster than the British infantry, and holding strong defensive positions in a difficult country. The Boers won victories in the Transvaal and in the Orange River Colony, Ladysmith, Kimberley (where Cecil Rhodes' company mined diamonds) and Mafeking were closely besieged, and no one knew how long they could hold out. Within one week three British armies were defeated and unable to advance a step farther without reinforcements.

The news of the British defeat was spread throughout Europe, and complete failure was generally foretold. But a great effort was made. Seeing that the Boers were a hard nut to crack, Britain sent 120 thousand by the end of 1899 and 450 thousand by the end of the war. Large forces of yeomanry and volunteers were enrolled. Canada, Australia and New Zealand sent

strong military forces, and irregular troops were supplied by the loyal population in Cape Colony and Natal. On December 23 Frederick Roberts left England to take supreme command and was soon joined by Herbert Kitchener from Egypt as his assistant.

On the news of Roberts's advance the Boers began to withdraw from Ladysmith, they gradually gave way, and after a fortnight of incessant fighting Ladysmith was relieved on the 28th of February. The garrison was almost at its last gasp. Had Ladysmith fallen, the result would have resembled that of General Burgoyne's surrender of Saratoga. Its staunch defence "saved South Africa for the British Empire."

Continuing his march across the veld, Roberts entered Bloemfontein on the 13th of March, pushing back the Boers as he advanced. In the capital of the Free State he remained for two months, mastering the country to the southward, and bringing up the necessary supplies for a further movement. This was necessarily a slow business; and the Boers gallantly recovering their spirits after defeat, more than once successfully attacked isolated bodies of the British troops.

Early in May, Rhodes set out again for the Transvaal. On the 16th of May the British vanguard crossed the Vaal. On May 18 an expedition sent from Kimberley relieved Mafeking, after a seven months' siege. On the 5th of June Roberts entered Pretoria. His way had lain over fairly open country, and there was frequent fighting. About 4,000 British prisoners were found near Pretoria and released. The march from Bloemfontein to Pretoria had been rapid, and Roberts was forced to wait for nearly six weeks till sufficient supplies had been brought up to enable him to make a further advance.

In September Kruger left for Europe, in the hope of obtaining foreign intervention — but his hope was not fulfilled. By this time all the main lines of railway were in hands of the British, and the Boer forces were broken up into small bodies. The government saw the opportunity in the moment for dissolving Parliament, which had now lasted for five years. But the war was not over still, although it had changed its character.

As there was no prospect of great operations, Roberts left South Africa in December 1900, handing over the completion of his task to Kitchener. It proved a very hard one. The two republics - Transvaal and the Orange Republic - together were nearly as large as France, and the vast size of the country, the barrenness and ruggedness of large parts of it, the want of communications, the rapidity with which the mounted Boers, added by the country population, moved about the country, the rebellion of the Dutch against the British in Cape Colony — all these things made the work of subduing a brave, obstinate, and wily enemy very slow, laborious, and costly. But on the whole, in spite of their resistance, the war went steadily against the Boers. The English burnt down their farms and drove away their cattle. The Boers resorted to guerrilla war, and then, to prevent helping the partisans, the Englishmen placed the Boer women and children in barren desert pens, fenced by barbed wire, where many (4,177 women and 22,074 children under sixteen¹⁰⁶) sickened and died of hunger and privations. It was the Boer War of 1899-1902 that gave the world the first concept of a concentration camp.

The Boer effort to fight the invaders was seriously weakened by the fact that the Boers (who despised the aboriginal population) did not use the help of the native Bechuana tribes in their struggle. In 1902 Transvaal and the Orange Free State became British colonies and were included in the British Empire.

Comprehension questions

1. Why did immigrants flood the Transvaal Republic? Who took possession of the gold and diamond industries in the republic?
2. Speak about Cecil Rhodes. Explain the term "settler imperialism". What is apartheid?

¹⁰⁶Totten, Samuel; Bartrop, Paul R. (2008). Concentration Camps, South African War. Dictionary of Genocide. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press. pp. 84–85.

3. The 1895 plot in Johannesburg and its consequences.
4. What rights did the Outlanders demand and what regulation did Paulus Kruger introduce? What did he demand for his part?
5. The beginning of the Boer War of 1899-1902.
6. The advance of the British army.
7. The British defeat the Boers. Kitchener's ordeal as commander-in-chief.
8. Boers' guerrilla fighting and the imprisonment of Boer civilians in concentration camps.
9. The outcome of the Second Anglo-Boer War.

Names and expressions

- an empty name** — пустые слова; только на словах
- that of the Transvaal** = the government of the Transvaal
- Damaraland** [dæmə're'lænd]
- Namaqualand** [næ'mækwo'lænd]
- Bechuanaland** [bat'ʃu'anə'lænd] — Бечуанленд
- Zambesi (Zambezi)** [zæm'bi:zi] — р. Замбези
- all the chance of expansion towards the river Zambesi (would be) destroyed** — уничтожится всякая возможность экспансии в сторону реки Замбези
- Charles Warren** [wɔrən]
- Cecil Rhodes** [rəʊdz] (1853-1902)
- Limpopo** [lim'pəʊpəʊ]
- Kruger** ['kru:gər]
- the Matabeles** ['mætəbɛls]
- took up arms** — взяли за оружие
- Amatongaland** [æmə'to:ngə'lænd]
- Swaziland** ['swa:zilænd]
- Witwatersrand** [wit'wo:təz'rænd]
- Johannesburg** [ˌdʒəʊ ænis'bɜ:g]
- Pretoria** [pri'to:riə]
- and who, if permitted to vote, would have swamped the Dutch settlers at the polling-booths** — и которые, если дать им право голоса, превысят числом голландцев в избирательных кабинках
- Dundee** [dʌn'di:]
- Kimberley** ['kimbəli]
- a difficult country** — страна с тяжелыми природными условиями
- Paardeberg** [pa:də'bɛg]
- Bloemfontein** [blu:mfo:n'tein]
- the Vaal** [va:l] — Вааль, или Ваал — река, давшая название Трансваалю
- the Boer forces were broken up into small bodies** — силы буров были разбиты, от них остались только небольшие отряды
- the opportunity of the moment for** — в этот момент наступил удобный случай для...
- the settlement of South Africa** — устройство дел в Южной Африке (т. е. распределение владений)
- it proved a very hard one** — one = situation
- to use the opportunity** — использовать удобный случай (возможность)

46. SOCIAL LIFE IN THE LATE 19TH C. DEVELOPMENT OF PERIODICALS, TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS AND CLASS RELATIONS

The political events of the second half of the 19th c. are, of course, very important as giving a clue to the political conditions under which the twentieth century began; but there were also non-political movements, which are also of great consequence for understanding properly the state of English society of that age. Indeed the British owe the interest taken in politics to one of the most powerful social influence of the time — the cheap newspaper: and the newspaper could not have reached the great influence if not the passing of the Elementary Education Act 1870, which established the foundations of English elementary education. So that here at least we have an example of a close connection between legislation and social progress, for the cheap newspaper and periodical, coming in the wake of elementary education, brought about a taste of reading which, in its turn, resulted in the establishment of free libraries supported by the public rates.

By the way, the press at the time was developing in all Europe, thus in the 19th c. periodicals were issued in Russia as well. There were differences, too: while in Britain and her colonies newspapers were published in English, in Russia the government founded newspapers in local languages, even if literacy in those regions was low. In Tbilisi, for example, since the 1830s the Tpilisis Utskebani (Tbilisi Gazette) was released in Georgian and the Tiflis Ehbari in Azerbaijani. In Central Asia, since 1870 Turkistan News began to come out, first in Turkmen, later in Uzbek (Chagatai) and Kazakh. Private periodicals sometimes appeared before official ones (in Georgian - since 1819) and sometimes later (in Azerbaijani - since 1875). The government did not interfere in the private press, unless it touched the foundations of the state. Books and periodicals were produced on a regular basis in more than 20 languages, in larger quantities – in Russian, Polish, the Baltic languages, Yiddish, Tatar, Armenian, Ukrainian, Georgian.

In the 18th c. many mechanical inventions had been made. The 19th c. is above all the period when science was applied to practical uses. The American steamship SS Savannah crossed the Atlantic in 1819; and in 1825 George Stephenson's "Rocket" was launched. The application of the steam engine to locomotion is the especial characteristic of the time.

Towards the end of the 19th c. electricity was beginning to take the place of steam on suburban lines in England, and to be used for tramways, while petrol was found cheaper for driving engines, or motors on ordinary roads. Apart from traction, electricity was found useful for many purposes. The electric telegraph was in fairly full operation as early as in 1845, although it was not till 1870 that the lines passed into the control of the Post Office as a national service. The electric telephone had passed through the same phase of private ownership since its establishment in England in 1880 and was also taken over by the Post Office service. One other use of electricity, for lighting, was spread rapidly at the beginning of the twentieth century.

These mechanical inventions, which we are apt to take for granted, had the most important effects upon the social life. They have, for instance, undoubtedly helped to stimulate that crowding of the rural population into the towns, which had been begun by the industrial revolution of the 18th c., and to encourage emigration. Distant countries and their produce, either as food or raw material, have been brought much nearer; and while the abundant raw materials had brought prosperity to the towns, abundant foreign corn had depressed native agriculture in England, and so helped to depopulate the countryside. The sudden crowding of the towns brought evils of its own; as we have seen, factory and other industrial Acts, often strongly resisted by the manufacturers and mine-owners, were required to regulate the conditions of labour; and elementary precautions against bad sanitation and housing were secured only by Parliament's interference.

Capital and Labour. It was inevitable that under the ill-organized conditions of industry disputes should arise between the employers and the employed. It was partly owing to the stormy

times of the revolutionary wars at the beginning of the century that all societies or clubs in the poorer ranks of society were regarded with suspicion, and no doubt the earlier trade-unions were distinctly political. This feeling of suspicion came to a head in 1866, when a Royal Commission brought to light a series of outrages, including murder, which had been perpetrated at Sheffield seven years before by agents of these unions. In 1875 and 1876, however, measures were passed which by legalising peaceful methods of combination greatly increased their power and influence, although the disastrous resort of "strikes" still remained their chief means for securing better conditions of labour. One of the most notable of these strikes occurred in 1889, when the dock labourers of London ceased work, it is memorable not only for the widespread sympathy with which it was viewed by the public, but as marking the origin of a new (labour) party in the state. From this time too may be dated a great development of the idea of municipal trading, and a general tendency to provide public services, such as baths, libraries, and trams, from local rates. This extended local interest in the well-being of the community may be taken as a prelude to that wider interference of the state itself in industrial affairs which later on had resulted in old-age pensions and in state insurance against sickness and unemployment. If the 19th c. were memorable for nothing else, it would be memorable for this — that at its close many thoughtful men had come to the conclusion that England's wealth is to be reckoned by the well-being to *all* her citizens, and that to ensure this well-being the nation must try to equalise opportunities and to redistribute burdens in order to lighten the lot of those who, by their lifelong labour, are the real creators of the nation's prosperity.

Comprehension questions

1. The development of the press in late 19th c.
2. The mechanical inventions and their influence on social life.
3. The relations between capital and labour.

Names and expressions

very important as giving a clue — очень важно, чтобы дать ключ к пониманию

the widespread interest taken in politics that the English owe one of the most powerful social influence of the time — широкая заинтересованность в политике, которой англичане обязаны одному из важнейших социальных могущественных воздействий эпохи (то есть периодической печати)

the electric telegraph was in fairly full operation — электротелеграф действовал всюду

of great consequence - важный, имеющий большое значение

unless it touched the foundations of the state - если это не касалось основ государственности

application of the steam engine to locomotion - применение парового двигателя в транспортных средствах

the sudden crowding of the towns — внезапно наступившее перенаселение городов

brought evils of its own — само по себе несло зло

a series — целый ряд (не серия!)

may be dated — может быть датирован(а)

state insurance — государственное страхование

47. BRITISH ART IN THE 19TH C.

In 1848, as revolutions swept continental Europe and Chartism - an uprising for social reform - unsettled Britain, seven rebellious young artists in London formed a secret society with the aim of creating a new British art. The group was founded in 1848 by such English painters, poets, and critics, as William Holman Hunt, John Everett Millais and Dante Gabriel Rossetti. The three

founders were joined by William Michael Rossetti, James Collinson, Frederic George Stephens and Thomas Woolner to form the seven-member "brotherhood."



Dante Gabriel Rossetti The Girlhood of Mary Virgin 1848–9. The picture is full of symbolic details. The palm branch on the floor and thorny briar rose on the wall allude to Christ's Passion, the lilies to the Virgin's purity, and the books to the virtues of hope, faith and charity. The dove represents the Holy Spirit.

They called themselves the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, and the name, whose precise origin is contested, nevertheless indicates the chief source of their inspiration. Disenchanted with contemporary academic painting — most of them were colleagues at the Royal Academy of Art and famously disparaged the Academy's founding president, Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723–1792), as "Sir Sloshua"— the Brotherhood instead emulated the art of late medieval and early Renaissance Europe until the time of Raphael, an art characterized by minute description of detail, a luminous palette of bright colours that recalls the tempera paint used by medieval artists, and subject matter of a noble, religious, or moralizing nature. In mid-nineteenth-century England, a period marked by political upheaval, mass industrialization, and social ills, the Brotherhood at its inception strove to transmit a message of artistic renewal and moral reform by imbuing their art with seriousness, sincerity, and truth to nature.

John Ruskin, an outstanding art critic and aesthete, an ardent supporter of the Pre-Raphaelites, defended them in his "Modern Painters" where he wrote that their works in finish of drawing and splendour of colour were the best work in the Royal Academy. When Ruskin saw that the Pre-Raphaelites were virtually committing themselves to decadence he broke off with them. His views were more in common with those of the outstanding poet and artist William Morris (1834-1896). Morris was a great admirer of Rossetti's poetry and medieval Gothic art. Like Ruskin he was estranged from the Pre-Raphaelites when decadent traits became apparent in their work. Inspired by Ruskin's views on medieval art he turned to decorative art which in his view was a mighty means of cultivating the popular masses' artistic tastes. Sickened by the ugliness of the Victorian machine-made products he founded the firm of Morris and Company for the making of furniture, wallpaper, tapestry and stained glass. His desire was to restore the handiwork crafts of the Middle Ages, which he had idealized in his poems. Morris also indirectly influenced architecture, particularly domestic architecture. The movement had won many adherents and influenced the decorative art in other countries. Morris regarded labour as a joyful creative process, beauty for him had not only an aesthetic but also a moral value. He went so far as to open schools of handicraft art for workers' children. His ideas of aesthetic education were essentially democratic.

Comprehension questions

1. Speak on the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood and its main artists.

Names and expressions

the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood - братство прерафаэлитов

Disenchanted with contemporary academic painting - разочарованы в современной академической живописи

disparage - принижать

emulated the art of late medieval and early Renaissance Europe - подражали искусству позднего средневековья и раннего возрождения Европы
minute description of detail - мельчайшее изображение деталей
a luminous palette of bright colours that recalls the tempera paint used by medieval artists - светящаяся палитра ярких цветов, которая напоминает краску темперы, используемой средневековыми художниками
marked by political upheaval - отмечены политическими потрясениями
at its inception - с самого начала
imbuing their art with seriousness, sincerity, and truth to nature - насыщая свое искусство серьезностью, искренностью и правдоподобием
when decadent traits became apparent in their work - когда в их работе проявились декадентские черты
to restore the handiwork crafts - восстановить ремесла ручной работы

48. BRITISH LITERATURE OF THE 19TH C.

Romanticists



George Gordon Byron

The 19th century in literature began with Romanticism, which was in fact connected with the negative attitude of various social layers to the way of life that the post-industrial-revolution bourgeoisie created. The social and political trends of the time contradicted the Enlighteners' idea of Man as a powerful and reasonable being. Now that reactionary forces were getting stronger, man looked more like a toy tossed here and there by supernatural forces.

Romanticists made a point of contrasting the romantic ideal to reality, the lofty flight of spirit to the earthy prosaic life of petty calculation and boredom, limited outlook and utter practicality. The real, materialistic bourgeois world was to be ignored, abstract ideals

and romantic natures with titanic passions were extolled. There were two trends opposed to each other in Romanticism.

The first trend was represented by the poets of the Lakes School, or the Lake Poets: William Wordsworth, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, and Robert Southey. An outburst of literary energy begins with the publication of the "Lyrical Ballads" by Wordsworth and Coleridge in 1798. This was the beginning of the English Romanticism. William Wordsworth loved the natural world; he loved to hear and tell stories of simple people and sought a style suitable to their feelings and condition. He also wrote many beautiful sonnets about England as well as of other countries of Europe. The main poems by Coleridge are "The Rhyme of the Ancient Mariner", "Christabel", "Kubla Khan", "Dejection". He considered imagination for a great creative force, and he came to believe that everyday language was not always the best language for poetry; and in this he differed from Wordsworth but on the whole their discussions were to the great good to poetry on the whole.

Somehow connected to the above poets were John Keats and Walter Scott. The works of Keats, whose "Endymion" and "Hyperion" display the enormous love of beauty with which the literature of Greece inspired him, were all created within the short space of four years — from 1817 to 1821, when he died. In 1802 he edited the "Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border" — he placed in this edition many of the popular ballads of old, which he himself collected, and often

wrote down the texts just from the mouths of the old people reciting and singing them. In 1803 Scott published a new volume of the "Minstrelsy", and there were some portion of the ballads composed by himself, "The Eve of Saint John" and others. After that, in rapid succession, Scott wrote several long poems concerning the English and Scottish history, his favourite subject — "The Lay of the Last Minstrel", "Marmion", "The Lady of the Lake" and others. These volumes, if they did not represent poetry of the first rank, were full of romance and imagination. But Scott's greatest work is to be found in the wonderful series of historical novels which began with "Waverley" in 1814 (perhaps most famous of them are "Ivanhoe" (1820) and "Quentin Durward" (1823)), and only ended with his death in 1832. These stories, full of action, humour, and character, described for ever the picturesque past, and had an influence on later writers which at the beginning of the twentieth century became even stronger.

The second trend was represented by the greatest revolutionary Romanticists George Gordon Byron (1788-1824) and Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792-1822), whose works were influenced by the French Revolution. While the poems by S. T. Coleridge — the "Rhyme of the Ancient Mariner" (1798) and "Christabel" were animated with rare expression and a vivid sense of the supernatural, Byron strikes a different note: the romance is there, but it is animated by the spirit of revolt, resentment. The central problem of Byron's poetry is actually the contrast between the romantic ideal and the bourgeois reality. He indulges in philosophical and political reflections in "Childe Harold's Pilgrimage" (1812-1818), where he sounds by turns heroic, passionate or bitterly sarcastic with deep lyricism beautifully colouring the whole in the ringing of Spenserian stanzas, creating the image of a disappointed and passive observer of injustice, oppression and tyranny reigning in the world. Byron's literary activity was enormous indeed, and between 1812 and his death in 1824 poem after poem — such as "Childe Harold", "Giaour", "Corsair", "Lara", "Manfred", "The Prisoner of Chillon" and "Don Juan" — made his poetical fluency, his brilliant wit, and his rebellious opinions known throughout the length and breadth of Europe.

Byron did not go further than expressing his bourgeois-democratic aspirations, but Shelley went so far as to actually voice the socialist ideals and interests of the workers. Shelley, that "prophet of genius", and Byron with his passionate and bitter way of satirizing contemporary society, enjoyed the greatest popularity among the working-class readers. Beginning with his first poem, "Queen Mab" (1813), a vision reminding one of William Langland's "The Vision of Piers the Ploughman", to "The Cenci" (1819), where he recognizes violence as a way of fighting tyrants, Shelley shows contemporary society as a combination of feudal violence and imperfect civilization. He prophesied a future of happiness, peace and fraternity. Shelley displays more spiritual vein than his great contemporary, published his melodious poems — "Alastor", "The Revolt of Islam", "Adonais", "The Cloud", "The Skylark", and many others— between 1816 and 1822.

The most prominent poets of the Chartists were William James Linton (1812-1897), Ernest Jones (1819-1869) and Gerald Massey (1828-1907). The lines of Ernest Jones "The Song of the Lower Classes" became world famous.

Critical realists

The critical realists of the 1840s and early fifties approached the characters they created from social viewpoints typifying them as representatives of the bourgeoisie, aristocracy, proletarians or peasants, petty officials or clergymen. Their realism was a step further as compared to the Enlighteners' realism, for it answered Frederick Engels' definition of realism implying, alongside with truthfulness of the details, the truthfulness of typical characters under typical circumstances. Their greatness is equally seen in their satirical portrayal of the bourgeoisie, in the depiction of the greed and hypocrisy of the ruling classes and in their sympathetic description of the suffering multitude. They are great in their humanism and they are great in their hatred of the oppressors.

Of all the constellation of the 19th century critical realists Charles Dickens (1812-1869), was

the greatest, with his humorous pictures drawn from the humbler ranks of society and his vivid sense of social wrongs. However, William Makepeace Thackeray might be thought a still more severe exposé of the vices of contemporary society or rather, of its top layer ("Vanity Fair", 1847-1848). Charlotte Brontë, or Currer Bell (her pseudonym), describes the hell of charity school run by pious clergymen and shows the narrow-minded philistines passing for the aristocracy of the land ("Jane Eyre", 1847). Her sister Emily Brontë showed strong passions and constant hearts - lovers, defying the bourgeois world and perishing in the world of property ("Wuthering Heights", 1847).

During the early decades of the century, Miss Austen was publishing her delicate studies of English provincial life, full of gentle humour and subtle insight. Elizabeth Gaskell pictured the terrible conditions under which the toilers of 19th c. England lived and worked and died as a consequence of bitter exploitation — and a cause of the Chartist movement.

In the 1850s and 60s the novel of critical realism succumbs to political reaction and declines. The works of George Eliot (1819-1880), Anthony Trollope (1815-1882) are no longer centred round the problem of class contradictions. The criticism of the privileged classes, the portrayal of the petty interests and stagnant lives of English provincial society that form the essence of George Eliot's work ("The Mill on the Floss", 1860, "Adam Bede", 1859, "Silas Marner", 1861) accompanied by fine realistic pictures of customs and manners, are mild and harmless.

Victorian literature

In the second half of the 19th century Alfred Tennyson (1809-1892), Robert Browning (1812-1889) created beautiful poetry of humanism. Tennyson was a fifteen-year-old boy when he ran passionately and could not stop till he almost suffocated, and then he wrote on a white cliff, "Byron is dead"; Tennyson, who in his romantic side, drank from the fountain unsealed by Scott, but who, in his exquisite sense of form and the charm of words, is exceeded by no other English poet save Milton; Tennyson, who combines patriotism with philosophy, modern science with the belief in a future life, and yet remains a poet throughout. His early poems, published in 1830-1832, were influenced by Keats and other poets. Quite original are "Morte d'Arthur" and "Ulysses", published in 1842, "The Princess" (1847). They were followed by "Maud" (1855), a lyric drama of passion, and by "The Idyls of the King" (1859), in which the old legends of King Arthur and his knights are revived in the light of modern thought and morality.

About the year 1870 a new school of poets arose, in Dante Gabriel Rossetti (1828-1882), Algernon Charles Swinburne (1837-1909) and William Morris (1834-1896), who turned their backs on philosophy and the deeper problems of humanity, and sought refuge in art, emotion, or the simple legends of a primitive world.

At the end of the 19th c. realistic and anti-realistic trends struggled in English literature. Truthful and convincing pictures of contemporary England were created by George Meredith (1828-1909), Samuel Butler (1835-1902), Thomas Hardy (1840-1928). Other writers while no less talented, escaped from the vital problems of social reality to a world of adventure (Robert Louis Stevenson, 1850-1894) or the "ivory tower" of decadent beauty (Oscar Wilde, 1856-1900).

Comprehension questions

1. Speak on the British Romanticists.
2. Representatives of Critical Realists in Britain.
3. Give an account of Victorian literature.

Names and expressions

Wordsworth ['wɜːdswɜːð] — Вордсворт

Coleridge ['kɒləridʒ] — Кольридж

sought a style suitable to their feelings and condition — искал стиль, подходящий для

выражения их чувств и условий жизни

Southey ['sauθi] — Саути

"**The Rhyme of the Ancient Mariner**" — "Сказание о старом мореходе"

"**Christabel**" ['kristəbel] — "Кристабель"

"**Kubla Khan**" ['ku:blə kan] — "Кубла Хан"

He considered imagination for a great creative force — он считал воображение великой творческой (созидательной) силой

"**Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border**" — "Песни шотландской границы"

"**The Eve of Saint John**" — "Вечер накануне Иванова дня", эта баллада широко известна в России в переводе В. А. Жуковского под названием "Замок Смальгольм, или Иванов вечер"

"**The Lay of the Last Minstrel**" — "Песнь последнего менестреля"

"**Marmion**" ['ma:miən] — "Мармион"

"**The Lady of the Lake**" — "Дева озера"

"**Waverley**" ['weivəli] — "Уэверли"

"**Childe Harold**" [tʃaɪld 'hær(ə)ld] — "Чайльд Гарольд"

"**The Giaour**" ['dʒaʊə] — "Гяур"

"**Alastor**" [ə'læsto:] — "Аластор"

"**Adonais**" [ədo'nəɪ] — "Адонаис"

"**Endymion**" [en'dimiən] — "Эндимион"

"**Hyperion**" [hai'pi(ə)riən] — "Гиперион"

"**The Prelude**" — "Прелюдия"

"**The Excursion**" — "Прогулка"

Austen ['o:stin] — Остин

"**Morte d'Arthur**" (French) — "Смерть Артура"

"**Ulysses**" [ju:'lisi:z] — "Улисс"

"**Maud**" [mo:d] — "Мод"

"**The Idyls of the King**" — "Королевские идиллии"

Browning [brauniŋ] — Браунинг

Thackeray ['ðækri] — Теккерей

Dante Gabriel Rossetti — Данте Габриэль Россетти

Swinburne [swinbɜ:n] — Суинберн

48. SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY IN THE 17th-19th CC.

In the 17th-19th cc. the traditions of advanced thinkers of the feudal epoch including English scientists such as Roger Bacon, Duns Scott and others, were further developed. It was the time of experiment and new thought, changing men's ideas of the constitution of the world.

Most of the physiological discussion of the 17th c. turned on the vital processes of animals and those of man. Galileo's thermometer was adapted to clinical purposes. The microscopic research of the 17th c. was really striking. Investigators of the front rank busied themselves with microscopic investigations of the structure and behaviour of living things. The microscope revealed minute organisms hitherto unknown, vast and unsuspected regions of forms of life and the infinitely complex structure of even the minutest living things, whose very existence had not been conceived.

The 17th c. science had great predecessors. Nicolaus Copernicus (1473-1543) formulated a model of the universe that placed the Sun rather than the Earth at the center of the universe. G. Bruno (1548-1600) proclaimed a universe of world beyond world, in which all place and all motion were relative, the stars were not fixed, and the universe had no bounds. Johann Kepler discovered three empirical laws, based on the 20 years of astronomical observations of Mercury, Venus and Mars by Tycho Brahe.

In the early 18th c., Isaac Newton (1643-1727) developed mechanics, which give the directions to the development of physical sciences in the modern era. He combined the idea of the Copernican solar system, Kepler's planetary orbits based on Tycho Brahe's precise observations, Galileo Galilei's experimental results and the concepts of momentum by René Descartes. Newton showed how the complex movements of celestial bodies were in relation to the natural succession of the earthly phenomena. His achievement lies in the discovery that the force that causes objects to fall is that which keeps the planets in their paths. Due to Newton the universe acquired an independent rationality, quite unrelated to the spiritual order or to anything outside itself. The cosmology of theologians Plato, Aristotle and Augustine was doomed. He assumed that the force which kept the moon in her orbit was none other than terrestrial attraction. The period of the moon's revolution round the earth and the dimensions of the orbit could be estimated, as well as its velocity. The impact of Newton's revolutionary discovery became apparent only in the 18th c. With Newton there set in an age of scientific determinism. This was the profoundest break with all for which the Middle Ages stood.

The 18th c. was also the age of the development of chemistry. Mikhail Lomonosov (1711-1765) developed the molecular-kinetic theory of heat, anticipated the modern concept of the structure of matter and many fundamental laws, including one of the laws of thermodynamics. In 1756 Lomonosov held the famous experiments on the burn-off of metals in a closed vessel, which gave proof of conservation of matter in chemical reactions and the combustion processes: the observed increase in weight associated with the baking of metals and explained it by their reaction with the air. The French chemist Antoine Lavoisier emphasized the role oxygen plays in combustion, recognized and named oxygen and hydrogen. Lavoisier helped construct the metric system, predicted the existence of silicon, established that sulphur was an element rather than a compound. Lomonosov and Lavoisier opposed the phlogiston theory commonly accepted in that time.

As the 18th century turned into the 19th, the question of the innate constitution of matter was again in the focus of scientific thought. The investigators of the previous century had great difficulty in obtaining substances in a pure state. The situation was conducive to further development of natural sciences and technological inventions. One of the founders of electrical engineering was Heinrich Lenz, a Russian-Baltic-German physicist. Michael Faraday discovered electromagnetic induction, James Joule evolved the caloric theory, James Maxwell gave his electromagnetic theory of light which proved the existence of electromagnetic waves spreading with the speed of light. The great Russian chemist Dmitri Mendeleev discovered the periodic law of chemical elements, one of the fundamental laws of the universe, essential for all natural science. His period table of elements brought chemistry into a new phase and made it possible to prophesy the existence and properties of elements then undiscovered, but subsequently isolated. In St. Petersburg the Russian physicist and electrical engineer Alexander Popov demonstrated the radio invented by him (1895). Certain achievements could be observed in the investigation of microstructures. The microscope became an essential instrument of the biological science and the intensive study of microscopic organisms and analysis of larger forms were made possible.

Extension of scientific interest in the study of animal function resulted in the birth of a new science which was called physiology. The exponents of this science were primarily preoccupied with its medical applications. The results of the observations had been portentous and had given rise to the picture of the animal machine which affected the current conception of the nature of man.

For many British philosophical teachings of the 17th -19th centuries the ideology of Protestantism, which implied a personal choice of activity "on all available fronts", became the cornerstone. The Protestant activism was later related by the German philosopher and sociologist Max Weber to the spirit of capitalism. The fervour of individualistic Protestant activism was to a large extent responsible for the development of industries and trade, for creating new science and technology, for the expansion on vast geographical spaces and cultural achievements. It also

gave momentum to European thought, expanding the boundaries of human understanding of the world and human power.

However, the Protestant ethic bore some irreconcilable contradictions. Firstly, there was a fundamental contradiction between the Protestant individual freedom granted to man by the highest divine authority and the scope of the "contractual" worldly institutions of the State and Law, limiting this freedom. Secondly, since Protestantism insisted that a human being was free in all his actions and, at the same time, another world and retribution were predestined for each person, the transcendental principle, the idea of God, of reward and retribution were not relevant in actual everyday life. Therefore, in the real world, God's testament could be followed but formally. Thirdly, free individual choices uncovered massive and very violent conflicts of individual human wills. These wills, unbridled by anything except individuals' own ideas about good and reasonable manner, constantly clashed. In Protestantism there was no reliable mechanism of curbing active individual wills. This contradiction was exacerbated by the extinction of the religious fervour of Protestantism, by the weakening of its rigid religious and moral norms. This essentially broadened the scope of "the acceptable" for individual activism. Fourthly, in a society as a historically very inert system, traditions and morals, sacred for the masses, were preserved and reproduced in their living actuality, despite all the changes.

Many subjects of this morality saw all too obvious contradictions between the existing legal framework and their own notion of justice. In particular, they saw the inequality by origin, birth, wealth and social status. That inequality was glaring, and it categorically denied the principles of the original equality of individuals, which was laid at the foundation of religious and secular modernity. And, alongside with inequality, they saw new non-religious individualism as the requirement to recognize the absolute right of an individual, his freedom and independence from the state and society, from moral and social restrictions, save the restrictions included in the scope of legal prohibitions. This ran contrary to the traditional religious notions of justice and enhanced social chaos.

In an attempt to resolve these contradictions, Modern Times philosophers devised their theories and doctrines. The founder of the British political philosophy Thomas Hobbes (1588 – 1679) spoke of rational individuals, pursuing their self-interest and waging "a war of all against all", and the State as the source of good governance. In 1651, during the English Civil War, Hobbes wrote his book "Leviathan", which established the social contract theory. In this book, he joins the Machiavellian criticism of the Utopian tradition and refuses to seek for a good society. Hobbes replaces the traditional opposition "natural state / divine grace," with the opposition "natural state / civil society." No longer divine grace, but good governance and, hence, civil society can become a cure for diseases of the natural state, which, according to Hobbes, is entirely guided by passions. The natural state of humans is the "war of all against all", the struggle for existence. Hobbes understands the disastrous nature of the war of all against all for the human race. Therefore, he believes that it is necessary to restrain the animal beginning, knowing that it can be just about restraint, rather than the total overcoming of this beginning. This animal beginning should be restrained by the mind. The mind of an individual cannot work here, rather, a collective intelligence, endowed with mighty force - the State - is needed for this. The State introduces certain limits to the bestial struggle for existence. At the same time, the State has enough wisdom to understand that a beast in man need not be overwhelmed but used - by introducing certain boundaries for its activism. Then the controlled competition at the marketplace may contribute to the development of the society. The State, for its part, is the result of a contract ("social contract") between people that puts an end to the natural state.

Hobbes was a champion of absolutism, he thought that the monarch was best fit to cope with the problems of maintaining civil peace. At the same time he was also the founder or developer of some of the concepts of European liberal thought: the right of the individual; the natural equality of all men; the artificial character of the political order (which led to the later distinction

between civil society and the State); the view that all legitimate political power must be "representative" and based on the consent of the people; and a liberal interpretation of law which leaves people free to do whatever the law does not explicitly forbid.

Later John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau and others in their writings justified the State of law based on the principles of social contract. They sought to elaborate the legal rules to regulate the social, economic and other relations between individuals. Philosophers, politicians and lawyers continually changed, refined and detailed the framework of laws, passing on to the principle "everything which is not forbidden is allowed."

John Locke (1632 – 1704), an English philosopher and physician, continued in the strain of Hobbes. He is regarded as the father of classical Western liberalism. His contributions to classical republicanism and liberal theory are reflected in the United States Declaration of Independence. Locke also understands civilian rule as "true freedom from the inconvenience of the natural state." But he focuses on an individual more than society and the State. Locke believes each individual entrusts their natural powers to community. He sharply criticises the subordination agreement and absolute monarchy. Locke's rupture with the theories of "divine right" of kings and popes was radical. An absolute monarchy cuts itself off from the civil society, ceases to be a part of it. Like Hobbes, Locke sees the foundation of natural law in the instinct of self-preservation of the individual. He emphasizes that a person's right to preserve themselves trumps any duties they may have. Locke interprets the desire for self-preservation as the desire for preservation of one's property in the first place. Locke considers property to be the most sacred right of all — so sacred that he explains the rights of personal freedom on the ground that man has a right of property in his person. Later William Blackstone (1765-69), alongside of personal security and personal liberty, included the right of property among the three absolute rights "inherent in every Englishman." Then, the first articles of the Virginia Bill of Rights of 1776 pointed "to enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property." Thence arises "the inviolable and sacred right to property", securing the capitalist right to acquisition of gain from other people's wage-labour.

Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), an English philosopher and jurist, founded a new theory which was developed in later days by J. S. Mill and F. Place. He is regarded as the founder of modern utilitarianism. Bentham defined as the "fundamental axiom" of his philosophy the principle that "it is the greatest happiness of the greatest number that is the measure of right and wrong". He became a leading theorist in Anglo-American philosophy of law, and a political radical whose ideas influenced the development of welfarism. He advocated individual and economic freedom, the separation of church and state, freedom of expression, equal rights for women, the right to divorce, and the decriminalisation of homosexuality. He called for the abolition of slavery, the abolition of the death penalty, and the abolition of physical punishment, including that of children. He was also an early advocate of animal rights. Though strongly in favour of the extension of individual legal rights, he opposed the idea of natural law and natural rights, calling them "nonsense upon stilts." Being a contemporary of Malthus and his colleagues in the same intellectual group of the East India Company, an aristocrat from a family of staunch supporters of the Tories, Bentham was perceived quite sympathetically in left-wing circles because of his principle of the "greatest happiness" as a policy criterion, the idea of the social contract and the humanization of the penal system. Deducing the driving principles of human actions from two independent motives - pleasure and pain, Bentham with his utilitarian theory anticipated Freud.

Let's dwell on Malthusian theory, which has become a popular stance with the English-speaking population. Thomas Malthus (1766-1834) – an English scientist, cleric¹⁰⁷, demographer

¹⁰⁷Malthus was ordained for ministry by the Anglican Church in 1788, which, remarkably, did not require formal faith in God.

and economist - took the baton from Hobbes. In 1798, Malthus published his famous book *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, in which parallels between animal and man were drawn even clearer than by Hobbes. Man, like the animal, is fighting for means of subsistence, but unlike animals, man is able to build up this livelihood by using his mind, technology, and so on. The struggle between animals for subsistence goes on under conditions where the overall means do not change. Accordingly, animals cannot outbalance their births and deaths, prescribed by the permanence of the means of subsistence, for which they fight. Man, however, can increase his livelihood. Therefore, the natural balance of births and deaths is not enough for him and such regulators are applied to humankind as epidemic, wars, famine.

Malthus hit upon the idea that food production increases arithmetically while population increases exponentially. The problem for Malthus and his acolytes was that they have failed to understand that the question of population and resources is not a zero-sum game. In each and every generation since Malthus first wrote his treatise, human ingenuity has developed technologies and techniques that have helped to expand the arable land for farming and agriculture and increased the number of crops that can be grown in each acre, even as the number of people required to work that land has fallen.

Then, in the afterglow of some modern scientific discoveries, another mistake of Malthus has revealed itself: it is true that the more hard-put the population, the harder its struggle for survival and the meager its subsistence, the more it is apt to procreate offspring extensively, but when it reaches the level of repletion and even surfeit of food, high safety and comfort, it is apt to stop procreating. Repletion and safety combined with a more or less large population density and low infant mortality block and frustrate the work of marriage-parent instincts. It manifests itself in a decrease in interest in full-scale family life and upbringing of children, in the distortion of parental feelings. At the same time, a full and safe life activates an instinct of self-nurturing and indulgence. It has already been observed with some reptiles and classes of animals above them. If we take the humankind, the example of the many wealthy countries might be also taken as a proof thereof.

And yet, over 200 years later, the Malthusians of our own time continue to argue that the same disaster that has failed to arrive for two centuries is now just around the corner. Every generation a new group of Malthusians or neo-Malthusians emerge to argue that the expansion of the food supply will fail, and the world will be plunged into chaos, and in each generation the predicted apocalypse has failed to arrive.


Charles Darwin (1809-1882) published his fundamental work, the full name of which is "The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life", in 1859. His work bears clear traces of Thomas Malthus's "An Essay on the Principle of Population", which Darwin studied in 1838, four years after the death of Malthus. Darwin agrees that natural laws apply to human society, that there is a pressure generated by the limited means of subsistence, and that man creates new skills and traits inherited by the next generation. He writes: "In the preservation of favoured individuals and races, during the constantly-recurrent Struggle for Existence, we see the most powerful and ever-acting means of selection. The struggle for existence inevitably follows from the high geometrical ratio of increase which is common to all organic beings... More individuals are born than can possibly survive. A grain in the balance will determine which individual shall live and which shall die,-- which variety or species shall increase in number, and which shall decrease, or finally become extinct. As the individuals of the same species come in all respects into the closest competition with each other, the struggle will generally be most severe between them; it will be almost equally severe between the varieties of the same species, and next in severity between the species of the same genus. But the struggle will often be very severe between beings most remote in the scale of nature. The slightest advantage in one being, at any age or during any season, over those with which it comes into competition, or better adaptation in however slight a

degree to the surrounding physical conditions, will turn the balance.”

Darwin tries to apply the Malthusian ideas to biological “races”: “All that we know about savages, or may infer from their traditions and from old monuments, the history of which is quite forgotten by the present inhabitants, show that from the remotest times successful tribes have supplanted other tribes. Relics of extinct or forgotten tribes have been discovered throughout the civilised regions of the earth, on the wild plains of America, and on the isolated islands in the Pacific Ocean. At the present day, civilised nations are everywhere supplanting barbarous nations, excepting where the climate opposes a deadly barrier; and they succeed mainly, though not exclusively, through their arts, which are the products of the intellect.”

This statement is probably determined by Darwin's belonging to the British elite and reflects the spirit of that elite, which was rather racist.¹⁰⁸ In fact, his evolutionary theory was used to justify cruel acts towards the natives. So, a liberal Prime Minister of 1841-1846, Sir Robert Peel, asserted in the House of Commons: “The lower races must disappear in contact with the higher.”

But that is where the similarity ends and Darwin's variance with the concepts popular in his circles begins. There are, according to Darwin, the specific human laws, created by the very



An illustration from an influential American magazine Harper's Weekly shows an alleged similarity between "Irish Iberian" and "Negro" features in contrast to the higher "Anglo-Teutonic." The accompanying caption reads "The Iberians are believed to have been originally an African race, who thousands of years ago spread themselves through Spain over Western Europe. Their remains are found in the barrows, or burying places, in sundry parts of these countries. The skulls are of low prognathous type. They came to Ireland and mixed with the natives of the South and West, who themselves are supposed to have been of low type and descendants of savages of the Stone Age, who, in consequence of isolation from the rest of the world, had never been out-competed in the healthy struggle of life, and thus made way, according to the laws of nature, for superior races. Drawing by: H. Strickland Constable. 1899, Ireland from One or Two Neglected Points of View.

nature of humanity and creating this very humanity. Those laws are different from the laws general for all natural beings, and, in the first place, from the law of the struggle for means of

¹⁰⁸Darwin sometimes sympathetically quotes quite odious racist scientists, and himself expresses similar ideas. Largely he, like them, is the flesh and blood of the British elite. For example the quotation of some W.R. Greg: "The careless, squalid, unambitious Irishman multiplies like rabbits: the frugal, foreseeing, self-respecting, ambitious Scot, stern in his morality, spiritual in his faith, sagacious and disciplined in his intelligence, passes his best years in struggle and in celibacy, marries late, and leaves few behind him. Given a land originally peopled by a thousand Saxons and a thousand Celts—and in a dozen generations five-sixths of the population would be Celts, but five-sixths of the property, of the power, of the intellect, would belong to the one-sixth of Saxons that remained. In the eternal 'struggle for existence,' it would be the inferior and less favoured race that had prevailed—and prevailed by virtue not of its good qualities but of its faults." By the way, in this racist quotation we also see the manipulative concept of “the pyramid of nations” as the former Anglo-Saxon foes (the Scots) are aggrandized at the expense of the nation, which is viewed as a nuisance at the moment (the Irish), and approximated to the “master-race”.

subsistence. These laws are in fact inherited social instincts, which are included as programmes into human behaviour performing a regulatory role. Above all, Darwin relates love and sympathy (for one's fellows; mutual aid) to these social instincts. He argues that these instincts have arisen as a result of human evolution and provided human dominion over nature.

Darwin divides mankind into two parts. The first is a barbarous part (barbarous race), not sufficiently guided in their lives by the desired degree of positive human instincts of love and sympathy. The second part of humanity, civilized, non-barbaric, is guided by the desired degree of these instincts. In "The Descent of Man" (1868) Darwin argues: "With strictly social animals, natural selection sometimes acts indirectly on the individual, through the preservation of variations which are beneficial only to the community. A community including a large number of well-endowed individuals increases in number and is victorious over other and less well-endowed communities; although each separate member may gain no advantage over the other members of the same community... It must not be forgotten that although a high standard of morality gives but a slight or no advantage to each individual man and his children over the other men of the same tribe, yet that an increase in the number of well-endowed men and an advancement in the standard of morality will certainly give an immense advantage to one tribe over another. A tribe including many members who, from possessing in a high degree the spirit of patriotism, fidelity, obedience, courage, and sympathy, were always ready to aid one another, and to sacrifice themselves for the common good, would be victorious over most other tribes; and this would be natural selection. At all times throughout the world tribes have supplanted other tribes; and as morality is one important element in their success, the standard of morality and the number of well-endowed men will thus everywhere tend to rise and increase."

On human morality and, ultimately, conscience, Darwin says: "Thus the social instincts, which must have been acquired by man in a very rude state, and probably even by his early ape-like progenitors, still give the impulse to many of his best actions; but his actions are largely determined by the expressed wishes and judgement of his fellow-men, and unfortunately still oftener by his own strong, selfish desires. But as the feelings of love and sympathy and the power of self-command become strengthened by habit, and as the power of reasoning becomes clearer so that man can appreciate the justice of the judgements of his fellow-men, he will feel himself impelled, independently of any pleasure or pain felt at the moment, to certain lines of conduct. He may then say, I am the supreme judge of my own conduct, and in the words of Kant, I will not in my own person violate the dignity of humanity."

Thus, according to Darwin, the barbarous races are those which are still too much responsive to nature's call, to the beastly struggle for the means of subsistence. Only the races which defy animal nature and do not obey its call, become human in the full sense of the word. These civilized races are guided by the laws of love and mutual sympathy. And the degree of their civilization is the more, the more the law of love and mutual aid prevails over the call of nature.

As we can see, despite the conception of "social Darwinism" which originated in the Anglo-Saxon world and which assumed Darwin's name, Darwin himself in general concludes on the detrimental effect of unlimited individual freedoms on society.¹⁰⁹ You are calling us back by proposing being guided by the animal call, - intimates Darwin to libertarians, - this is the path of involution, of regress. It is certainly remarkable that even Hobbes insists on the need of regulation, because he understands that the animal calls must be baulked by something. Darwin

¹⁰⁹Social Darwinism is a conception of society that emerged in the United Kingdom, North America, and Western Europe in the 1870s, and which applied biological concepts of natural selection and survival of the fittest to sociology and politics. Social Darwinists generally argue that the strong should see their wealth and power increase while the weak should see their wealth and power decrease. Different social Darwinists have different views about which groups of people are the strong and the weak, and they also hold different opinions about the precise mechanism that should be used to promote strength and punish weakness. Many such views stress competition between individuals in laissez-faire capitalism, while others motivated ideas of eugenics, racism, imperialism, fascism, Nazism, and struggle between national or racial groups.

simply denies the triumph of animal call in the human world. However, there were philosophers who spoke of animal call as of something desirable, among whom the conspicuous figure was Herbert Spencer (1820-1903), an English philosopher, psychologist and sociologist. Spencer became one of the most prominent adherents of positivism – a teaching intermediate between classical liberalism and the reactionary ideology of imperialism of the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th c. His works on psychology, biology and ethics had a great influence on the minds of bourgeois youth of England and the USA.

In 1852, seven years before the publication of “The Origin of Species” by Charles Darwin, and the first version of “Das Kapital” by Karl Marx, Herbert Spencer publishes an article “The Hypothesis of Development.” In 1858, Spencer makes a plan of work, which is going to be the main work of his life - the System of Synthetic Philosophy. Spencer plans to publish ten volumes of this "synthetic philosophy." In 1862, Spencer published his “First Principles”, or basic principles, in 1864-1867 - two volumes of “Principles of Biology”, in 1870–1872 - two volumes of “Principles of Psychology”, in 1876-1896 - three volumes of “Principles of Sociology”, in 1892–1893 - two volumes of “Principles of Morality.” All these works were studied by the prominent thinkers of his time, such as Darwin and Marx, and, in his turn Spencer underwent the influence of the above-mentioned thinkers. Being in strong opposition to Spencer, they nevertheless, together with him, created the rhythm of that epoch. In 1902, shortly before his death, Spencer was nominated for the Nobel Prize for literature. He continued writing all his life, in later years often by dictation, until he succumbed to poor health at the age of 83. His ashes are interred in the eastern side of London's Highgate Cemetery facing Karl Marx's grave.

Spencer was guided by the principle of the so-called laissez-faire, or non-intervention of the State in the economy. Previously Adam Smith had introduced essential humanitarian reservations to that principle. However, later these reservations were completely discarded, as well as the principles of love and mutual aid as prerequisites for humankind were discarded from Darwin's theory of evolution. The economy came to be described as a kind of self-regulating system, which provided an effective balance, and the interference of the State into which could only destroy the system itself. The State thus was obliged to abide by the principle of non-interference, and only played the role of a “night watchman” for the economy.

The principle of laissez-faire is a direct extrapolation of the principle of domination in the struggle for the means of subsistence. Even if the whole parallel between man and animal is unfair, in regard to the economy the tenet that man is animal is certainly true, claimed the laissez-faire capitalism supporters. Not incidentally it was Spencer who introduced the expression "survival of the fittest", which became a term to describe natural selection in biology, as well as the processes in the society and culture.

Spencer regarded the division of society into exploiters and the exploited as a natural consequence of the biological law. Hence, according to him all fight against capitalism was irrational. In his view a revolution did nothing but harm and social evolution was to him a slow process which he compared with the organic changes in a human body.

For him the capitalist system was the only norm. Spencer's philosophic and sociological views served as a source for bourgeois philosophy and sociology. He implicitly believed that biologically handicapped nations were doomed to slavery and ultimate extinction, whereas the Anglo-Saxons were born masters of the world. So, social Darwinism had grown into rank racism and was vastly used to justify the brutalities of English colonizers.

Spencer claimed that a universal law of nature is that creatures not fit enough to struggle for their existence should die. However, it may be argued that if man wholly complies with this law, mankind is doomed to be dehumanized, deprived of distinctive human features, such as love and mutual aid, postulated by Charles Darwin. Yet, since Spencer, it is precisely this law that the parasitic classes have lobbied.

Comprehension questions:

1. Speak about the development of science and the doctrine of scientific determinism (17th -18th cc.).
2. Development of science in the 19th c.
3. Protestantism as the heart of many British philosophical teachings. Contradictions within Protestantism, contradictions between religious outlook and the capitalist order. Attempts to bridge those contradictions.
4. Thomas Hobbes's "Leviathan."
5. John Locke and his concept of private property.
6. Jeremy Bentham's views.
7. John Malthus's concept.
8. Charles Darwin's "The Origin of Species" and "The Descent of Man."
9. Herbert Spencer's Synthetic Philosophy.

Names and expressions

Jeremy Bentham [bɛntəm] — Иеремия Бентам

Ricardo — Рикардо

microscope revealed minute organisms hitherto unknown - микроскоп выявил мельчайшие организмы, доселе неизвестные

concepts of momentum - концепции импульса

He assumed that the force which kept the moon in her orbit was none other than terrestrial attraction - Он предположил, что сила, которая удерживает луну на ее орбите, является не чем иным, как земным притяжением

the cornerstone - краеугольный камень

irreconcilable contradictions - непримиримые противоречия

"contractual" worldly institutions of the State and Law - «контрактные» светские учреждения государства и права

the absolute right of an individual, his freedom and independence from the state and society - абсолютное право человека, его свобода и независимость от государства и общества

the State as the source of good governance - государство как источник благого управления

They sought to elaborate the legal rules to regulate the social, economic and other relations between individuals. - Они стремились разработать правовые нормы для регулирования социальных, экономических и других отношений между отдельными лицами.

the inviolable and sacred right to property - неприкосновенное и священное право собственности

welfarism - линия на создание "государства всеобщего благосостояния"

relics of extinct or forgotten tribes - реликвии вымерших или забытых племен



49. EDWARD VII (1901-1910). THE DOMINIONS AND COLONIES

When Queen Victoria died, her eldest son, Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, the first of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha (now Windsor) dynasty, succeeded to the throne with the title of Edward the Seventh. He was born in Buckingham Palace on the 9th of November 1841. In his childhood he was educated by the dowager Lady Littelton, and in his boyhood successively by the Reverend Henry Mildred Birch, F. W. Gibbes and others.

Afterwards Edward resided in Edinburgh where he studied chemistry in its industrial application, and then — at Christ Church College, Oxford, and at Trinity College, Cambridge.

Early in 1863 the prince of Wales took his seat in the House of Lords as Duke of Cornwall.

In 1863 he married to the princess Alexandra, daughter of Christian IX, king of Denmark. From the time of their marriage the prince and princess were mainly in the country. They often filled Queen Victoria's place at important public functions.

In January 1874 the prince of Wales attended the marriage in St. Petersburg of his brother, the duke of Edinburgh, with the Grand-duchess Maria of Russia. In 1885 he visited Ireland at a time of much political tension and was received rather enthusiastically in many places. Afterwards he took a great part in the famous Jubilee of Victoria in 1887; he rode on the queen's right at the great procession to St. Paul's, and took his duties as an admiral of the fleet.

It was the especial distinction of Albert Edward, while Prince of Wales, to have been a support to the throne before he was called upon to fill it. This cannot be said about any of his predecessors except Edward the Black Prince. Besides, he was a keen patron of the theatre, and had a British taste for sport.

On the death of Queen Victoria, he was almost sixty — the age at which many of the British rulers had had the end of their lives. The question what title the new king would assume was speedily settled: it was decided that he would be called Edward VII. The new reign began by the holding a Privy Council at St. James's Palace at which the king announced his intentions to follow his mother's footsteps and to govern as a constitutional sovereign. On the 14th of February the king and queen opened the parliament of state.

During the parliamentary session of 1901 the attention of the country was so fully concentrated on the war in South Africa that comparatively little of new laws was accepted. The Factory Law was consolidated; an Education Bill was introduced and abandoned; a Factory and Workshops Act, establishing a system of Government inspection, was carried. The population of the United Kingdom had risen to about 41,500,000, and the inhabitants of Scotland were, for the first time, more numerous than those of Ireland.

In July 1902 the serious illness of the King was a cause to postpone his coronation; Edward needed an immediate operation; so, the coronation which had been fixed on the 26th of June, did not take place. The operation was, however, so marvellously successful, and the king's progress towards recovery so rapid, that within a fortnight he was pronounced out of danger, and soon afterwards it was decided to hold the coronation service on the 9th of August. The coronation took place on that date in Westminster Abbey amidst great rejoicing. The king spent several weeks in a yachting trip round the coast in recovering his health, and on the 25th of October he went in procession through the main streets of south London, where he was most enthusiastically received. Next day the king and queen attended St. Paul's cathedral in order to return thanks for his restoration of health. On New Year's Day 1903 the coronation was proclaimed in India at Delhi.

Meanwhile, the South African War was still raging. Terms of peace were discussed in February 1901, but were rejected by the Boer leaders, who required their complete independence.

In the spring of 1902, the prospect of peace began to brighten. The resistance of the Boers was worn down; their provisions and military supplies were exhausted, and their forces reduced. Negotiations for peace began early in April. On the 15th of May the delegates from the two Boer states met and after some hesitation agreed to accept the British terms.

The chief of that terms were that "all burghers should surrender and acknowledge Edward the Seventh as their sovereign; that prisoners should at once be restored, and should lose neither liberty nor property; that a representative form of government should be established as soon as possible; and that Dutch as well as English should be recognised as the official language." On that basis peace was signed on the 31st of May. Early in the following year Chamberlain visited

South Africa, in order to investigate many problems awaiting solution, and to “assure the Dutch of Britain's desire to deal justly and generously with them.”

The long war, which had cost the Empire nearly 45,000 men, and almost 200,000,000 of pounds thus came to an end. The prisoners, over 31,000 in number, returned; and the work of resettlement on the deserted and desolated farms was going on. The process of recovery from the effects of the war was slower than everybody could expect. In order to increase the supply of labour in the gold-mines — the great source of wealth in the Transvaal — it was resolved to have a large number of Chinese labourers under very difficult conditions. During the last year of Milner's administration this scheme was carried out.

When, at the close of 1905, a Liberal Government came into power in England, it very soon put an end to this system. At the same time ministers pledged themselves to introduce in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony a self-government on the Canadian or Australian model. Early in 1907 self-government was established in both colonies.


As a result of the first elections held under the new constitution, Boer governments took office in both colonies; while, about the same time, in Cape Colony, the leaders of the Dutch party, "Bond", came into power. Meanwhile, the difficulties of the railway question, the requirements of common defence, and the need of united action in regard to the natives, had led all parties in South Africa to desire some form of federal union. A convention of delegates from the different provinces met at Durban in October 1908; and continued the deliberation of Cape Town and elsewhere during the winter. In February 1909 the scheme of federation was published. The Dutch and the English language were then placed on an equal footing. The seat of the government was to be in Pretoria, but the Parliament was to meet at Cape Town.

Among the other overseas dominions, Canada took the first place. In 1903 the question of the boundary between Canada and the territory of Alaska was decided in favour of the United States. A development has taken place in the north-western territories. New lines of railway were pushed across the South America continent; enormous areas of land were opened up to settlers for cultivation; immigration was wisely encouraged; and large numbers of immigrants, nearly a third of whom came from the United States, entered the country.

The Empire of India witnessed during this period some very important changes. “Steps were

taken in the direction of self-government; but these were unfortunately accompanied by a growth of political discontent, by plots and outrages.”

The Viceroy of India at the time was Lord Curzon (1899-1905). A major famine, the second Victorian-time famine in a row, happened in India in 1899–1900 in which 6.1 to 9 million people died. Large parts of India were affected, and millions died, and Curzon was criticised for having done little to fight the famine. Curzon stated that "any government which imperilled the financial position of India in the interests of prodigal philanthropy would be open to serious criticism; but any government which by indiscriminate alms-giving weakened the fibre and demoralized the self-reliance of the population, would be guilty of a public crime." He cut back rations that he characterised as



Famine stricken people during the famine of 1876-78 in Bangalore

indiscriminate alms-giving weakened the fibre and demoralized the self-reliance of the population, would be guilty of a public crime." He cut back rations that he characterised as

"dangerously high" and stiffened relief eligibility by reinstating the Temple tests.^{110 111}

Curzon carried out an administrative reform and in the regulation of the frontier. The system of university education, the irrigation of unproductive lands, and the railways, were all examined by authoritative commissions (1902-1903). The so-called co-operative banks were established to help the poorer classes of cultivation.

The rising political movement for independence of India, and colonial government's administrative strategies to neutralize it, pressed the British to make the attempt to partition the most populous province of India, Bengal in 1905 along religious lines - a Muslim majority state of East Bengal and a Hindu majority state of West Bengal. The British colonial era, since the 18th century, portrayed and treated Hindus and Muslims as two divided groups, both in cultural terms and for the purposes of governance. The colonists favoured Muslims in the early period of colonialism to gain influence in Mughal India but underwent a shift in policies after the 1857 rebellion.

The partition was deeply resented, seen by both groups as evidence of British favouritism to the other side. Waves of religious riots hit Bengal through 1907. The religious violence worsened, and the partition was reversed in 1911. The reversal did little to calm the religious violence in India, and Bengal alone witnessed dozens of violent riots, between Muslims and Hindus, in the 1910s through the 1930s. This partition would be a model for the 1947 partition of India and Pakistan, in which over 10 million people were uprooted from their homeland and travelled on foot, bullock carts and trains to their promised new home. During the partition between 200,000 to 500,000 people were killed in the retributive genocide.

On the north-eastern frontier there was more trouble; the Government in 1903-1904 send an expedition into the Tibet. The British force, after overcoming some resistance from the natives and more serious obstacles in the nature of the country, advanced to the capital, Lhasa, where peace was made in September 1904. After that the British troops returned.

In 1905, because of the difficulties with the Commander-in-Chief, Kitchener, Curzon resigned, and Minto took his place. As the unrest in India increased, Morley took strong measures to suppress disorder, but at the same time announced that he intended to grant to natives a share in the government. He began by nominating two natives as members of the India Council in London. Two years later, in 1909, the London Council Act was passed, among other reforms, the legislative councils in the Indian provinces were enlarged, and some care was taken that the Mohammedan population should not be swamped in the elections by the more numerous Hindus.

Among the other colonies and dependencies of the Empire were Egypt and the Sudan. The

¹¹⁰From: Davis, Mike. *Late Victorian Holocausts*. 1. Verso, 2000. ISBN 1-85984-739-0. P.164.

¹¹¹Richard Temple was sent by the British India Government during the Great Famine of 1876–78 as Special Famine Commissioner to oversee the relief works of the Mysore government. To deal with the famine, the government of Mysore, started relief kitchens. A large number of people came into Bangalore, when relief was available. These people had to work on the Bangalore-Mysore railway line in exchange for food and grains. Temple insisted on cutting down expenditure on charitable relief and carried out a policy of *laissez faire* (which meant loose prices) with respect to the trade in grain. He imposed strict standards of qualification for relief and meagre relief rations. The insistence on more rigorous tests for qualification led to strikes by "relief workers" in the Bombay presidency. Furthermore, in January 1877, Temple reduced the wage for a day's hard work in the relief camps in Madras and Bombay — this 'Temple wage' consisted of 450 grams (1 lb) of grain plus one anna for a man, and a slightly reduced amount for a woman or working child, for a long day of hard labour without shade or rest. The rationale behind the reduced wage, which was in keeping with a prevailing belief of the time, was that any excessive payment might create 'dependency' among the famine-afflicted population. The Great Famine was to have a lasting political impact on events in India. Less than a decade later the Indian National Congress was founded, whose activists were Dadabhai Naoroji and Romesh Chunder Dutt for whom the Great Famine would become a cornerstone of the economic critique of the British Raj. The famine lives on in the Tamil and other literary traditions. A large number of Kummi folk songs describing this famine were documented.

finances of Egypt were placed upon a firm footing. During the reign of Muhammad Ali (1805-1848) two dams were built - the Rosetta and the Damet, the latter, by the way, still controls the flow in the Nile Delta. The next dams were built in Asyu in 1902 and in Esna in 1909. By means of dams across the Nile, the irrigation of the valley, on which its fertility depends, was extended and regulated, some areas were added to cultivation. The condition of the peasant was somewhat improved.

As for the Sudan, after the conquest of Muhammad Ali in 1819 it was ruled by the Egyptian authorities. In the second half of the 19th century, the British influence in the Sudan increased. The Egyptian Khedive appointed Governor General of the Sudan an Englishman, General Charles George Gordon. The brutal exploitation and national oppression led to the emergence of a powerful popular movement of protest of a religious orientation. The religious leader Muhammad Ahmad (Muhammad ibn Abdullah) in 1881 declared himself a Mahdi and led a revolt against the Turkish-Egyptian bureaucracy. Mahdi proclaimed the abolition of taxes and began to gather an army of holy war (jihad) against the Turks and Egyptians. He tried to unite the tribes of the western and central Sudan. As a result, for 13 years Europeans had been driven out of Sudan. However, at the beginning in 1898 the Mahdi State was defeated by Anglo-Egyptian forces led by General Kitchener. The state created by Muhammad Ahmad was destroyed.

The territorial expansion which the Empire received during this period was in West Africa, to the north of Nigeria, where, in 1903, the persistent hostility of the Ameer made necessary an expedition against him, which ended in the occupation of the great Arab towns, and of a large tract of the surrounding territory. In Southern Nigeria the British had begun plans to move into the Sokoto Caliphate by 1902. British General Frederick Lugard used rivalries between many of the Ameers in the south and the central Sokoto administration to prevent any defence as he worked toward the capital. As the British approached the city of Sokoto, the new Sultan Muhammadu Attahiru I organized a quick defence of the city and fought the advancing British-led forces. The British force quickly won, sending Attahiru I and thousands of followers on a Mahdist hijra. On the 13th of March 1903 at the grand market square of Sokoto, the last Vizier of the Caliphate officially conceded to British Rule. The British appointed Muhammadu Attahiru II as the new Caliph. Lugard abolished the Caliphate but retained the title Sultan as a symbolic position in the newly organized Northern Nigeria Protectorate. In June 1903, the British defeated the remaining forces of Attahiru I and killed him; by 1906 resistance to British rule had ended. The area of the Sokoto Caliphate was divided among the control of the British, French, and Germans under the terms of their Berlin Conference. In Eastern Africa an unsuccessful war took place against the natives of Somaliland, led by a Mullah; and the British forces had now practically withdrawn from the inland parts of that wild and barren country.

Of other events connected with the Empire beyond seas, the most important were those conferences of colonial premiers with the Home Government which were held in 1902 and 1907. These conferences, the third and fourth in the series were intended to contribute "to strengthen the sense of common interest and of national unity in the Empire at large."

The English poet of this period (by the way, he spent his childhood in colonial India) Rudyard Kipling wrote many poems about British soldiers and their wars in Africa, in India and in Afghanistan. We shall finish this chapter about the colonial expansion of the British Empire with several stanzas from his verses.

From "Boots"

We're foot — slog — slog — slog — sloggin' over Africa —

Foot — foot — foot — foot — sloggin' over Africa —

(Boots — boots — boots — boots — movin' up and down again!)

There's no discharge in the war!

.....

Don't — don't — don't — don't — look at what's in front of you.
(Boots — boots — boots — boots — movin' up and down again!)
Men — men — men — men go mad with watchin' 'em,
An' there's no discharge in the war!

.....

I — 'ave — marched — six — weeks in 'Ell an' certify
It — is not — fire — devils, dark, or anything,
But boots — boots — boots — boots — movin' up an' down again,
An' there's no discharge in the war!

From "Private Ortheris's song"

I fired a shot at an Afghan,
The beggar 'e fired again,
An' I lay on my bed with a 'ole in my 'ed,
An' missed the next campaign!
I up with my gun at a Burman
Who carried a bloomin' 'dah',
But the cartridge stuck and the bay'nit bruk,
An' all I got was the scar.
(Chorus) Ho! don't you aim at an Afghan,
When you stand on the skyline clear;
An' don't you go for a Burman
If none o' your friends is near.

In general, despite some contribution to the economy of its colonies (which was by no means gratuitous) and the establishment of institutions in its own image, the British metropolis had a pattern of exhausting the resources (material, human, economic, etc.) of the colonies, causing their impoverishment and blight. The periphery, fighting for survival, began to deal with the metropolis, trying to establish an independent existence.

Comprehension questions:

1. Albert Edward before and after his enthronement.
2. End of the Second Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902).
3. A major famine in India in 1899–1900. Lord Curzon's policies there.
4. The partition of Bengal.
5. Egypt.
6. Sudan. The Madhist War.
7. The British in Africa under Edward VII.
8. The pattern of British colonial policy.

Names and expressions

Gibbes [gibz]

Edward, while prince of Wales — Эдвард, в то время как он был принцем Уэльским...

protests from those at home who were opposed to the war — протесты тех англичан, которые были настроены против войны

Dutch as well as English should be recognized as the official language — голландский должен быть признан официальным языком наряду с английским

many problems awaiting solution — многие проблемы, ожидающие разрешения

this experiment turned out a success — ЭТОТ ЭКСПЕРИМЕНТ

оказался успешным

Durban ['dɜ:bən]

the Dutch and the English language were then placed on an equal footing — ГОЛЛАНДСКИЙ
и английский языки были

таким образом уравниены в правах

Lord Curzon (1859-1925) [kɜ:zn] — Керзон

Lhasa ['la:sə] — Лхаса

Lord Minto [mintə]

Lord Morley ['mo:li]

some care was taken — были приняты кое-какие меры

Khartum [ka:'tu:m] — Картум (англо-египетский Судан)

Nigeria [nai'dʒi(ə)riə] — Нигерия

We're foot = we are foot

sloggin' = slogging

movin' = moving

up an' down = up and down

watchin' 'em = watching them

an' there's no discharge in the war! (and) — и на этой войне

нет выстрелов

in 'Ell = in Hell

an' = and

'e = he

with a 'ole in my 'ed = with a hole in my head

bloomin' = blooming

dah — a large heavy knife used especially by the Burmese

none o' your friends = none of your friends

the bay'nit bruk = the bayonet broke



Emperor Taishō in the robes of the Order of the Garter, as a consequence of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. As a foreign national he was not entitled to use the prefix 'Sir' but could use the post-nominal letters KG after his name.

50. FOREIGN AFFAIRS IN THE REIGN OF EDWARD VII. RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR (1904–05)

Passing to the subject of foreign policy, we find that the relations of Britain with other powers were outwardly peaceful throughout the reign of Edward VII. The hostile feelings towards this country during the South African War went no further than words, and nothing occurred to break the peace which had prevailed in Europe during those years.

In 1903 the British King paid a visit to President Loubet in Paris; and at the same time negotiations were opened with a view to removing the various obstacles which hindered understanding between England and France. These negotiations resulted in a general agreement between the two countries, which was signed in April 1904. By this treaty France recognized the position of Britain in Egypt; and in return Britain acknowledged the predominance of French interests in Morocco. The question of the Newfoundland fisheries was settled, and few other questions also.

To provide for itself a footing in Asia against China and Russia, in February 1902 Britain secured a treaty of alliance with an Asiatic power — Japan. The treaty pledged the two states to mutual assistance, under certain conditions, for the defence of their respective interests in the Far East; and the alliance was to last for five years. The effect of this alliance was apparent soon afterwards, when Japan became involved in a dispute with Russia about Korea, over which the Japanese claimed supremacy, and Manchuria, which was in the sphere of Russian commercial and political interests. The Russian-Japanese dispute led, in February 1904, to the Russo-Japanese War, which lasted from 8 February 1904 till 5 September 1905.

The Russo-Japanese War, in which Britain was vitally interested, had great effects in many quarters. The international relations of European powers were radically affected. A new grouping of the powers took place. The British agreement with France was signed in 1904. Before that, on the eve of the death of Emperor Alexander III in 1894, as we have said already, the Franco-Russian contract of alliance had been concluded. According to it, the Russians and French should immediately declare war on Germany if it attacked either country. Although this alliance involved Britain and was actually called *the Triple Entente*, Britain had no such obligations under it. The commitment to declare war to defend the ally concerned only St. Petersburg and Paris.

The nature of the Anglo-Japanese alliance meant that France was unable to come to Russia's aid in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904 as this would have meant going to war with Britain. So, Britain neutralized France.

Looking ahead, we should say that Britain's having no defence obligations under the Entente provisions would eventually lead to the outbreak of the First World War, the pretext for which was the assassination in Sarajevo of the heir to the Austrian throne Franz Ferdinand by Serbian nationalists.

The Russo-Japanese War and its evaluation is worthy of consideration. According to mainstream historiography, Russia suffered a defeat in it, but with regard to the actual course of the war, the defeat does not seem obvious. Furthermore, there are some aspects of this war that are understated and should be brought to light. It is noteworthy that, under the Anglo-Japanese treaty, England could come to the aid of Japan only in the event that Japan was at war with two (or more) countries simultaneously. It is perhaps no coincidence that in 1904 Montenegro announced war against Japan. It is likely that that decision had been lobbied through its diplomatic channels in this Balkan country. After all, Russia received no more or less serious support from Montenegro.

In fact, Japan's military machine was started, having secured direct support of Britain and the USA. The former supplied Japan with coal and sold her warships, the latter exported arms. This had begun before the war and increased drastically in 1905. The American and British banks gave Japan big loans for militarization, in fact, Japan's foreign loans covered 40% of her military expenditures. There is a vast array of facts which clearly indicate that Russia was at war, in fact, not with Japan, and with a coalition, which included the largest, richest and most powerful countries of that time - the British Empire and the United States. True, Japan provided manpower for the war, but the weapons, money, energy resources, i.e. all that plays a crucial role in the wars of the industrial age, were provided by industrialized and strong nations. The

Overall, Russia was much stronger than Japan, including in the industrial and - increasingly - economic terms, it was also much ahead of her enemy in the development of her military industrial complex. Moreover, besides manufacturing weapons, she had also purchased them in the West. However, the difficulty in concentrating troops on the distant outskirts of the Empire, the slowness of the military and naval departments, the errors in assessing the opponents largely caused her initial military defeats.

The pretext for the war was as follows. By the middle of the 1890s, Japan moved to the

external expansion policy, especially in the geographically closest Korea. Faced with the resistance of China, Japan dealt a crushing defeat to it during the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895). The Treaty of Shimonoseki, signed at the end of the war, conditioned the Chinese denial of all rights in Korea (facilitating the Japanese expansion there), the transfer to Japan of several areas, including the Liaodong Peninsula and Manchuria. In 1896, after the defeat of the troops of the Qing Empire in the Sino-Japanese war, the secret allied treaty between Russia and China was signed, according to which Russia pledged to defend China against any encroachments of Japan to take any part of the Chinese territory. Then, the triple intervention of Germany, Russia and France led to the Japan's abandonment of the Liaodong Peninsula, and then to its transfer for the rental use to Russia in 1898. In this peninsula was an open port called Port Arthur, where Russia set up a naval base. Currently, the site of the former city is the city of Dalian of the People's Republic of China. In 1903, a dispute over Russian forest concessions in Korea and the ongoing development of Russian Manchuria led to the aggravation of Russian-Japanese relations. Japan wanted to complete its domination in Korea and demanded that Russia should clear Manchuria.

On January 24, 1904 the Japanese Ambassador handed the Russian Foreign Minister a note of the severance of diplomatic relations, and in the evening on January 26 the Japanese fleet, without declaring war, attacked the Port Arthur squadron. So, the Russo-Japanese war began. However, despite all their attempts, the Japanese failed to capture the Russian stronghold at the beginning of the war. On August 6, 1904 they made another attempt, by laying siege to it. The assault on Port Arthur began after its protracted shelling. Anatoly Stoessel commanded the Port Arthur defences, while the siege was commanded by Nogi Maresuke. A 45 thousand Japanese army under the command of Oyama was committed to the attack on the fortress. Meeting strong resistance and losing more than half of its soldiers, the Japanese army was forced to retreat on 11 August.

On December 2, 1904 the Russian army suffered a severe loss – General Roman Isidorovich Kondratenko, military engineer, hero of the defence of Port Arthur was killed. About a month later, despite the estimates that Port Arthur could have held out at least for two months more, Stoessel and Reyes decided to hand it over. Still, perhaps their decision was right, as they thus saved the lives of the heroic defenders who had done everything possible. The act of surrender of the fortress was signed on January 1, 1905. With it, the first Russian fleet fell into the hands of the Japanese. 32 thousand Russian defenders were captured.



Russian-Japanese war of 1904-1905. People of war. Russian officers, wounded and killed in sea battles with the Japanese in July-August 1904



Despite the surrender, it can hardly be called the unqualified victory of the Japanese. With the view to losses – and the Japanese losses were much more than those of the Russians – the Japanese tactics may well be considered a blunder. A military historian Basil Liddell Hart wrote that the Japanese “had swallowed their own bait in taking Port Arthur — they hoped for a Sedan. Instead, there was an abundance of indecisive bloodshed. As a result, they were so exhausted after the final indecisive battle of Mukden that they were glad, and lucky, to make peace with a foe who had no heart in the struggle, and had not yet put one-tenth of his available forces into it.”¹¹² Nogi Maresuke, following his victory, committed ritual suicide – he did seppuku. In his suicide letter he said that he wished to expiate for his disgrace in Kyūshū, and for the thousands of casualties at Port Arthur.

General Roman Isidorovich Kondratenko

Some historians think that had it not been for the 1905 revolution in Russia, which had been largely financed by the foreign money, Russia might have prevailed. The revolution began in January 1905, four months before the Tsushima and seven months before the signing of the peace treaty. It is no accident in the army circles evaluated the revolutionary actions of 1905 as a "stab in the back."¹¹³

In February 1905, the Japanese forced to withdraw the Russian army in a pitched battle at Mukden. In May the same year the Japanese fleet engaged the second Russian fleet (the Baltic Squadron) in the Straits of Tsushima. The Squadron, up to 6 times smaller in numbers than the Japanese fleet, was almost completely destroyed.

Despite a number of defeats, Russia, had increased the capacity of its railway and its group of forces, armed and well-endowed, achieving numerical superiority. It even managed to deploy some submarines in Vladivostok. At the time of the peace negotiations Russia turned up much stronger than Japan. Yet the Russian Emperor wavered and agreed to the peace talks, not without pressure from the West. Through the mediation of the USA President Roosevelt peace was signed on September 5, 1905. By this treaty Russia conceded the Japanese the southern part of Sakhalin, her lease rights to the Liaodong Peninsula and the South Manchuria Railway. Japan thus obtained all, and even more than all, at which she had aimed.

¹¹²Hart, B. H. Liddell. *Strategy: the indirect approach*: Faber and Faber Ltd. 1929. P. 160

¹¹³While the outcome of the war was unclear and no defeat was in the offing, a nationwide strike started in Russia, turning into a veritable terrorist war. Militants persecuted mayors, officers, large manufacturers, policemen. On February 4, 1905 terrorists killed the son of Alexander II - Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich, and on June 28 they gunned down a prominent statesman, Moscow and Odessa mayor, Major General Count Pavel Pavlovich Shuvalov. Shortly before that, in June, there was a mutiny of sailors on the battleship Potemkin, even before that an uprising broke out in the Polish city of Lodz. Remarkably, the Russian revolutionaries mostly procured arms from the West, mainly from Britain, with the headquarters of the Russian revolutionaries being in London. The steamship John Grafton was bought for the delivery of several thousand firearms (in particular, Swiss Vetterli rifles), ammunition and explosives to revolutionaries. And although she ran aground off the coast of Finland, some of the weapons reached the addressee. During one of the key episodes of the 1905 revolution - the December uprising in Moscow, the police recorded that some participants were armed with Vetterli rifles. Then another boat, Sirius, was bought and also charged with weapons - 8,5 thousand Vetterli rifles and a large consignment of ammunition (from 1.2 to 2 million units). The ship sailed from Amsterdam to the coast near the town of Poti, where her contents were loaded on four barges. And although some weapons were intercepted by the Russian border guards, a significant portion of them fell into the hands of the revolutionaries.

Japan's victory, despite all the battles won, was not absolute. Her economy and human resources had been depleted: during the war Japan had suffered far greater losses in the number of the dead and dead from the disease, her total losses were twice as much as Russia's.¹¹⁴ Japan had no reserves left. Over time, more and more the balance of power was changing in favour of Russia. Judging by the general willingness to continue the war, the Japanese empire was closer to defeat than Russia. In this sense, not only the 1905 revolution, but also the conclusion of the Peace of Portsmouth by Count S.Y. Witte (later nicknamed Polusahalinsky – Half-Sakhalin) was the betrayal of the Russian army.

Shortly before the conclusion of peace, Britain renewed with Japan the treaty of alliance. This treaty was signed on the 12th of August 1905 and had to last for ten years. It had for its objects “the maintenance of peace in Eastern Asia and India, and of the integrity and independence of the Chinese Empire.”

The Russo-Japanese War, in which Britain was vitally interested, had great effects in other quarters. The international relations of European powers were radically affected. A new grouping of the powers took place; and France established a good understanding with Britain. The agreement with France (1904) has already been mentioned. Before that on the eve of the death of Emperor Alexander III in 1894, as we have said already, the Franco-Russian contract of alliance had been concluded. According to it, the Russians and French should immediately declare war on Germany if it attacked Russia or France. Although this alliance involved Britain and was actually called *the Triple Entente*, Britain had no such obligations under it. The commitment to declare war to defend the ally concerned only Paris and St. Petersburg. This circumstance would eventually lead to the outbreak of the First World War, the pretext for which was the assassination in Sarajevo of the heir to the Austrian throne Franz Ferdinand by Serbian nationalists.

Also, the Anglo-Russian Convention on Persia, Afghanistan and Tibet was signed on the 31st of August 1907. It was agreed to recognize jointly the independence and integrity of Persia; Afghanistan was declared outside the sphere of Russian influence; in Tibet both parties agreed to abstain from intervention, since 1914, however, it de facto became a British protectorate. While defining the British and Russian zones of influence, this treaty did not contain a single line on mutual military obligations.

In July 1908 a revolution, long prepared by the party of reform in Turkey, broke out. The leaders demanded the revival of the Constitution, which had been granted in 1876, and afterwards suppressed. The Sultan, after his army had deserted him, was forced to give way; and in December 1908 a Turkish Parliament met at Constantinople. Meanwhile Bulgaria, which, since the Treaty of Berlin in 1878, had been only nominally subject to Turkey, took advantage of these troubles to declare itself independent — on the 5th of October; and two days later, Austria-Hungary formally annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina, which by the same treaty had been placed under its protectorate. Along with St. Petersburg, which refused to recognize the annexation, London and Paris expressed their dissatisfaction with the developments in the Balkans by their protest notes to the Austro-Hungarian government but did not take any decisive action against the Austro-Hungarian Empire. A conference was demanded; but Germany, supported its ally Austria-Hungary, refused its consent. The population of Servia and Montenegro, connected by race and feeling with those of Bosnia and Herzegovina, now became increasingly agitated, and looked for aid from the Russian Tsar, the official head of the Slavonic race. This attitude,

¹¹⁴The ratio of military casualties in the Russian-Japanese war of 1904-1905: killed and dead of wounds: Japan — 58,812, Russia — 31,458 persons; dead of diseases - Japan — 27,192, Russia — 11,170 persons. Sources: Uralnis, B.Ts. *Istoriya voyennykh poter'* (The history of military casualties). Saint Petersburg - Moscow, 2008. P. 288; *Voyna s Yaponiyey 1904-1905 gg. Sanitarno-statisticheskiy ocherk* (The war with Japan of 1904-1905. Sanitary & statistical review). Pg. 14, 15, 247. 1914.

combined with the demand for a conference, produced a dangerous situation. However, in March 1909 Germany presented an ultimatum to Russia. Prime Minister Stolypin strongly opposed a direct confrontation with Germany and Austria-Hungary, saying that "to wage war would mean to unleash the forces of revolution." The next day, the Emperor Nicholas II telegraphed to the Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany that Russia recognized the annexation. On March 31, 1909 Serbia was also forced to recognize the annexation. These events led to a counter-revolution in Constantinople, by which the Sultan momentarily regained power. But the resistance of his troops was speedily suppressed: and the constitutional party, known as the "Young Turks", have since then held undisputed sway.

In 1901 Britain made a treaty with the United States, by which she gave up certain claims of little value in Central America in order to make it possible to build the Panama Canal. The efforts of Britain to make a general treaty with the United States were not successful.

In the Congo Free State, under the rule of the King of the Belgians, there had been, for years past, complaints of mismanagement, tyranny and brutality, on the part of Belgian officials. The British Government, which was responsible for the condition of this vast territory, as it recognized the Belgian occupation in 1885, remonstrated against this state of affairs.

In 1907, the British Government took part among representatives of some fifty other States, in the Second Peace Conference at Hague. (The First Hague Conference was proposed in 1898 by Russian Tsar Nicholas II and was held in 1899. It consisted of three main treaties and three additional declarations: Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes; Convention with respect to the Laws and Customs of War on Land; Convention for the Adaptation to Maritime Warfare of the Principles of the Geneva Convention of 22 August 1864.) The Hague Conventions were among the first formal statements of the laws of war and war crimes in the body of secular international law. The discussions lasted from June to October; but, as the interests of so many powers were touched, little was achieved.

The Boer War brought to light many defects in the British military system, particularly in the confused and cumbersome machinery of the War Office; the want of a General, which was called the "brain of the army"; the slowness of mobilization; the inadequate provision for the Intelligence Department; the insufficiency of the Reserve, especially concerning officers; the need of doctors and trained nurses for the sick and wounded. These wants concerned primarily the regular army; but the defective organization of the auxiliary forces — the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers — was equally obvious; and the nation slowly awoke to the fact that these forces were utterly inadequate for the defence of Britain, should an invasion take place while the regulars were employed elsewhere. In 1903 a commission of three was appointed to consider the whole question of army reform. It made its report in January 1904; and changes at once took place. The navy has not required any radical transformation as the army; but changes of great importance in training, in the construction of ships, and of the distribution of fleets have been made. In 1903 a new scheme of training for officers was adopted, under which all cadets were to be educated in all branches of the service. In 1906 an advance was made in naval construction by the appearance of a larger and more powerful battleship, the "Dreadnought", which gave its name to all later vessels of a similar type. French redistribution of the fleets was made in 1906 and 1907. The reorganization, which was principally due to the rapid growth of the German navy, was completed in 1909.

Comprehension questions:

1. The British alliance with Japan (1902). Japanese militarization.
2. The Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905). The pretext for the war.
3. The defence of Port Arthur.
4. The conclusion of the Russo-Japanese War.
5. The Triple Entente. Why was this alliance conducive to World War I?

6. The Anglo-Russian Convention on Persia, Afghanistan and Tibet.
7. The events connected with Turkey and the Ottoman Empire.
8. The Peace Conferences at Hague.
9. The army reform in Britain.

Names and expressions

passing to the subject — переходя к теме

Loubet (French) [lu: 'bə] (b. 1838)

Morocco [mə'rokəu] — Марокко

Korea [kə 'riə, kə:-] — Корея

with it all that was left of the first Russian fleet... — таким образом, все, что осталось от первого русского флота,..

Roosevelt [ru:svelt], Theodore (1858-1919) — twenty-sixth president of the **United States** (1901-1909)

Tsushima ['tsu:ʃimə] — Цусима

Sachalin [sæhə'lin] — Сахалин

Tibet [ti'bet] — Тибет

Delcasse (French) [del'kasə]

Algeria [æ'l'dʒi(ə)riə] — Алжир

Bosnia ['boznjə] — Босния

Herzegovina [hʒ:tsigəu'vi:nə] — Герцеговина

Panama Canal [ˌræpə'nə: kə'næl, ræpə'nə:-] — Панамский Канал

Congo ['kɒŋgəu] — Конго

Belgian ['beldʒ(ə)n]

the nation slowly awoke to the fact — нация медленно начала осознавать тот факт...

...should an invasion take place while the regulars were employed elsewhere — ...случись вторжение врагов в то время, как регулярные войска будут заняты где-то в другом месте...

"Dreadnought" — дредноут (букв.— "не знающий страха", "отважный")

51. ECONOMY AND POLITICS IN THE REIGN OF EDWARD VII

The key feature of imperialism has been monopoly, developed from the end of the 19th c. This was especially apparent in the case of iron and steel industries, in shipping and shipbuilding, in some new industries like the manufacture of chemicals, soap, etc. and in the case of railways and banks. By the beginning of the 20th c. economic life in Britain was dominated by powerful trusts, such as the Imperial Chemical Industries, the Vickers armament and machine-building company. It was by this time that a great many railway companies, sprung during the period of railway building, were reduced to about a dozen, and some thirty years later there were only four. Private banks were swallowed by huge joint stock concerns which proceeded to open branch banks all over the country.

As to the export of capital, that other salient feature of the imperialist stage, it was inseparably connected with territorial expansion. British investments in Asian and African countries justified subsequent annexations of those countries, and when the territories had been appropriated, British state power was used to promote the interests of the City moneybags. Thus, it was early in the 20th c., when the division of the Planet among the principal capitalist powers was completed, that the export of capital became "all the rage". By this time the total amount of British investments abroad averaged some two thousand million pounds which gave an annual income of a hundred million pounds. By 1914, both figures were doubled.

Now the interest on these investments (mostly paid in foodstuff and raw materials) far exceeded the profit derived from British foreign trade. This is how Great Britain became a parasite, a usurer and the interests of her biggest individual usurers became the determining

factor in her foreign politics. Signs of decay were to be seen in the growing unemployment (in the years preceding World War I the number of unemployed was seldom much below a million), in the increasingly growing frequency of cyclical crises (in 1902, then in 1908, then in 1914, to be cut short by the outbreak of the war).

Control over vast capital came into the hands of a very small number of individuals. The typical capitalist was now an absolute drone having nothing whatever to do with the process of production but contributing capital, a passive shareholder. Interpenetration of bankers' capital and industrial capital made the power of the bankers increasingly formidable.

During this period the monopolistic bourgeoisie played the leading part in the economic and political life of the country. The landed aristocracy were the second decisive factor. Both were linked by common material interest. The supremacy of big capital rested on two political parties, the conservatives (the Tories), who were, besides, connected with land aristocracy, and the liberals (the Whigs) as they took alternate turns in the government. The Tories pursued a more vigorous policy of colonial conquest. They were in favour of introducing protectionism for British goods while the Whigs realized the power of free trade as a tool for British global economic domination and colonial oppression. Tories stood for a stronger central power and for fewer bourgeois concessions and reforms.

In 1900 the Labour Party was founded in Britain. It followed the Taff Vale railwaymen strike in South Wales. The company took the matter to court. The case was brought before the House of Lords; the Trade Union was ordered to pay the company for damages caused by the strike. This precedent was taken advantage of by the bourgeoisie in every strike that followed. The Government thus made it practically impossible for the workers to take strike action. The Trade Unions were confused and disheartened.

The workers realized that the creation of an independent political party was a vital necessity. The party was created, and it might have been a grave danger to the exploiting classes. But the latter were consummate masters of political intrigue, diplomacy, corruption. They could not stop the masses from creating the party that was intended to promote the workingmen's political power, so they educated it into a lackey of theirs that promoted their interests. This is how it came about. Even before the House of Lords decision on the Taff Vale case, a "Labour Representation Committee" was formed by the Trade Union Congress with the support of the Independent Labour party (1900). This committee became the nucleus of the Labour party, a name adopted in 1906. The main objective was the election of workers' representatives to Parliament in order to draft legislation favourable to the working class. The creation of the Labour party reflected the workers' aspirations of pursuing independent class policy. Unfortunately, right-wing reformists leaning upon the "workers aristocracy" did their best to worm themselves into leading positions in the party. In its organizational aspect, too, the party fell short of the requirements of a Socialist workers' party. It admitted to membership not only individuals but also entire organizations, such as Trade Unions, the workers' educational cooperative associations, and the Independent Labour party. The party leadership was soon in the hands of opportunists who led it along the lines of close collaboration with the bourgeoisie.

The domestic political history of the Edward's reign falls into two distinct portions, nearly equally divided by the change of Government at the end of 1905 and the general election of January 1906. During the earlier portion, the Tory, or Unionist party was in power; during the later, the combined Whigs, Radicals and Nationalists held sway.

In his first two years King Edward VII was flattered for a reputation of "promoter of international friendliness" and called "Edward Peacemaker", although Britain's active part in the militarisation of Japan and the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905 may well be said to have busted this reputation.

The parliamentary session of 1902 was long and arduous. One of the most important measures was an Education Act, which reorganized primary education, and also did something

towards placing the secondary schools on a satisfactory footing. One of the chief measures of 1903 was an Educational Act for London. A change was also made in university education. The university colleges in certain towns of the north had hitherto been united in a body called the Victoria University. The desire of these colleges for independence led to the abolition of that body, and the creation of separate universities in Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds and Sheffield (1903-1905).

Another important measure of 1903 was the Land Purchase Act for Ireland, based upon the resolutions of a conference between representatives of the landlords and the Nationalists, held in Dublin in the previous autumn. After paying their regular rents for about forty years the tenants who buy under the Act would become owners of their holdings.

But much important event in the domestic history of that year was Joseph Chamberlain's declaration in favour of tariff reform. He urged that it was necessary to revise the English free-trade policy and to levy duties on the import of foreign goods, while admitting colonial goods free. He said it was necessary 1) to bind the Empire together by economic ties; and 2) to provide employment for British workmen, who saw themselves deprived of it by the free import of foreign manufacturers, produced more cheaply.

The election of 1906 was fought mainly on the question of tariff reform against free trade, and those of education, temperance, and Chinese labour in Transvaal.

The Irish allies of the Government received attention in the Town Tenants Act for Ireland, which conferred greater security on urban tenements; and a somewhat similar measure, the Agricultural Holdings Act. Another Act was passed for giving meals, at the public expense, to schoolchildren of the poor families.

But the great fight of the session took place over the Education Bill. This large measure aimed at bringing the elementary schools of the country, including those supported by any religious body, under complete public control; and, while retaining rudimentary religious teaching, insisted that the teachers, in any schools receiving aid from the State, should be appointed without the imposition of any test concerning their creed. The Opposition fought hard but vainly to keep "religious teaching". An agreement proved impossible, the Bill was dropped, much to the regret of those who wished to see a settlement of this troublesome question.

During the session of 1908 several important Acts of Parliament were passed. One of these, the Old Age Pensions Act, provided a pension of five shillings a week for all persons, with certain exceptions, over the age of seventy, who might be in need of such assistance. Another Act restricted the hours of employment in coalmines to eight hours. A third solved the difficult university question in Ireland by establishing two universities — one in Dublin, the other in Belfast. But a Bill to provide State employment for the unemployed was thrown out by the Commons.

The Licensing Bill aimed at the speedy suppression of one third of the existing public-houses, but failed, in the view of its opponents, to provide adequate compensation for the license holders, and for those who had invested money in such property. The opposition, within and without the Parliament, was such that it emboldened the House of Lords to reject the Bill.

During the session, Parliament was not infrequently disturbed by the attacks made upon its precincts; and upon individual ministers, by the more ardent — supporters of Female Suffrage, who had already in the previous year adopted new methods to make the Houses hear their demands.

The stormy session of 1909 was almost entirely occupied by the struggle over Budget. Time was, however, found for passing several measures of secondary importance, such as Acts to regulate the planning of towns, and for the development of agricultural districts and means of communications.

Comprehension questions:

1. The two key features of the 19th c. imperialism: monopoly and export of capital.
2. Two major parties in Britain. The draconic laws on strikes. The creation of the Labour Party.
3. The opportunistic trends in the Labour Party.
4. Acts enacted by Parliament at the turn of the century (1902, 1903).
5. Acts of Parliament during the sessions of 1906, 1908, 1909.

Names and expressions

- the combined Liberals, Radicals and Nationalists held sway** — властвовали объединившиеся либералы, радикалы и националисты
- in order to return thanks** — чтобы воздать благодарность (Богу)
- satisfactory footing** — достаточно удовлетворительная основа
- united in a body** — объединены в одно целое
- the tenants who buy under the Act** — арендаторы, которые покупают (землю) при действии этого закона...
- their holdings** — свои участки (которые они ранее брали в аренду)
- tariff reform** — реформа закона о пошлинах
- free import** — беспошлинный импорт товаров
- complete public control** — полный общественный контроль (без участия церковных властей)
- those of education** = reforms of education
- without the imposition** of any test concerning their creed — без навязывания каких-либо испытаний, касающихся их веры
- in the view of** — принимая во внимание
- supporters of Female Suffrage** — сторонники женского избирательного права (суфражисты), активное политическое движение в начале XX в.

52. BRITAIN AT THE TURN OF THE 20TH C. THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND BRITAIN'S' GEOPOLITICAL STRUGGLE

During the year 1909 the political situation in England was developing into an acute constitutional crisis, which seemed likely to involve the Crown in serious difficulties. King Edward, although certainly not prejudiced against a Liberal ministry, was seriously disturbed in mind and health by the progress of events. The king became weak in health, and in the early spring he had to take change and rest at Biarritz, and then he had a bronchial attack which caused some anxiety, although the public heard nothing of it. When he returned to England there is no doubt that he was acutely affected of being forcibly dragged into the political conflict. There was considerable opinion that the king's tact and experience would help to bring order out of chaos; but this was not to be. Within two days the public heard that Edward was ill. On the 5th of May it was announced that the king had bronchitis; and he died on the 6th, of the heart failure. On May 20, the burial took place at Windsor, after a funeral procession through London, the coffin being followed by the new king, George V, and by eight foreign sovereigns, and a number of special ambassadors, including Theodore Roosevelt as representative of the United States. After Edward VII's death his eldest son George V was made his heir to the throne. George V was born on the 3rd of June 1865, and he ruled the country from 1910 till 1936. A symbolic figure (Robert Walpole of the 18th c. or Palmerston of the 19th c.) of the time was Lloyd George, since 1916 until 1922 - Prime Minister, greatly valued by the bourgeoisie for his devotion to the war cause and for his demagogic talents.

In February 1915 there were strikes in the great engineering centre of the Clyde under the

leadership of the Shop Stewards Movement, not under the official Trade Union leadership that had lost credit with the workers. The government, badly scared by the developments, passed the Munitions Act by which a number of industries were proclaimed as war industries and strikes in them were to be considered illegal. But the workers challenged the act and in July 1915 200,000 miners in South Wales went on strike and won a wage advance. The Shop Stewards of the Clyde area organized themselves into the Clyde Workers' Committee. All through 1915 neither the Government nor the government-serving Union officials could prevent the strike movement until they suppressed the Clyde Workers' Committee paper, "The Worker", and imprisoned the most active shop stewards when the centre of shop-stewards-headed resistance shifted to Sheffield.

In 1916 the national liberation movement in Ireland grew to a pitch of such intensity that the left wing (opposed to the bourgeois nationalists who supported England) headed by James Connolly (Seamus O Conghaile, 1868-1916), a socialist and outstanding revolutionary, prepared for an armed rising against the war and all it implied. The English government crushed the rebellion, called the Easter Rising of 1916, and executed James Connolly.

It is worth mentioning that the foreign policy pursued by Britain, in fact, contributed to the preparation of the outbreak of the First World War, 1914-1918. In particular, negotiating with the German Ambassador Karl von Lichnowsky and the Russian Ambassador Alexander Konstantinovich Benkendorf, the British Foreign Secretary Edward Grey made certain that the local 1914 Austrian-Serbian conflict acquired at first European and then global scale. Grey created in the Germans a feeling of uniqueness of the moment: just then England was going to be neutral, so the Germans could be tough and hard; they could immediately solve the problem of Serbia and at the same time put Russia and France in place. To create this false sensation with the German and Austrian governments the British were ready for any tricks, including the simulation of Russia's weakness by financing the strike movement in Russia. Edward Grey is remembered for his remark at the outbreak of the First World War: "The lamps are going out all over Europe. We shall not see them lit again in our life-time." Because of the war, four empires - Russian, German, Austrian and Ottoman - collapsed within a year. Each of them represented one of the traditional religions, so their downfall was at the same time the collapse of traditional religious strongholds.

The German Empire, formed by Otto von Bismarck during the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-1871, initially did not aspire for the political and economic dominance in Europe. However, by the 1880s, having strengthened economically and militarily, it began to have such aspirations. Germany was late in her colonial expansion and lacked colonies. The German capital felt shortage of markets for export; owing to population growth, there was food shortage. So, the idea of the expansion of Lebensraum began to capture some influential German minds. The German capital needed re-division of the world market. To achieve it, Germany had to gain hegemony on the European continent. But first Germany had to defeat the Great Powers: Russia, Britain and France.

The pretext for the war was the assassination in Sarajevo of Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife by the Serbian nationalist Gavrilo Princip. In the wake of the killings, Germany had promised Austria-Hungary its unconditional support in whatever punitive action it chose to take towards Serbia, regardless of whether or not Serbia's powerful ally, Russia, stepped into the conflict. By the time an ultimatum from Vienna to Serbia was rejected on July 25, Nicholas II had ordered preliminary mobilisation to begin, believing that Berlin was using the assassination crisis as a pretext to launch a war to shore up its power in the Balkans. On July 28, 1914, Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia.

In the early hours of July 29, 1914, Tsar Nicholas II of Russia and his first cousin, Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany (Prussia), begin a frantic exchange of telegrams regarding the newly erupted war in the Balkan region and the possibility of its escalation into a general European war.

“In this serious moment, I appeal to you to help me,” Tsar Nicholas wrote to the Kaiser in a telegram sent at one o’clock on the morning of July 29. “An ignoble war has been declared to a weak country. The indignation in Russia shared fully by me is enormous. I foresee that very soon I shall be overwhelmed by the pressure forced upon me and be forced to take extreme measures which will lead to war.” This message crossed with one from Wilhelm to Nicholas expressing concern about the effect of Austria’s declaration in Russia and urging calm and consideration as a response.

After receiving the Tsar’s telegram, Wilhelm cabled back: “I...share your wish that peace should be maintained. But...I cannot consider Austria’s action against Serbia an ‘ignoble’ war. Austria knows by experience that Serbian promises on paper are wholly unreliable. I understand its action must be judged as trending to get full guarantee that the Serbian promises shall become real facts...I therefore suggest that it would be quite possible for Russia to remain a spectator of the Austro-Serbian conflict without involving Europe in the most horrible war she ever witnessed.” Though Wilhelm assured the Tsar that the German government was working to broker an agreement between Russia and Austria-Hungary, he warned that if Russia were to take military measures against Austria, war would be the result.

The telegram exchange continued over the next few days, as the two men spoke of their desire to preserve peace, even as their respective countries continued mobilizing for war. On July 29, Nicholas II suggested handing over the Austria-Serbia issue to the Hague Conference, but he did not get a reply. On July 30, the Kaiser wrote to Nicholas: “I have gone to the utmost limits of the possible in my efforts to save peace. Even now, you can still save the peace of Europe by stopping your military measures.” The following day, Nicholas replied: “It is technically impossible to stop our military preparations which were obligatory owing to Austria’s mobilization. We are far from wishing for war. As long as the negotiations with Austria on Serbia’s account are taking place, my troops shall not make any provocative action. I give you my solemn word for this.” However, Emperor Franz Josef had rejected the Kaiser’s mediation offer, saying it came too late, as Russia had mobilized, and Austrian troops were already marching on Serbia.

The German ambassador to Russia delivered an ultimatum that night (31 August) — halt the mobilization within 12 hours, or Germany would begin its own mobilization, a step that would logically proceed to war. By four o’clock in the afternoon of August 1, in Berlin, no reply had come from Russia. At a meeting with Germany’s civilian and military leaders — Chancellor von Hollweg and General von Falkenhayn — Kaiser Wilhelm agreed to sign the mobilization orders.

On August 1, the British Foreign Minister Edward Grey promised the German Ambassador in London that in the case of war between Germany and Russia Britain would remain neutral, provided France were not assaulted.

That same day, in his last contribution to the telegram exchange, Tsar Nicholas pressed the Kaiser for assurance that his mobilization did not definitely mean war. Wilhelm’s response was dismissive. “I yesterday pointed out to your government the way by which alone war may be avoided...I have...been obliged to mobilize my army. Immediate affirmative clear and unmistakable answer from your government is the only way to avoid endless misery. Until I have received this answer alas, I am unable to discuss the subject of your telegram. As a matter of fact, I must request you to immediately order your troops on no account to commit the slightest act of trespassing over our frontiers.”

Germany declared war on Russia that same day, on August 1, 1914. In two days, on August 3, it declared war on France, accusing it of air bombardments of Germany and the breach of Belgian neutrality. Having declared war, however, Germany was not ready for the war with Russia. Russia’s military and political leadership knew that perfectly well, which is why the German Kaiser’s declaration of war surprised everybody in St. Petersburg tremendously. It was one of the most uncommon beginnings of war. Up until that time, whoever declared war would

begin an offensive action. On 7 August 1914, however, having declared war on Russia, Germany immediately went on the defensive.

For her part, the Russian Army went on the offensive because it was asked so by its Entente allies France and Britain, who were trying to get the Russian army to make an offensive from the very first day of the war. The French Minister of War, Adolphe Messimy, literally demanded it, while the French ambassador in Russia, Maurice Paléologue, begged Tsar Nicholas II to order the attack since otherwise France would “inevitably be crushed.” General Alexey Alexeevich Brusilov, hero of the First World War and commander of the renowned Brusilov Offensive, recalled: “At the beginning of the war, in order to save France, he (the Commander in Chief) decided to go against the war plan worked out earlier and quickly launch an offensive, without waiting for the concentration and expansion of the armies to be completed.”

Indeed, Tsar Nicholas II felt deeply indebted to Paris and London and was willing to help the French fight off Germany’s attack, to the detriment of Russia, paying with the blood of thousands of Russian soldiers. However, the Russian army was not ready for the assault. That error at the highest level was a factor that seriously undermined the state system of the Russian Empire.

Now let us turn to the complexion of war at its initial stage. In August 1914 the Germans won a victory at the Battle of the Frontiers and began their advance into France, reaching the eastern outskirts of Paris. In September 1914, there was a sharp reverse of fortune for them when the famous first Battle of the Marne took place, resulting in the allied victory over the German army. Historians later called it the Miracle of the Marne to emphasise its importance in saving Paris. In reality, however, this miracle was largely due to the fact that during the most acute battles for Paris, two Russian armies under the command of Generals Alexander Vasilyevich Samsonov and Pavel Karlovich Rennenkampf invaded the territory of East Prussia drawing to themselves the enemy forces. It was no miracle at all that saved Paris, but heroic Russian soldiers, tens of thousands of whom were slaughtered or captured.

As we have said, Germany was not ready for the war with Russia. At the beginning of war, it became clear that the German generals did not have any special plan for Russia. The German general staff had plans in the event of a war with France, which Russia would support, but not against Russia herself. Trying to halt the Russian Army forcing its way into the Prussian territory, the Germans faced serious difficulties and were forced to improvise, pulling new military units ‘out of nowhere’.

After losing the Battle of Gumbinnen (present-day Gusev) to the Russian armies, the defeated Germans began to retreat. The High Command of the German Army was forced to remove nearly 100,000 soldiers from their advance on Paris and redeploy them against the Russians. The result of the ensuing German assault was the encirclement and destruction of the army of General Samsonov, who shot himself, unable to bear the shame.

At the same time with the offensive in Germany, designed to lead away the enemy from France, the other section of the Russian army began an offensive against Austria in Galicia to help the Serbians. The intention to draw as many German and Austrian troops as possible to the Eastern front is a common thread running through all the operations of the Russian army in 1914. But the Russian troops were advancing not prepared, not having completely mobilised, and suffered a number of initial setbacks. However, the overall superiority of the Russian troops in terms of tactics, arms and morale made its contribution. As a result of stubborn fighting, the Austrian-Hungarian troops suffered a serious defeat in the battle of Galicia. This victory caused jubilation in Russia. The capture of Galicia was perceived in Russia as the return of a torn-away part of historical Rus rather than occupation.¹¹⁵ For its part, Austria-Hungary lost faith in its

¹¹⁵ Austria annexed Galicia in 1772, and during the First World War the Austrian pressure on the East Slavic

army forces and did not risk embarking on large operations without the assistance of the German troops.

The Russian army went on the offensive, this time straining at Moravia and Silesia, an important industrial region of Germany, rich in coal. German commanders were again obliged to shift their troops from the French to the Russian front and go into action with the Russian troops, who were eventually repulsed. In just six months, the number of losses in those fights accounted for half of the overall number for the entire war.

Not grasping the reasons and aims behind the war that had broken out, the Russian leadership were unable to assess correctly the possible ways in which events could develop. Initially, St. Petersburg was convinced that the war would not last very long, since Germany and Austria would surely not be able to withstand the combined power of the Entente. However, the illusion that the war would be speedily concluded had melted away after a few months. The war came to be justly called the Great War. Probably, Germany would have been defeated quickly on condition that all the three Allies of the Entente were on the level, made their share in the fighting, and had similar aims. However, Russia was fighting for the defence of her allies and for the defeat of her enemy, while Britain put her dominance before anything else and fought for the future world order.

The British as usual preferred fighting by proxy, sending their troops to battles sparingly. Besides, they continued manning their army only with volunteers. Thus, to help France, London dispatched to the continent an expeditionary force of General French consisting of two corps and one cavalry brigade, a total of 70,000 people – which was not much by the standards of that war, less than even the numbers of losses sustained by the fighting armies. At the same time, the other major warring powers had quickly called up millions of reservists to fight for their countries. In Britain, the general military service was only introduced on 6 January 1916 – 16 months after the



Admiral von Tirpitz

start of the world conflict. Until then, the British were unable to help their allies to the full extent, and when asked for help, they shrugged their shoulders helplessly – there was no standing army.

By 1915, the war entered a positional phase – the enemies had exhausted the last of their prepared reserves and had no strength for a decisive victory. At issue was just a few seized kilometres of the French territory. The exhausted Germans were no longer able to advance, and the Western front was stabilised, having reached neutral Switzerland on the one side and the sea on the other. The enemies went below ground and were constantly improving their defences.

During the complex moments of military operations and at critical times of arms shortages, neither the English nor the French offered Russia support. The exports of weapons to Russia were few and far between. In 1915 the allies supplied Russia with just 1.2 million shells, less than one sixth of Germany's monthly shell production.

The Russian Generals' notes on those events prove it. General Bonch-Bruевич: "Both England and France were lavish with their promises, which, however, remained promises. The huge

population of Galicia increased. A new ethnicity was virtually imposed by the Austrian authorities. The ethnonym "Ukrainian" came into use, in its modern sense, only in the twentieth century (before the terms "Rus", "Ruthenians", "Rusiny", "Rutenen" were used, see the materials of Vienna Institut fur Geschichte http://www.univie.ac.at/igl.geschichte/vocelka/SS2002/vo_ss2002_1006.htm). Many people who refused to accept this, who called themselves Russians or Ruthenians, were hanged by the Austrian military, mass destroyed in Terezin and Talerhof concentration camps e.g. see Vavryk, V. R. (2001). *Terezin i Talerhof: K 50-letney godovschine tragedii galitsko-russkogo naroda* (Terezin and Talerhof. On the 50th anniversary of the tragedy of the Galician-Russian people). Moscow: Moscow Society of Friends of Carpathian Rus.

sacrifices made by the Russian people in saving Paris from the German invasion were unreciprocated. With rare cynicism, those same allies virtually refused us any kind of help. To every suggestion that Russia should be supplied with ammunition, the French and English generals declared they had nothing to give.” General Svechin: “Our request to the French to order shells from their factories was refused. It turned out they were not ready to make any sacrifice, unlike we did at the start of the war, ready for the offensive in support of our allies. Only in 1916 did the French government grant us permission to buy a small percentage of the output of a factory in Creusot. That factory’s management had no scruples about charging us exorbitant prices...” In the meantime, the British, as testified by the Prime Minister Lloyd George, were stockpiling shells and flaunted their enormous reserves of shells ready to be sent to the front. When Russia paid for the manufacture of ammunition to American factories, the cargo, which was ready for dispatch, was simply intercepted by the British and used to their own needs. Further negotiations and correspondence on the issue led to nothing.

The war was dragging on and there was no sign of it ending. Having already been at war for six months, the Entente allies still did not coordinate their actions so as to put pressure on the Reich from different sides at the same time. The impression was that some forces did not want Germany to be defeated quickly, for that would mean counting Russia among the victors. The Germans understood that well enough: “The English were hoping to crush our nation with the help of the Russian steamroller, and the Franco-Belgian-British army were to slow down our attack. If Russia had been too victorious, their plan was to end the war”, Admiral von Tirpitz pointed out. As the war dragged on, the bony hand of destruction was slowly but surely creeping towards Europe and close on its tail, the future revolution was beginning to cast its shadow across the maps of Russia, Germany and Austria-Hungary.

A series of provocations involved Turkey in World War I. As the world’s leading shipbuilding power, Britain had received orders from many states to build cutting-edge ships. A few years before the start of the war, Brazil had ordered with England its third battleship – a dreadnought armed with 14 305 mm guns. However, it had not quite considered its financial capabilities and was about to retract its order, when Turkey repurchased the Brazilian ship and also paid for the construction of one more ship of the same type. By the summer of 1914, those ships were to be handed over to the customer. However, the English firms started to use every excuse to delay handing over the ships and on 28 July 1914, the day that Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia, Britain requisitioned both of the Turkish dreadnoughts and included them as part of their own fleet under the names HMS Agincourt and HMS Erin. Such actions caused indignation in Istanbul, since the construction of the warships had been financed by public subscription. The unexpected deficit to the tune of two top-rank ships sapped the defensive power of the Turkish fleet. Turkey’s hatred spread to the whole of the Entente, of which the nearest member geographically was Russia.

The German Military Command decided to take advantage of the developing situation and secretly offered the Turkish government two new German warships, which since 1912 had been located in the Mediterranean. These were the battle cruiser SMS Goeben and the light cruiser SMS Breslau. The daring actions of the German Command in getting Turkey on their side seem to fit in completely with the interests of the English, which is why the two ships reached Istanbul safe and sound. In August 1914 Turkey signed a treaty of alliance with Germany. On 29 October 1914, German Admiral Souchon, having accepted the post of Commander-in-Chief of the Ottoman navy, led his fleet out to sea, allegedly for training exercises. Under his command SMS Goeben opened fire on Sebastopol, SMS Breslau on - Novorossiysk and the cruiser Hamidiye - on Odessa. Thus, contrary to Russia’s wishes, Turkey turned out to be Russia’s next adversary.

The Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, the navigable waterways of the Black Sea, along which the Russians could be supplied with everything they needed, were blockaded. The main flow of Russian exports moved through those Straits: between 60 and 70% of all Russian grain exports

passed through them; the total of Russia's goods exports using that route accounted for almost 34% of her total trade. Russia now had a problem selling goods and receiving the materials she needed. The shortages in the first few years of the war can in many ways be explained by that fact. As Russia's Black Sea ports were blocked, a significant amount of the allies' weapons had to be delivered via Murmansk and Arkhangelsk, but much of the equipment was delayed and never reached the front.

The British only provided transport ships to carry weapons on the condition that in return they were given bread, butter, timber, spirits and important strategic raw materials that Russia herself needed. Before long, the British government demanded that Russia should move its gold reserves to London as a guarantee that its orders would be paid for. Dozens of tonnes of Russian gold (it became known as the "Tsar's gold") was moved there. It was never returned to Russia, nor was it covered by supplies. Perhaps, the coalition partners did not do this because they knew of their final victory.

The question of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles was a very difficult one for the Allies. The British regarded the Straits as the zone of their vital interests and would not let anyone get in their way. But the British needed Russia to participate in the war as the tip of the military spear (or the steamroller, in Tirpitz's words) against Germany. They knew that their refusal to concede the Straits could incite supporters of alliance with Germany in Russia to call for peace. That ran contrary to the British plans. They had to reassure Nicholas II of their reliability. Now they were using the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles as a bait. "The extreme need to bolster Russia in the midst of its failures in East Prussia", wrote Winston Churchill in *The World Crisis*, "forced Edward Grey, Britain's Foreign Secretary, to instruct Buchanan, our ambassador in St. Petersburg, as early as 14 November 1914 to inform Sazonov that the government recognised that the issue regarding the Straits and Constantinople must be settled in accordance with the desires of Russia." That was allegedly the chance for Russia to resolve the age-old question of the Turkish straits, bridging the Black Sea.

But conceding the Straits to Russia was a bluff. Instead of the offensive on the German front, which would have forced the Germans to ease the pressure on the Russian army, the British and the French decided to strike against Turkey, trying to capture the straits that Russia had claimed. On April 25, 1915, they planted the landing at Gallipoli. Their goal was to seize the Dardanelles and Constantinople. Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk) commanded the Turkish army, Churchill organized the operation on the British side. In the Battle of Gallipoli, the allies suffered a crushing defeat. Nearly a third of the squadron was put out of action: three ships were sunk, three more sustained very serious damage. The Turks lost a total of only eight guns on shore. Later, the English admiral Wallis acknowledged that "in the entire history of the world, there has never been another operation carried out in such haste and so badly organised". In 1915, at the height of the fighting on the Russian-German front, when the Russian held back the German offensive, there was a host of allied divisions pointlessly hanging around Gallipoli. The Russians vainly tried to get at least some kind of real help from the Allies.

The actions of the Entente countries, unlike their adversaries, "continued to lack coordination", which is exactly how the English and the French accounted for their passivity and reluctance to draw part of the German forces towards themselves. Having received no support, Russia insisted on resolving the issue of coordination. Under the pressure of St. Petersburg, an inter-allied military conference took place at Chantilly on 7 July 1915, after almost a year of military actions by the countries of the Entente. This was the first time they had tried to coordinate strategic plans more closely to achieve a final victory in the war. At the very first session, the French General Joffre declared that "the existing lack of coordination of actions by the allies" could lead to "the Austro-Germans focussing their main attacks on each of the Allied armies in succession and removing them from the battle one by one". The solution that suggested itself was simple and logical: the allied army at which the enemy's main attack was directed

should receive help from the other members of the Entente. But, as the head of Russian military intelligence Colonel Ignatiev, whose brother represented Russia at the conference, wrote: “Despite the fine declarations, it wasn’t possible to create a central coordinating inter-Allied body, largely through the fault of England. The contradictions ... turned out to be too great.”

In order to work out and coordinate its plans, the Entente held a second conference at Chantilly in December 1915. Russia’s new representative, General Zhilinsky, once again tried to achieve clear and simple objectives with the coalition partners. The Russian command insisted that attacks on the Western and Eastern fronts should be carried out at the same time. There should be no time lapse between the start of operations conducted by separate armies. The Russian general also pressed for an immediate counterattack by the other allies, should one of them be attacked by the Germans, even if preparations for such a counterattack had not been completely finalised.



Marshal Joffre in Chantilly, 1915

The conference heard Zhilinsky out, agreed that what he had suggested would not allow the enemy to freely manoeuvre with reserves, but only managed to work out general provisions, rather than specific objectives. Later the dates of future offensives were determined in a memorandum composed by the French General Staff. In its initial version, everything was planned as General Zhilinsky had requested – a simultaneous attack on the Western and Eastern fronts. Then small amendments made by the allies began to creep in. According to the updated plan, there was a two weeks' lapse between the planned offensives on the French and on the Russian fronts in July 1916 – just enough time for the Germans to redeploy their divisions by rail to the Russian front. In other words, in the new plan, Russia was once again saddled with the main burden of the war, and the subsequent events changed nothing, regardless of any changes in the political and military situation.

In August 1916, Romania entered into the war, not without the British involvement, and Russia’s operation to take control over the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles was thwarted again. As the Russian army was kept busy rescuing the Romanians, this operation was moved to April 1917. “Romania asked Russia for help at the very outset of military actions and the size of this help increased continuously as the German and Austro-Hungarian offensives progressed. By the beginning of spring 1917, there were 36 Russian infantry and 6 Russian cavalry divisions on the Romanian front, which was some 500 kilometres long. This meant that the Russian army had sent approximately one quarter of its troops to Romania and was left with almost no reserves itself. On top of that, Russia was supposed to supply the Romanian army with food and equipment, but by that time Russia’s own situation was getting worse by the day. It is a textbook example of how a weak ally brings more worries than it is able to give help!” - General Mannerheim wrote in his memoirs.

Despite all the hardships, the Russian army was able to mobilize and rearm, and entered the year of 1917 stronger than ever. The Russian soldiers were standing on the approaches to Iran. As a promulgation of the agreements reached between Russia and the Entente, Nicholas II appealed to the army and navy with an order which confirmed his intention to fight for the restoration of the Russian control of Constantinople, hence, the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. In the spring - summer 1917 a new offensive was blueprinted by Russia and the allies, while the German army was preparing for strategic defence. However, the February 1917 Revolution in Russia quickly led to the collapse of the Russian army. The Russian Tsar Nicholas II was made to abdicate.

On March 3, 1918, in Brest-Litovsk, the representatives of Soviet Russia on one side and the Central Powers (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey and Bulgaria) - on the other signed a separate peace treaty. It marked the withdrawal of Russia from the First World War. In July 1918, Nicholas II was murdered together with his family. Remarkably, Nicholas II's cousin, George V of Britain, did not accept the Tsar and his children as refugees in Britain, even though Russia was the British ally in the First World War. On June 28, 1919, in Paris, Britain, the USA, France and Italy signed the Peace Treaty of Versailles with Germany. The treaty forced Germany to disarm, make substantial territorial concessions, and pay reparations to certain countries that had formed the Entente powers. In 1921 the total cost of these reparations was assessed at 132 billion Marks (then \$31.4 billion or £6.6 billion, roughly equivalent to US \$442 billion or UK £284 billion in 2016). Germany was neither pacified nor conciliated, nor permanently weakened.

As a result of World War I, the re-division of the world was effected in Britain's favour, and her colonial empire was greatly augmented. Britain captured many of former German colonies, strengthened its position in Africa and in the Near East. For the time being Germany ceased to be dangerous, and other rivals of Britain were also weakened.

The reaction of British progressive public opinion to war was shown by Richard Aldington for whom World War I proved to be an eye-opener and a determining factor in his spiritual maturity. All the inhuman essence of the bourgeois society, the mendacity of ideology justifying a way of life and a structure of society that led to wars and made the horrors the author witnessed possible, — all that was condemned in Aldington's masterpiece "Death of a Hero" (1929). His protagonist, a young Englishman, attempts to disentangle himself from the web of lies and hypocrisy that entrap a man's life in the bourgeois society and perishes miserably and, it seems, senselessly, if it were not for the protest of a humanist against an inhuman society that his death expresses.

Comprehension questions:

1. Death of Edward VII and enthronement of George V. Lloyd George. The strikes in Britain in 1915. The Easter Rising of 1916 in Ireland.
2. The role of the Britain in igniting World War I. The exchange of letters between Nicholas II and Keiser Wilhelm. How were the monarchs of Russia and Germany beguiled into entering the war? What were their motives? What were the reasons of Germany to begin the War? Why did it declare war on the Russian Empire? On France? What aims did Russia pursue in the War? What was the common thread running through all the operations of the Russian army in 1914? What were the aims of Britain in the War? Did it mobilise and participate in active fighting to defend France, like Russia?
3. Describe the development of the war in 1914. The "positional war" of 1915. Did the allies supply enough weapons to the eastern front? Why do you think were the British stockpiling shells and flaunting enormous reserves of them? The British interception of the cargo of weapons ready to be sent to Russia. What impression did the allies' actions produce? Admiral von Tirpitz's observation concerning those actions.
4. Which provocation involved Turkey in World War I? Which provocation turned Russia into

Turkey's next adversary? The blockade of the Russian Black Sea ports. Russia pays exorbitantly for the promised British help. The bluff of conceding the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles to Russia. The Battle of Gallipoli. The inter-Allied military conferences at Chantilly. Dealing with lack of coordination of actions. The entrance of Romania in the war. The events of 1916 and 1917.

5. The February Revolution in Russia. The murder of Tsar Nicholas II. The Peace Treaty of Versailles.

6. Richard Aldington's "Death of a Hero."

Names and expressions

greatly valued by the bourgeoisie for his devotion to the war cause and for his demagogic talents - ценился буржуазией за его приверженность делу войны и талант к демагогии

imprisoned the most active shop stewards - заключили в тюрьму самых активных стюардов (профсоюзных активистов, цеховых старост)

Because of the war, four empires - Russian, German, Austrian and Ottoman - collapsed within a year - в результате войны четыре империи - Российская, Германская, Австрийская и Османская - рухнули в течение года

the collapse of traditional religious strongholds - крах традиционных религиозных оплотов

Berlin was using the assassination crisis as a pretext to launch a war to shore up its power in the Balkans - Берлин использовал кризис, возникший в результате этого убийства, в качестве предлога для начала войны с целью сохранения своей власти на Балканах

in the case of war between Germany and Russia Britain would remain neutral, provided France were not assaulted - в случае войны между Германией и Россией Великобритания оставалась бы нейтральной, если бы Франция не подвергалась нападению

Tsar Nicholas pressed the Kaiser for assurance that his mobilization did not definitely mean war - царь Николай II требовал от кайзера заверений в том, что мобилизация в Германии определенно не означает войну

Up until that time, whoever declared war would begin an offensive action. On 7 August 1914, however, having declared war on Russia, Germany immediately went on the defensive - до сих пор государство, объявлявшее войну, начинало наступление. Однако на сей раз Германия, объявив войну России 7 августа 1914 года, стала немедленно готовиться к обороне

Indeed, Tsar Nicholas II felt deeply indebted to Paris and London and was willing to help the French fight off Germany's attack, to the detriment of Russia, paying with the blood of thousands of Russian soldiers - на самом деле, царь Николай II был в большом долгу перед Парижем и Лондоном и был готов помогать французам отражать нападение Германии в ущерб России, заплатив кровью тысяч русских солдат

designed to lead away the enemy from France - было запланировано заставить противника вывести войска из Франции

The intention to draw as many German and Austrian troops as possible to the Eastern front is a common thread running through all the operations of the Russian army in 1914 - Намерение отвлечь как можно больше немецких и австрийских войск на Восточный фронт проходит красной нитью через все операции русской армии в 1914 году

The capture of Galicia was perceived in Russia as the return of a torn-away part of historical Rus rather than occupation - Захват Галиции воспринимался в России как возвращение отторгнутой части исторической Руси, а не как оккупация

However, the illusion that the war would be speedily concluded had melted away after a few months. The war came to be justly called the Great War - Однако иллюзия, что война быстро закончится, растаяла через несколько месяцев. Эта война стала справедливо называться Великой войной

Probably, Germany would have been defeated quickly on condition that all the three Allies of the Entente were on the level, made their share in the fighting, and had similar aims - Вероятно, Германия была бы быстро побеждена при условии, что все три союзника Антанты были бы честны друг с другом, равным образом участвовали в боях и имели схожие цели

charging us exorbitant prices - сильно завышали стоимость оружия для русских

The unexpected deficit to the tune of two top-rank ships sapped the defensive power of the Turkish fleet - нехватка двух кораблей высшего ранга подорвала оборонительную мощь турецкого флота

Before long, the British government demanded that Russia should move its gold reserves to London as a guarantee that its orders would be paid for - вскоре британское правительство потребовало от России перевести свои золотые запасы в Лондон в качестве гарантии того, что его заказы будут оплачены

the British needed Russia to participate in the war as the tip of the military spear (or the steamroller, in Tirpitz's words) against Germany - британцы нуждались в России для участия в войне в качестве тарана (или парового катка, по словам Тирпица) против Германии

Then "small" amendments by the allies began to creep in - затем стали появляться «мелкие» поправки союзников

As a result of World War I, the re-division of the world was effected in Britain's favour, and her colonial empire was greatly augmented - В результате Первой мировой войны перераспределение мира было осуществлено в пользу Англии, и ее колониальная империя значительно расширилась

His protagonist, a young Englishman, attempts to disentangle himself from the web of lies and hypocrisy that entrap a man's life in the bourgeois society - главный герой, молодой англичанин, пытается выпутаться из паутины лжи и лицемерия, которые опутывают жизнь человека в буржуазном обществе

53. BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR

In 1933, Adolf Hitler, the ideologue of Nazism, was appointed as Chancellor of Germany. By that year, the Nazi Party was the largest elected party in the German Reichstag. On 15 July 1933, representatives of Italy, Britain, Germany and France signed in Rome the Four-Power Pact - an international treaty envisaging political cooperation between the four powers in the League of Nations to eliminate the threat of war in Europe. It suggested the audit of the Versailles borders (between Germany and Poland and between Hungary and her neighbours). Eventually, this agreement fell through.



Leader of the British Fascists Oswald Mosley (1896 - 1980) addresses supporters in Bermondsey, London.

The British reactionary circles greeted Hitler's triumph. They lavished praises on him to prepare ground for anti-democratic measures in England. Soon enough fascist organizations emerged to active existence in Britain. The British union of fascists was especially active in the 1930s as a "new party", and it was headed by a millionaire, a former Labour party Executive Committee member and one of the second Labour government cabinet ministers, Oswald Mosley. In 1931, the British fascists sent a delegation to Germany so as to "absorb the valuable experience." Storm troops were organized in England in 1932 and special barracks were built for the English "black shirts" in 1933. They practised their methods in the London Olympic Hall on June 7, 1934 with 15 thousand listening to Mosley preaching his Gospel of terror. Searchlights were used to spot out those not inclined to shout for a speedy alliance with Hitler Germany and the brave individuals who ventured to object were brutally beaten up by fascists to the approving shouts of the blood-thirsty audience. The money to support the English fascists came from British big business and Mosley was heard to say in 1936 that he was still getting support from English industrialists.¹¹⁶

The Labour leaders were inclined to ignore the struggle against fascism. But the people rose to face the fascist danger and swamped the fascist bandits after the Olympic Hall massacre (at the Olympia Rally of 1934 a number of anti-fascist protestors met brutal force – from the fascists inside the hall and from the police who attacked them outside). When Mosley's "black shirts" met in Hyde Park on September 9, 1934 it was only thanks to the police force (seven thousand policemen) that they managed to escape the peoples' wrath. After that not a single attempt on the part of the fascists was left without due attention from the workers; it should be borne in mind that the General Council of Trade Unions instructed the Trade Union members "not to participate in the counter-demonstrations against Mosley." Fascism in Britain was stopped by mass protests, led by the left and in opposition to the official leaders of the movement.

There were other reactionary organizations which fought against the pro-socialist forces and for an anti-Soviet alliance with fascist states. The British government itself was not above praising fascist dictatorships. In 1934 a special Bill was passed, officially to suppress radicalism in the army and navy, and in fact to suppress any democratic movement that appeared. According to "Sedition Bill" as it was officially termed, any individual in possession of socialist literature was to serve a two-year term in prison.

¹¹⁶Mullally, Frederic. *Fascism Inside England* / by Frederic Mullally. Published by London: C. Morris Books Ltd., 1946.

In 1935, fascist Italy attacked Abyssinia; Mussolini had got Britain's tacit consent to it but when the League of Nations protested, the English government supported the League's decision of economic sanctions against Italy. However, when it came to acting, England did nothing to prevent Italy from fighting Abyssinia (England even refused to close the Suez Canal, which would have been a serious hindrance to the Italian troops in Abyssinia). In fact, the English Establishment must have been afraid that the failure of Italian fascism would weaken the European colonialists and then the defeat of the Italian aggressors in Abyssinia might strengthen the national liberation struggle of the British colonial slaves in Africa. That sort of policy emboldened fascism. The non-interference allowed the fascist regimes to have their way, the military alliance of Germany and Italy was allowed to flourish.



Edward reviewing a squad of SS with Robert Ley, 1937

George V died in 1935 and then his eldest son Edward became the English King as Edward VIII. But he did not rule a whole year when in December 11, 1936 he abdicated in favour of life with Wallis Simpson, an American woman he loved, so he did not want to marry any offspring of a royal family, which was obligatory for the king. Like many British and American high-class representatives, he admired Nazi Germany. During his reign

Britain de facto condoned Nazis' occupation of the demilitarized Rhineland in 1936.

His younger brother took his place on the English throne as George VI. George VI was born on the 14th of December 1895, and he was the English king since December 1936 till the 6th of February 1952, when he died, while his brother Edward lived till May 1972.

In 1936 fascist elements encouraged by impunity took the offensive in Spain, as a civil war broke out between the Second Spanish Republic and pro-fascist Francisco Franco. The Conservative British leaders supported by the Labour party leadership condemned the lawful Spanish government and supported the fascist rebels. By proclaiming the so-called "non-interference" policy Britain in fact helped Hitler, Mussolini and Franco. Under the guise of this policy, the US, France and the United Kingdom kept their weapons markets closed for the Republicans, while Franco, through Portugal and ports that were in his hands, was able to receive all the new military supplies and troops from Germany and Italy. As George Orwell wrote in his essay *Looking back on the Spanish War*: "The outcome of the Spanish war was settled in London, Paris, Rome, Berlin — at any rate not in Spain."

On the other hand, the Soviet government on October 23, 1936 officially declared that it cannot be bound by an agreement of neutrality. Up to 3.5 thousand Soviet citizens were directly involved in the events in Spain; the Soviet Union also rendered the Spanish Republicans a significant financial aid and supplied them arms; the Comintern initiated the establishment of International Brigades, enlisting about 40 thousand foreigners from 54 countries. The British poet Winston Hugh Auden, who fought in Spain for the Republican cause, wrote a fine poem "Spain, 1937" – the best of his works on political themes and one of the best poetic comments on those events. Still, ultimately the rightist counter-revolution won, and in April 1939 the Civil War in Spain ended. As a result, the Spanish Republic was eliminated, and the dictatorship of Francisco Franco was installed in the country. Franco then ruled Spain for the next 36 years, from April 1939 until his death in November 1975.

In 1937, Neville Chamberlain succeeded Stanley Baldwin as prime minister. Britain claimed to pursue the policy of 'appeasement', but at the core Chamberlain, as well as his predecessors and successors, were collaborators of Adolf Hitler's. It was in Chamberlain's time, that Britain

was engaged in the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia. In fact, the British elite saw Hitler and Nazism as a bulwark against communism in Europe. With a few exceptions - like Winston Churchill - they were more concerned with the Bolshevik spectre than with the fascist reality.¹¹⁷ They were uneasy about Hitler's emergent power, but they did not look upon fascism with the same fear that they did upon communism. Unlike the communists, the fascists were not a threat to private enterprise. If anything, the fascists had crushed socialist organizations in Germany and Italy and had made those countries safer for private capital. Chamberlain and his associates' eagerness to avoid war arose not from their commitment to peace, but from a willingness to strike a bargain with the Nazi leader that Germany would fight against Russia. The British historian Geoffrey Baraclough argued: "Hitler's successes in Western foreign policy were due less to German armament, the deficiencies and limitations of which were known to competent military circles, than to the tacit alliance of powerful reactionary elements in England and France which, although loathe to see a reassertion of German equality, were still more unwilling to check it by military alliance with Soviet Russia, or to run the risk of social revolution in Germany as a result of Hitler's fall."

In November 1937, the tripartite bloc of Japan, Italy and Germany concluded the anti-Comintern pact and vowed a joint struggle against communism. England, believing they intended to attack Soviet Russia, did not mind it in the least. Since the end of 1937, Germany began to heavily supply Japan with aircraft and all types of military equipment. On 15 July 1937, the broad-scale aggression of Japan against sovereign China began. In the Second World War, China suffered the heaviest losses, about 35 million people). In 1938-1939, the Japanese attacked the Soviet Union near the Outer-Mongolia area. This resulted in a full-scale war with the USSR that ended with Japan suffering 18,000 casualties and a military defeat.

In Germany, Hitler, who in 1935 repudiated the Treaty of Versailles that limited Germany's army to 7 divisions, began a major mobilization of 21 divisions and planned to move toward 36 divisions.

In March 1938 Hitler accomplished the Anschluss – the invasion and annexation of Austria into Nazi Germany. To remove from the English government the responsibility for Germany's actions in Austria Chamberlain said in the House of Commons that Germany deserved serious censure. After the Austria deal, Hitler laid claim to the entire western, industrial base of Czechoslovakia, known as the Sudetenland. However, even at that time, Hitler still could have been stopped, and there were powerful forces in the German army itself that were ready to stop

¹¹⁷ It should be remembered that after World War I the British and Americans - among twelve other nations - sent expeditionary forces to invade Soviet Russia. The military intervention took place in 1918-1919, the invaders landed on the Russian shores of the Black Sea, the White Sea and the Far East. Already in the summer of 1917, the famous English writer and intelligence agent W.S. Maugham and the leaders of the Czechoslovak corps left for Petrograd through the USA and Siberia. They were part of a conspiracy to prevent the Bolshevik victory and Russia's withdrawal from World War I. This conspiracy was closely linked with the plans of the US to establish their control over the Trans-Siberian Railway. However, the 1917 October Socialist Revolution baffled those plans. The Brest Peace was signed on March 3 1917 and the Germans ceased their offensive against Petrograd. In December 1917, Britain and France agreed to divide Russia. In May 1918, the mutiny of the Czechoslovak corps took place in Chelyabinsk. In November 1918, the Anglo-French fleet of 32 ships landed on the Black Sea shore: the British in Batumi and Novorossiysk, the French in Odessa and Sebastopol. Later the British, American and French troops landed in Murmansk and Arkhangelsk. The Japanese invaded the Far East, the British and Americans landed in Vladivostok. The regime of the interventionists in Arkhangelsk and Murmansk was especially cruel. They established a colonial regime there; declared martial law, introduced military courts, during the occupation they exported 2686 thousand poods of different cargoes for a total of more than 950 million rubles in gold. The entire military, commercial and fishing fleet of the North became the interventionists' trophy. American troops performed the functions of punishers. Over 50,000 Soviet citizens (more than 10% of the total population under control) were thrown into the prisons of Arkhangelsk, Murmansk, Pechenga, and Yokangi. Only in Arkhangelsk provincial prison 8 thousand people were shot, 1020 died of hunger, cold and epidemics.

him.

In 1938, a group of high-ranking German generals, who had reckoned that Hitler's plans for a global war, including his prospective offensive against the million-strong Czech army in the mountains, were tantamount to suicide of Germany, made a plot against Hitler. They proposed to arrest him when in mid September he would be returning from Berchtesgaden to Berlin. Fecklessly, they made the British aware of their plans, believing that the latter would be interested in the planned outcome, but the British in fact did everything to prevent the plot. Chamberlain flew to Berchtesgaden to negotiate with Hitler and thus kept him from returning to Berlin.¹¹⁸ At the same time, Winston Churchill gave a letter to the German military commander Ewald von Kleist, read and approved by Halifax, to take back to Germany to show to his co-conspirators. In this letter, Churchill stated his conviction that a German invasion of Czechoslovakia would precipitate a world war and suggested the continuance of this war for several years.¹¹⁹ Eventually, the anti-Hitler conspiracy failed.

On September 30, 1938, the Munich Agreement ("the Munich Collusion") was concluded by the representatives of Germany, Britain, Italy and France - Hitler, Chamberlain, Mussolini and Daladier. The four powers agreed to accept German occupation of Czechoslovakia's Sudetenland before any plebiscite. And when the German troops were already near the Czechoslovakian border, Britain sent Lord Ransiman, under diplomatic cover, to persuade Czechoslovakia to suppress the forces within their country that were against surrender to Germany, under the threat of freezing the Czechoslovakian assets. Notably, after the occupation of Czechoslovakia in March 1939, more than 2 million gold bars worth 5.6 million pounds were transferred from the account of the National Bank of Czechoslovakia to the account of the Reichsbank through the Bank for International Settlements.

According to the Russian historian Andrei Fursov, in 1938 in Munich the four powers created an anti-Soviet bloc, a proto-NATO, that was actually aimed against the USSR, with the British brain and the German fist, which Stalin managed to check by the German-Soviet non-aggression pact of 1939. Czechoslovakia's industrial complex was meant to facilitate the growth of the German military might and ensure its ability to launch a big war against "Bolshies" in the East. European elites were interested in the war and expected by this means to exhaust both Germany and Russia. In Britain, it was believed that Germany's attack on the Soviet Union would nullify the danger of a German invasion of the British Isles, so it was desirable both from the geopolitical and the military point of view.

Even after Munich, the Soviet Union offered to stand with Czechoslovakia, offering to send their troops and planes there. The Soviets, however, were denied passage to Czechoslovakia by

¹¹⁸In his essay "Finest Hour Regime Change, 1938: Did Chamberlain 'Miss the Bus'?" British author Michael McMenemy narrates: "there is no historical doubt that the German resistance repeatedly warned the British of Hitler's intention to invade Czechoslovakia in September 1938... In response, however, the Chamberlain government took every diplomatic step it could... to undermine Hitler's opposition." Thus whatever Chamberlain's motivation was, instead of beating the drums over Hitler's aggression in Europe, on September 28, 1938 he "proposed [Fuhrer] a five-power conference between Britain, Germany, Czechoslovakia, France and Italy, where, Chamberlain assured Hitler, Germany could 'get all essentials without war and without delay'," McMenemy wrote citing official documents, and added that Chamberlain also turned a blind eye to the fact that Germany excluded Czechoslovakia from the conference.

¹¹⁹"I am sure that the crossing of the Czechoslovak frontier by German armies or aircraft will bring about a renewal of world war. I am certain as I was at the end of July 1914 that England will march with France, and certainly the United States is now strongly anti-Nazi. It is difficult for the democracies in advance and in cold blood to make precise declarations, but the spectacle of an armed attack by Germany upon a small neighbour and the bloody fighting that will follow will rouse the whole British Empire and compel the gravest decisions. Do not, I pray you, be misled upon this point... Such a war once started, would be fought out like the last [WWI] to the bitter end, and one must consider not what might happen in the first few months, but where we should all be at the end of the third or fourth year."

Poland, which was a right-wing military dictatorship. Poland had profited by the Munich as it gained the Těšín region. However, the Polish position proved fatal: in April 1939 Hitler approved the Fall Weiß - the Nazi strategic plan for the invasion of Poland, which even specified the date – September 1, 1939.

The Soviet Union had made repeated overtures to conclude collective security pacts with the United States and European countries in order to contain German and Japanese aggression since 1932. These overtures were repeatedly ignored or rebuffed, including the Soviet attempts to render arms and assistance to Czechoslovakia. During all this time, 11 American corporations, such as Ford Motor Company, General Motors, Standard Oil and others were investing in German heavy industry, particularly, arms productions. In fact, American corporations continued to receive dividends from their assets in Germany until the opening of the second front in 1944, cashing in on the war. It is worth recalling in this connection the famous phrase uttered by Harry Truman in 1941: "If we see that Germany is winning we ought to help Russia, and if Russia is winning, we ought to help Germany, and let them kill as many as possible..."

On June 2, 1939, the Soviet People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs (the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) urgently addressed the United Kingdom and France with a proposal to their governments to conclude a defensive anti-German agreement providing for a joint repulsion of all kinds of German aggression. The whole of July and half of August London and Paris had expressed their approval but refrained from any action. The British delegation had been instructed to delay the negotiations and avoid clear language. While the USSR insisted on working out specific military agreements, Britain was stalling the process. The Western representatives, Admiral Drax and General Dumenko, arrived by sea only on 11 of August, and it turned out that the British side had no formal authority to negotiate or ratify anything. At the same time, representatives from the UK and Germany in secret from the Soviet side conducted joint negotiations in London. The pattern of World War I and, more generally, the pattern of gaining advantage by pitting two strong countries against each other revealed itself again. The next step to accomplish it was that Poland would share the fate of Czechoslovakia – Hitler would be allowed to devour it and then move further east to assault the Soviet Union.

The USSR saw that it was being set up as a target for Hitler's aggression. In light of this, the only move for the USSR to subvert this plan was to follow the example of many European countries and conclude a similar non-aggression agreement with Germany¹²⁰, and the German-Soviet non-aggression pact ("The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact") was signed in Moscow on August 23, 1939. The Soviet Union urgently needed about three years to complete rearmament and delay the war until the end of 1942, to meet it head-on. It was able to delay it only until June 22, 1941, but even so this helped the Soviet Union to accumulate its resources in the face of the inevitable invasion. The West understood the preventive nature of this pact well enough, thus Winston Churchill, then First Lord of the Admiralty, said on October 1, 1939, in an interview to the British national broadcaster that this Soviet action "was clearly necessary for the safety of Russia

¹²⁰ Thus, on January 26, 1934, the German-Polish non-aggression pact was concluded (an important part of it was directed against the USSR). On December 6, 1938, a similar pact of non-aggression with Germany was signed by France. After that, the French Foreign Minister Bonnet sent out a circular letter informing the French ambassadors about the results of his talks with Ribbentrop, saying that German policy was henceforth guided by the struggle against Bolshevism and that Germany showed its will to expand to the East. Having an agreement with Moscow on mutual assistance and being aware of Hitler's intentions to commit aggression against the USSR, the French government concluded an agreement on non-aggression, thereby guaranteeing to the fascists the inviolability of their western borders in the event of the German-Soviet war. The Anglo-German negotiations (the London talks) were conducted at about the same time - from June to August 1939. And as the leaders of the USSR knew the London talks to be aimed at concluding a broad Anglo-German agreement on political and economic issues. The allies were thus consciously pushing Hitler to fight with the USSR. However, while to this day no one publicly censures these actions of European states, Stalin's analogous steps are declared criminal.

against the Nazi menace."¹²¹

On September 1, 1939 Germany invaded Poland. The German-Polish war lasted two and a half weeks, Warsaw fell, and the Polish government fled to Britain. Only following that, on September 17, the USSR began its liberation campaign, which was finished on October 5. It took back western Belorussia, the western Ukraine, and other areas seized and incorporated into the Polish Pilsudski dictatorship in 1921 under the Treaty of Riga. It also moved into Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia – the Baltic territories that had been taken from it in 1919. By reclaiming their old boundaries, the Soviet Union drew a line on the Nazi advance.¹²² On September 3, Britain and France declared war on Germany. The war created a necessity for a coalition government. But Chamberlain had become so notoriously reactionary that neither the Liberals nor the Labour party representatives could participate in his government.

In the period of September 1939 - April 1940 England and France waged the "phoney war" against Germany; it was a war without military action taken. As always, the British government thought it could fight Germany with the bodies of foreign soldiers supported by British financial aid. The military activity of Britain was confined to occasional air fights or naval fights when stray German ships were attacked in the open sea. Chamberlain's government was severely criticised, and not by the opposition only. In May 1940 Chamberlain retired and a coalition government was formed (54 Conservatives, 17 Labour party men, 4 Liberals, etc.) under Winston Churchill.

In May 1940, when Belgium capitulated, England hurriedly evacuated troops from Dunkirk leaving large quantities of equipment to the enemy and leaving half of the French troops in the lurch to be taken prisoners. The ordinary English people showed downright heroism helping to evacuate both the British and the French soldiers, using boats, motor-launches and every kind of craft they could command, but they did not manage to save them, do what they could. In June 1940 France capitulated and Petain headed the collaborationist government while De Gaulle headed the "Free France" movement.

In 1940 Italy joined the war against Britain with a view to seizing British colonial possessions in the Mediterranean and African zones, while Hitler was planning to seize British colonies in the Near and Middle East.

After an event in December 1941 when the Japanese fleet attacked the American Pacific naval base of Pearl Harbour, the USA, sensing the danger of German domination in Europe, declared war on Germany and its satellites, concluded an agreement with Britain, trying to take advantage

¹²¹ Blinova, Ekaterina. Untold Story of Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact (23.08.2015, updated 23:12 23.09.2015). URL.: <http://sputniknews.com/politics/20150823/1026098760/molotov-ribbentrop-pact-untold-story.html>

¹²² During the negotiations with Britain and France, in order to prevent a German invasion, the ships of the Baltic Fleet and the British Navy warships were supposed to secure bases in Finland (Porkkala) and in the Baltic states.

The Baltics said that their people were ready to overthrow the semi-fascist regimes of Pats in Estonia, Smetona in Lithuania and Ulmanis in Latvia, and that the appearance of the Red Army would be the catalyst for that. (And semi-fascist they were, for example, Estonia held the infamous world record for destroying of 98% of Jews living on its territory.) By 1938, the socio-economic situation of the Baltic states was catastrophic. The factory industry in Latvia accounted for only 56% of the 1913 level. The number of workers had fallen by more than a half of the pre-war level. Due to the significant decline in manufacture, only 17.5% of the workforce were employed in industrial production in Estonia, 13.5% in Latvia, 6% in Lithuania, contrary to the pan-European trend - most of the population were employed in agriculture. The people of those countries overthrew their dictators, whereupon the first free democratic elections in 20 years were held (under the dictators' regimes, all political parties were banned). The elected governments decided that, in the conditions of war, it was easier to defend themselves as parts of the Soviet Union, and legally became parts of the USSR.

By the way, Lithuania received its capital, Vilnius, which in 1922 had been wrested from it by Poland, as a gift from the Soviet Union after the Red Army occupied Vilna and the vicinity. On 10 October 1939 of the Vilnius Region, and Vilna were transferred to the Republic of Lithuania. On October 27, 1939, the Lithuanian military units entered Vilna, and on October 28 the ceremony of the meeting of Lithuanian troops was officially held.

of the situation so as to get certain concessions; in March 1941 the Lend-lease Bill was passed in the USA stipulating aid in terms of equipment and foodstuffs. The USA understood that, weakened by the war, England would make a very nice junior partner in the after-war period.

The British Empire dominions joined the war then on the side of the metropolis. In 1939 Australia and New Zealand declared war on Germany, then the South-African Union, later Canada. The colonies and dominions sent their armies.

In April 1941, Germany invaded the territory of Greece and Yugoslavia. Thus, by the summer of 1941, all the Western and Central European countries were occupied by Nazi Germany and Italy.

At the same time, Italo-German troops launched an offensive in North Africa. They expected in autumn of 1941 to begin the conquest of the Middle East, followed by India, where the meeting of the German and Japanese forces was expected.

On June 22, 1941, Hitler attempted to conquer the country, which Napoleon's experience should have taught him to avoid, for it had repeatedly proved too hard a nut to crack for foreign invaders. Treacherously attacking the Soviet Union, Hitler mobilized all his assets. Afraid to rely on Germany's resources, he used those of his allies. It was a liberating war that the Soviet Union waged against fascist hordes that used medieval cruelty, appalling atrocities, unscrupulous disregard of warfare laws. The role of the Soviet State in curbing the fascist aggression had a world-scale historical significance.

Hitler had hoped that Churchill who had always been the Soviet Union's implacable enemy and who said in 1937 that if he were to choose between communism and Nazism he would be more likely to choose Nazism would really support Germany. Naturally, Churchill said so as an act of "safety first". This attitude determined the development of Anglo-Soviet relations in World War II. The British Establishment both helped the Soviet Union sending supplies and took measures to weaken Soviet positions. Churchill's biographers state that he calculated to "settle" the problem of Russia after the war with the help of a strong Anglo-American bloc, able to dictate to Russia (also note the Operation Unthinkable conceived after the war). On the other hand, the progressives among the British were enthusiastic supporters of the Soviet Union. Trade-Unions sent delegations to the Soviet Embassy in London letting the Soviet people know that the workers of Britain were determined to make the British-Soviet unity real and strong. And indeed, the anti-fascist coalition of the Soviet Union, the USA and England that was thus created did play a role in winning the victory over fascism. It was a great victory of Soviet foreign policy which prevented the danger of an imperialistic alliance, that isolated the aggressive fascist states and made the Soviet Union the leading force of a powerful united front of peoples struggling against fascist enslavement.

In July 1941 the Soviet-British Treaty of united action against Germany was signed in Moscow. The goals pursued by the Soviet government, liquidation of fascist danger not only for the Soviet Union but also for the fascist-enslaved peoples, helped to the latter in their struggle for independence, for democratic freedom were near to the hearts of the wide masses which influenced the policy of the Western members of the anti-fascist coalition. The Atlantic Charter signed in August 1941 by Britain and the USA proclaimed their aims as those directed at liquidation of fascist tyranny; no territorial gains were to be sought, the people's rights to choose the form of government were to be respected; the people of the world were to get rid of fascism and then live happily without fear or privations. In September 1941 the Soviet Union joined the Atlantic Charter.

But in the summer months of 1941 when Soviet troops were on the defensive the difference in the attitudes of the British progressives and proletarians and of the reactionary part of the British Establishment became apparent. The people wanted the Second Front to be started, so that the German push against the Soviet forces could be weakened while the British leaders did their best to stop the growth of sympathy for the Russian soldiers, to sow the seeds of doubt as to the

Soviet ability to resist the fascist onslaught. The doubts went so far as to make the British leaders break their promises made in the July Treaty of 1941 according to which Britain pledged herself to loyalty and said no separate negotiations with Germany were to be conducted. Such negotiations took place in September 1941 in Lisbon.

The first major defeat of the Nazis was in the Battle of Moscow (1941-1942), during which the Soviet Army routed the German forces, foiling Hitler's plan of "blitzkrieg" and busting the myth of the invincibility of the Wehrmacht: By the "Typhoon" plan the German armies made offensive on September 30 on Bryansk, and October 2 on Viazma. Despite of fierce resistance of the Soviet armies their front was broken. With huge losses, in November-December 1941 Germans managed to reach the Volga-Moskva canal, force the river Nara, and approach the town of Kashira from the south. But the further attempts of Germans to approach Moscow were broken. The enemy was stopped. During the counter-offensive on December 5-6, the Soviet armies liberated from Germans over 11 thousand occupied towns and villages, and by the beginning of January 1942 pushed Wehrmacht back about 100-250 kms, causing a heavy defeat of 38 enemy divisions. In the course of the counter-offensive and general offensive, the enemy was repulsed.

In Britain, voices were raised again in demand of the Second Front action with renewed vigour and moves were made for the creation of the anti-Hitler coalition. The Anglo-Soviet Treaty signed in London in May 1942 sought to help an understanding to be achieved between the Soviet Union and Britain as to the Second Front action. But Britain's promises were broken again and again and neither 1942 nor 1943 saw the long-awaited Second Front launched. The reason was but too clear. The British and American ruling circles did not plan to defeat fascism fully, the liberation of the fascist-ridden European peoples did not matter much in their schemes. They planned to preserve reactionary forces in Germany at the same time weakening German competition at the world markets, weakening the Soviet Union so that it would no longer exist as a great power.

The tide of war was turned after the counter-offensive and triumph of the Soviet army in the famous Battle of Stalingrad on July 17 1942 — February 2 1943. It had a great influence on the further course of the Second World War. The mass expulsion of the enemy from the territory of the USSR began. The Battle of Kursk (1943) and access to the Dnieper completed the radical change in the course of the Great Patriotic War. The Battle of the Dnieper (1943) upset the calculations of the enemy to conduct a protracted war. The Soviet Union and the Soviet Army played a decisive role in the victory over Hitlerism.

After a long and careful preparation the Second (Western) Front was opened on June 6, 1944, when the allies landed in Normandy (France). By the time, the best German forces had been made harmless by the Soviet Army. France, Belgium and Holland were places where the weakest German troops were located. In August Paris was liberated. The French Resistance headed and directed by the French Communist party was a great help. Late in September 1944, the Anglo-American troops reached the western German border. Early in April 1945, the troops of the Western Allies successfully surrounded and then captured about 19 enemy divisions in the Ruhr area.

In January - the beginning of April 1945, as a result of a powerful strategic offensive along the entire Soviet-German front by ten fronts, the Soviet army inflicted a decisive blow to the main forces of the enemy on the Eastern Front. During the East Prussian, Vistula-Oder, West-Carpathian and Budapest operations, the Soviet troops created conditions for further attacks in Pomerania and Silesia and then – for the advance on Berlin. They liberated almost all of Poland and Czechoslovakia, the entire territory of Hungary. Attempts by the new German government, on May 1, 1945 after the suicide of Adolf Hitler, to achieve a separate peace with the United States and Great Britain (the signing of a preliminary protocol of surrender took place in Reims, 7 May 1945) failed. The victory of the Red Army in Europe had a decisive impact on the

Crimean (Yalta) Conference of the heads of the USSR, the United States and the United Kingdom (from 4 to 11 February 1945), where the questions completing the defeat of Germany were solved and its post-war settlement effected. The USSR confirmed its commitment to join the war against Japan following 2-3 months after the end of the war in Europe.

The question of who would come first in the German capital in the final stage of the war turned into an acute political problem. The Soviet troops were 60 km from Berlin and the advanced part of the Anglo-American troops were 100 km from it. Both the British and the US government demanded that the commander of the allied forces General Eisenhower should take Berlin before the Red Army. For the Soviet Union – the country that had suffered immense destruction and civilian losses, it was a matter of principle to be the victor in the Great Patriotic War. Millions of Soviet women and children died during this war, which Germany waged for the destruction not only of the Soviet Union, but also of the peoples living in it. And, quite understandably, the Red Army had to overcome more resistance than the Anglo-American forces.

In favourable conditions, the Anglo-American-French forces launched an offensive in the centre of Germany, and by mid-April reached the line of the Elbe. On April 25, 1945, a historic meeting of the Soviet and American soldiers took place. In the following months, the Western Allies advanced in the north - to Lubeck and Wismar, blocking Denmark. In the south, they occupied southern Germany, came to Upper Austria, Czechoslovakia, took the town of Karlovy Vary and Plzen. On May 2, 1945, the troops of the German Army Group C surrendered in Italy, on May 4 the act of surrender of the German armed forces in Holland, Northwest Germany and Denmark was signed.

The decisive assault on Berlin was performed by the Soviet troops of the 1st and 2nd Byelorussian Fronts and the 1st Ukrainian Front led by the outstanding Soviet commanders Georgy Konstantinovich Zhukov, Konstantin Konstantinovich Rokossovsky, Ivan Stepanovich Konev, with the participation of the 1st and 2nd Polish Armies. The attack began at 5:00 am April 16, 1945. The artillery and bombers rained down crushing blows on the enemy, who fiercely defended every line and town, many of which had been adapted to the all-round defence. On April 21 the shock troops of the Red Army stormed the outskirts of Berlin and engaged in fighting in the city. On April 25 the troops of the 1st Byelorussian and the 1st Ukrainian Fronts, advancing from the north and south, joined in the west of Berlin. Surrounding Berlin, Soviet troops continued to move to the west, and on the same day on the Elbe their landmark meeting with the US Army took place.

The German command launched several counterattacks to break through the encirclement of Berlin, but they were repulsed. With the advance of the Soviet troops in the central part of Berlin the resistance of the Nazis increased dramatically. Every street, every house had to be taken through combat. The enemy understood the hopelessness of the situation and fought with the fury of a beast cornered in its lair. The bloody battles on the streets of Berlin lasted for 11 days, especially heavy was the fighting for the Reichstag, which was a symbol of Nazi Germany. On May 1 the Reichstag was taken by the Soviet troops and the Banner of Victory was hoisted over it. Berlin surrendered. The act of unconditional surrender of Germany was signed on the night of 8 to 9 of May, 1945.

An important difference is observed in the attitude towards the civilian German population. The Soviet Army took all possible measures to minimize the war on civilians. As the Soviet troops advanced in Germany, the Soviet propaganda changed dramatically, and quite harsh laws were introduced to prevent mass violence, looting and other acts against the civilian population. Incidentally, such facts did occur, as always happens in the wartime, and the Allies had them too, by some reports, even more, on the territories where they stayed. At the same time, the Soviet Air Force had never resorted to carpet bombing of German cities, which the Anglo-American air force performed. Those bombardments were designed not only to deprive the population of

Germany of their illusions about Hitler's regime, but also to intimidate them. To this end the bombings of such cities as Berlin, Nuremberg, Stuttgart, Freiburg were accomplished, as well as the notorious February 1945 destruction of Dresden. According to official data of the current German historians, during that bombing around 25-30 thousand people were killed. In the opinion of David Irving, a historian, the bombing of Dresden killed about 130 thousand people. The total losses of the German population from the bombing by the Anglo-American air force, by some estimates, reaches about 600 thousand. Of course, this number cannot be compared with the especially the Russians, while the Anglo-American air force bombed the German cities after careful consideration as an intimidating act.

At the general elections after the war the Labour party gained a majority and Clement Attley became the first Labour Prime Minister. The Conservative program had been anti-Soviet which lost them the votes of the wide masses of Englishmen. The Labour leaders had stated the chief principles of their programme as envisaging socialism, which brought them millions of votes. Two representatives of the Communist party were elected. The English people demonstrated their condemnation of the home and foreign policies pursued by the Tories in the period between the two world wars.

Meanwhile the war with Japan went on. After three and a half years of direct US involvement in the Second World War about 200 thousand Americans had been killed, about half of them - in the war against Japan. In April-June 1945 during the operation to capture the Japanese island of Okinawa, more than 12 thousand US soldiers were killed, 39 thousand injured.

On 6 August 1945 the US Air Force dropped an atomic bomb on Hiroshima (the reason for that bombing from the American side was that Hiroshima was the city with a high concentration of headquarters and warehouses of the Japanese army and military schools). On August 9, 1945 the US Air Force dropped an atomic bomb on Nagasaki (the declared reason for that bombing was that Nagasaki was a major naval port, a number of shipyards for repair of naval vessels, a large number of military units). The total number of victims ranged from 90 to 166 thousand people in Hiroshima and from 60 to 80 thousand people in Nagasaki. The role of the atomic bombings in Japan's surrender and the ethical justification for the bombings themselves still cause heated debates.

The Japanese Minister of Defence, as well as the leadership of the army and the navy believed that Japan should wait till the attempts of peace negotiations through the Soviet Union should bring something better than unconditional surrender. But on August 8, according to the Yalta agreement, the Soviet Union declared war on Japan, and shortly after midnight on August 9 attacked Manchukuo. The Soviet Union joined the war on Japan at numerous requests of the US and the UK. The Soviet intervention was seen by them as necessary: they feared that landing on the Japanese islands would cost them great losses and needed the defeat of Japanese land forces in Manchuria and Korea, which, in case of the neutrality of the USSR, could have been used by Japan to reinforce its army. The 1945 War of the Soviet Union and Japan became the last major campaign of the Second World War. It lasted less than a month - from 9 August to 2 September 1945, but this month became a key to the history of the Far East and the Asia-Pacific region. The war, which was called "August Storm" in the West, was swift. With the wealth of experience of fighting against the Germans, the Soviet troops dealt a series of quick and decisive blows at the Japanese, broke through their defence and launched an offensive deep into Manchuria. Tank units successfully moved in unsuitable conditions - across the sands of the Gobi and Khingan ranges, but the Soviet Army, well-honed in the four years of war with the most formidable opponent, almost always succeeded. It is worthy of special mention, that the Soviet paratroopers found in Manchuria evidence of the crimes of the Japanese war-machine against humanity and some of the arsenals of biological weapons of Troop 731 - a special Japanese unit for the development of biological weapons and experiments on humans (Emperor Hirohito thought that biological weapons would help Japan to conquer the world; some important materials were later

transferred by Shiro Ishii and other leaders of the unit to the USA).

On August 10, 1945, Japan gave the Allies an offer of surrender, Japan's only condition was to preserve the emperor as nominal head of state. Emperor Hirohito agreed to the terms of capitulation, adopted by Britain, the US and China in the Potsdam Declaration. He radio-addressed the nation on August 15 and announced the surrender of Japan. On August 28 Japan's occupation by allies began. The signing of the surrender took place on September 2, ending World War II.

Eighty percent of the German casualties were on the Eastern front. The scale and the ferocity of the fighting was unparalleled with that in the West – or in any modern warfare. There was nothing on the Western front that could compare to the battle of Stalingrad (1942-1943), involving 1,129,619 Soviet irrevocable and sanitary losses, 841,000 Nazi irrevocable and sanitary losses, 237,775 captured troops. The blockade of Leningrad (1941-1944), lasting 872 days and claiming the lives of about 649,000 Soviet civilians and resulting in the Soviet victory in the battle of Leningrad. The battle of Kursk (July-August 1943) claiming about 254,470 killed, captured, missing, 608,833 wounded on the Soviet side, and about 500,000 total Nazi casualties on the Kursk Bulge. The battle of Warsaw (the summer of 1944) which lasted two months and involved hundreds of tanks, as a result of which the Germans suffered a defeat losing Belarus and the eastern part of Poland. The battle of Berlin (April-May 1945), with nearly 400,000 captured and 380,000 irrevocable losses on the side of Nazi Germany and its allies, and with 352,475 (78, 291 irrevocable) losses on the side of the USSR¹²³. Most discussions in the West about World War II focus on the Western war, which was less than one-fifth of the actual war, and ignore the scale, and horror and heroism of the Eastern front.

While the USSR sustained huge loss of human lives and was left with the ruined industry (1,710 cities and towns, more than 70,000 villages, 32,000 factories, 98,000 collective farms destroyed), the US industry at the end of the war prospered and accounted for more than 50% of the world's. After the Second World War, the British colonial system was destroyed, but later it mutated into a new format, introducing financial institutions and agents of influence into other countries and thus laying them under tribute, while most of the force functions were delegated to the United States. The recipe for success was usual: to set countries in wars with each other and to stand by or formally participate in those wars. And even though it was the USSR that put the banner on the Reichstag of the enemy, it was the Anglo-Saxon structures that funded the restoration of Europe and Japan, driving the world powers into bondage.

Comprehension questions:

1. Hitler coming to power. Oswald Mosley and his "new party". Mass protests against fascism in Britain. The Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) and the British policy of non-interference. Anti-socialist reaction and the Sedition Bill.
2. Edward VIII. George VI. Neville Chamberlain. Nazi Germany occupies the demilitarized Rhineland, Austria. Failure of the anti-Hitler conspiracy (1937).
3. The Munich Agreement (the Munich Collusion) of September 30, 1938. The non-aggression pact between the USSR and Germany (August 23, 1939).
4. The beginning of World War II. The "phoney war". The Dunkirk evacuation. The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor and the United States' entry into World War II.
5. Hitler attacks the USSR. The beginning of the Great Patriotic War (June 22, 1941),
6. British policy during World War II. Breaking promises of launching the Second Front.

Names and expressions

¹²³ According to G. F. Krivosheev ("Russia and the USSR in the wars of the 20th century).

They practised their methods in the London Olympic Hall on June 7, 1934 with 15 thousand listening to Mosley preaching his Gospel of terror - 7 июня 1934 года они продемонстрировали свои методы в лондонском Олимпийском зале, когда 15 тысяч слушали Мосли, проповедующего «евангелие террора».

According to "Sedition Bill" as it was officially termed, any individual in possession of socialist literature was to serve a two-year term in prison - Согласно закону о борьбе с подстрекательством к мятежу, как официально называлось это законодательство, каждому человеку, владеющему социалистической литературой, полагалось наказание в виде двухлетнего тюремного срока.

de facto condoned Nazis' occupation of the demilitarized Rhineland in 1936 - Эдвард VIII де-факто попустительствовал оккупации нацистами демилитаризованной Рейнской области в 1936 году.

In March 1938 Hitler accomplished the Anschluss – the invasion and annexation of Austria into Nazi Germany - В марте 1938 года Гитлер совершил Аншлюс - вторжение и аннексию Австрии в нацистскую Германию.

On September 30, 1938, the Munich Agreement (“the Munich Collusion”) was concluded by the representatives of Germany, Britain, Italy and France - Hitler, Chamberlain, Mussolini and Daladier - 30 сентября 1938 года представители Германии, Великобритании, Италии и Франции - Гитлер, Чемберлен, Муссолини и Даладьё заключили Мюнхенское соглашение («Мюнхенский сговор»).

the German-Soviet non-aggression pact (“The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact”) was signed in Moscow on August 23, 1939. The Soviet Union urgently needed about three years to complete rearmament, to meet it head-on - Германско-советский пакт о ненападении («Пакт Молотова-Риббентропа») был подписан в Москве 23 августа 1939 года. Советскому Союзу требовалось около трех лет, чтобы завершить перевооружение и подготовиться к возможной войне.

In the period of September 1939 - April 1940 England and France waged the "phoney war" against Germany; it was a war without military action taken - В период с сентября 1939 года по апрель 1940 года Англия и Франция вели «странную войну» («фальшивую войну») против Германии; это была война без военных действий.

It was a liberating war that the Soviet Union waged against fascist hordes that used medieval cruelty, appalling atrocities, unscrupulous disregard of warfare laws - Советский Союз вел освободительную войну с фашистскими полчищами, которые использовали средневековую жестокость, ужасающие зверства, беспринципное пренебрежение военными законами.

The first major defeat of the Nazis was in the Battle of Moscow (1941-1942), during which the Soviet Army routed the German forces, foiling Hitler's plan of "blitzkrieg" and busting the myth of the invincibility of the Wehrmacht - Первым крупным поражением нацистов стало поражение в битве под Москвой (1941-1942 гг.), в ходе которой Советская Армия разгромила немецкие войска, сорвала план «молниеносной войны» Гитлера и разрушила миф о непобедимости Вермахта.

The tide of war was turned after the counter-offensive and triumph of the Soviet troops at Stalingrad on July 17 1942 — February 2 1943 – Ход войны радикально изменился после контрнаступления и триумфа советских войск на Сталинград с 17 июля 1942 года по 2 февраля 1943 года

After a long and careful preparation the Second (Western) Front was opened on June 6, 1944, when the allies landed in Normandy (France) - После долгой и тщательной подготовки 6 июня 1944 года был открыт Второй (Западный) фронт и союзники высадились в Нормандии (Франция).

The decisive assault on Berlin was performed by the Soviet troops of the 1st and 2nd

Byelorussian Fronts and the 1st Ukrainian Front led by the outstanding Soviet commanders, with the participation of the 1st and 2nd Polish Armies - Решающее нападение на Берлин осуществлялось советскими войсками 1-го и 2-го Белорусских фронтов и 1-го Украинского фронта во главе с выдающимися советскими командиром, при участии 1-й и 2-й польских армий.

It is worthy of special mention, that the Soviet paratroopers found in Manchuria evidence of the crimes of the Japanese war-machine against humanity and some of the arsenals of biological weapons of Troop 731 - a special Japanese unit for the development of biological weapons and experiments on humans - Особо следует отметить, что советские десантники обнаружили в Маньчжурии арсеналы отряда 731 - специального японского подразделения по разработке биологического оружия и экспериментов на людях, доказывающие преступления японской военщины против человечества.

TOPICS

1. THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR (1618-1648)
2. JAMES II'S REIGN (1685— 1701). ENGLISH HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS IN THE 17TH C
3. THE "GLORIOUS REVOLUTION" OF 1688
4. "CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT": WILLIAM AND MARY'S RULE (1689-1694/1702)
5. PARTY RULE: ANNE (1702-1714)
6. THE WHIG OLIGARCHY. THE FIRST JACOBITE RISING
7. THE INCREASED STRENGTH OF THE WHIGS. THE SOUTH SEA COMPANY, PROBLEMS WITH IRELAND
8. THE EAST INDIA COMPANY
9. ROBERT WALPOLE'S PEACE POLICY AND RETIREMENT OF WALPOLE. WAR OF THE AUSTRIAN SUCCESSION
10. THE SECOND JACOBITE RISING: THE REBELLION OF 1745
11. METHODISTS. WILLIAM PITT THE ELDER. THE STAMP ACT
12. THE SEVEN YEARS' WAR (1756-1763)
13. GEORGE III (1760-1820). INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT. HISTORY OF AMERICAN COLONIZATION AND AMERICA'S STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE
14. AMERICAN REVOLUTION, OR THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR OF 1775— 1783
15. WILLIAM PITT THE YOUNGER AND THE SOCIO-POLITICAL SITUATION IN EARLY 19th C. BRITAIN. FRENCH REVOLUTION
16. IRELAND AND THE WAR. THE REBELLION OF 1798. THE ACT OF UNION
17. BRITISH ECONOMY AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE, INDUSTRIES AND PRICES IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY
18. BRITISH ART AND LITERATURE IN THE 18th CENTURY
19. NAPOLEON BONAPARTE. ANTI-FRENCH COALITIONS. THE MURDER OF RUSSIA'S EMPEROR PAUL I
20. NAPOLEON AT THE HEIGHT OF POWER
21. FRENCH LOUISIANA PURCHASED BY AMERICANS. THE CONTINENTAL WARS
22. THE RUSSIAN CAMPAIGN OF 1812
23. END OF NAPOLEON
24. AFTER THE WARS WITH NAPOLEON (1816-1829). LUDDITES, THE PETERLOO MASSACRE
25. PARLIAMENTARY REFORM OF 1832. WORKHOUSE 1834 ACT. SITUATION OF THE WORKING PEOPLE. CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION
26. THE BEGINNING OF THE VICTORIAN AGE
27. MELBOURNE. PRINCE ALBERT. DURHAM IN CANADA
28. BRITISH ECONOMY IN THE 1820s-1840s
29. THE SOCIAL MOVEMENTS IN THE 1830-1840S. CHARTISM
30. ANTI-CORN LAW LEAGUE. FREE TRADE CONCEPT GAINS GROUND
31. IRISH FAMINE OF 1845-1849
32. LORD PALMERSTON'S FOREIGN POLICY (1809-1828)
33. THE GROWTH OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE
34. THE CRIMEAN WAR (1853-1856)
35. THE SEPOY MUTINY, OR THE FIRST WAR OF INDIAN INDEPENDENCE
36. AMERICAN CIVIL WAR. ABRAHAM LINCOLN. RUSSIA'S ROLE IN AMERICAN CIVIL WAR
37. FENIAN MOVEMENT, UPRISING OF 1867. HOME RULE

38. POLITICS DURING BENJAMIN DISRAELI, 1st EARL OF BEACONSFIELD (1874-1880)
39. POLITICS DURING GLADSTONE'S MINISTRY (1880-1885)
40. SALISBURY'S MINISTRY
41. THE LAST YEARS OF QUEEN VICTORIA. ECONOMY AND DOMESTIC AFFAIRS IN BRITAIN IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19TH C. THE WORLD IN THE 1890s
44. THE FAR EAST. BRITAIN IN AFRICA
45. THE SECOND BOER WAR (1899-1902)
46. SOCIAL LIFE IN THE LATE 19TH C. DEVELOPMENT OF PERIODICALS, TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS AND CLASS RELATIONS
47. BRITISH ART IN THE 19TH C.
48. BRITISH LITERATURE OF THE 19TH C.
48. SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY IN THE 17th-19th CC.
49. THE REIGN OF EDWARD VII (1901-1910). THE DOMINIONS AND COLONIES
50. FOREIGN AFFAIRS IN THE REIGN OF EDWARD VII. RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR (1904-05)
51. ECONOMY AND POLITICS IN THE REIGN OF EDWARD VII
52. BRITAIN AT THE TURN OF THE 20TH C. THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND BRITAIN'S' GEOPOLITICAL STRUGGLE
53. BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR

References

- Антология чартистской литературы*. М.: Изд-во литературы на иностранных языках. 1956.
- Всемирная история*. В 24 томах. Минск: «Харвест» - Москва: АСТ, 1998-2003.
- Ивонина Л. И. Вильгельм III Оранский // *Вопросы истории*. № 3 (1998). Сс. 154— 159.
- История России. Учебник для учителя*. Руководитель авторского коллектива: В. Э. Багдасарян. М.: Научный эксперт, 2012.
- Усова Г. С. *История Англии*. Тексты для чтения на английском языке. Том 2. Серия: «Учебники для вузов. Специальная литература». СПб.: Издательство «Лань», 2001.
- Халфин Н. А. *Политика России в Средней Азии (1857-1868)*. М.: Издательство восточной литературы, 1960.
- Keatinge, Maurice Walter, Frazer, N. L. (1911, 1919) *A History of England for Schools; With Documents, Problems, and Exercises*. London : Adam and Charles Black; Forgotten Books (reprint). URL: https://archive.org/stream/historyofengland00keatuoft/historyofengland00keatuoft_djvu.txt
- Adams, B. (1898, 2nd edition (1975)) *The Laws of Civilizations and Decay. An Essay on History*. N.Y. : Gordon Press.
- Antonova, K.A., Bongard-Levin, G.M., Kotovsky, G.G. (1973) *A History of India*. Moscow : Mysl'.
- Bhattacharya, S. (1953) *The East India Company and the Economy of Bengal from 1704–1740*. London : Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay.
- Brown, Dee (2007) *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, LLC.
- Burke, James (1985) *The Day the Universe Changed: A Personal View by James Burke* (Revised ed.). Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Davis, Mike (2000) *Late Victorian Holocausts*. 1. Verso.
- Dickens, Charles. *Bleak House*. The Fireside Dickens, London.
- Dickens, Charles. *Hard Times*. Ibid.
- Dickens, Charles. *Oliver Twist*. Ibid.
- Gaskell, Elisabeth. *Mary Barton*. London.
- Green, John R. (1896) *A History of the English People*. In 8 volumes. London: the Macmillan and Co., Ltd., New York: the Macmillan Co. URL: <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/25533>
- Hague, William (2007) *William Wilberforce: The Life of the Great Anti-Slave Trade Campaigner*. London: Harper Press.
- Hart, B. H. Liddell (1929) *Strategy: the indirect approach*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd.
- Hobsbawm, Eric (1999) *Industry and Empire: The Birth of the Industrial Revolution*. London : Penguin.
- Hochschild, Adam (2005) *Bury the Chains, The British Struggle to Abolish Slavery*. London : Macmillan.
- Khalfin, N.A. (1960) *Politika Rossii v Sredney Azii (1857-1868) (Russia's policy in Central Asia (1857-1868))*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vostochnoy literatury.
- Kipling, Rudyard (1912) *Poems by Rudyard Kipling*. A choice of Kipling's verse. London.
- Maude, Frederic Natosha C.B. Colonel (1910) *Napoleonic Campaigns // Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th edition, vol. 19, pgs, 216-236 URL: <http://www.xenophon-mil.org/milhist/napoleon/napcampaign.htm>
- Mee, Arthur, Thompson, Holland. *The Book of knowledge : the children's encyclopaedia*.

https://archive.org/stream/bookofknowledgec04meeaa/bookofknowledgec04meeaa_djvu.txt

Moorhead, Alan. (1966) *The fatal impact: An account of the invasion of the South Pacific 1767— 1840*. Harmondsworth.

Morton, A.L. (1989) *A People's History of England*. London : Lawrence & Wishart.

Murray, Hugh et al. (1832) *Historical and Descriptive Account of British India*. Edinburgh : Oliver & Boyd.

Prothero, G. W., Litt, D. (1914) *Nelson's School History of Great Britain and Ireland*.

Robinson, Howard. (1922) *The development of the British Empire*. Boston, New York, Chicago, San Francisco : Houghton Mifflin Company. URL.: https://archive.org/stream/developmentofbri00robi/developmentofbri00robi_djvu.txt

Rowntree, Joshua (1906) *The imperial drug trade*. London: Methuen Co.

Shaxson, Nicholas (2011) *Treasure Islands, Tax Havens and the Men Who Stole the World*. London : The Bodley Head.

Spence, Jonathan D. (1990) *The Search for Modern China*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Symonds, Richard. (1951) *The Making of Pakistan*. London: Faber and Faber.

Taylor, J.A. (1840) *A Sketch of the Topography and Statistics of Dacca*. Calcutta.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica (1926) 13th edition, London.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica (1964) A New Survey of Universal Knowledge. London; New York; Chicago; London; Toronto; Geneva; Sydney. - Vol. 1-24.

The Overlander Songbook (1956) Victoria, Australia.

Totten, Samuel; Bartrop, Paul R. (2008). *Concentration Camps, South African War. Dictionary of Genocide*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Trevelyan, G. M. (1944) *English social history, a survey of six centuries, Chaucer to Queen Victoria*. London - New York -Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co.

Ubelaker, Douglas H. (1988) North American Indian population size, A.D. 1500 to 1985. In *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. Volume 77, Issue 3, Pages 289–294.

World History. (2001) In 24 v. V. 10. Minsk : Harvest, Moscow : AST.

<http://britannika.com>

<http://krugosvet.ru>

<http://survincity.com/2013/10/the-history-of-the-american-west-told-by-indians/>

<http://tass.ru/spec/wwii>

<http://wikipedia.org>

Background Materials

1. On Grammar Schools

Grammar schools are state secondary schools, which select their pupils by means of an examination taken by children at age 11, known as the "11 Plus". Pupils who pass the exam go to the local grammar school, while pupils who do not go to the local "secondary modern school".

Most parts of the UK do not have an explicitly selective education system of this sort. More common is the "comprehensive" system, in which pupils of all abilities and aptitudes are taught together.

There are around 164 grammar schools in England and a further 69 in Northern Ireland. There are no state grammars in Wales or Scotland and although some retain the name 'grammar school', they are non-selective and have no special status.

Most grammar schools teach pupils aged between 11 and 18, having integrated "sixth forms" that teach A Levels and equivalent post-16 courses. "Sixth forms" of this sort are far more unusual in comprehensive schools.

Background

The name "grammar school" points to the historic origins of many of these institutions. Grammar schools came to prominence in the 16th century. Most were located in towns and made provision for the admission of some non-fee-paying scholars. The curriculum was dominated by Greek and Latin ("grammar"). Over the centuries, some of these schools evolved into the sort of fee-paying public schools that flourished in the 19th century.

The modern grammar school concept, however, dates back to the Education Act 1944. Prior to 1944, secondary education after 14 had been fee-paying - the Act made it free. It also reorganised secondary education into two basic types: grammar schools, which focused on academic studies, with the assumption that many of their pupils would go on to higher education; and secondary modern schools, which were intended for children who would be going into trades, and which therefore concentrated on basic and vocational skills.

The system was called the "tripartite system", because it also provided for a third type of school, the technical school, but few were ever established, and the system was widely regarded as being bipartite, with the best going to grammar schools and the rest going to the secondary moderns.

The tripartite system was controversial amongst many educationalists who feared that secondary modern schools were giving a second-rate education, and that the system was depressing expectations of pupils by branding them as "failures" at age 11. During the 1950s and early 1960s, it also became increasingly unpopular amongst Labour supporters and politicians, who argued that the system reinforced class division and the privileges of the middle classes, who dominated the grammar schools.

Both these concerns were exacerbated by the practices of some local education authorities, in concentrating resources on their grammar schools. Indeed, the system was expensive as it required the maintenance of at least two secondary schools in every area: economies of scale could be obtained in larger schools, it was widely felt.

Some local education authorities had already experimented with creating comprehensive schools for pupils of all abilities before 1964, when the new Labour government ordered LEAs to prepare plans for phasing out grammar schools and replacing them and secondary moderns with a comprehensive system.

This process began in 1965 but progressed irregularly as the government had left the timescale for implementation to local authorities. On the whole, the quickest shifts were made in Labour-controlled areas, while strongly Conservative counties moved very slowly or not at all. In spite of their initial opposition, the Conservatives soon switched to support the new system.

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the Conservative governments were content to permit the inconsistent situation to continue, although Labour in opposition remained hostile to the surviving grammar schools - yet in 1996, Tony Blair stated, "the 160 grammar schools that there are, let them remain".

However, the new Labour government's School Standards and Framework Act 1998 made provisions for local ballots on the future of grammar schools. While the Act forbade the establishment of new all-selective schools, the government was formally committed to local decision-making, but it was widely accused of rigging arrangements - by both pro- and anti-grammar campaigners.

In areas where grammar schools were the norm, the 1998 regulations made under the Act provided for ballots to be triggered by 20 per cent of parents at all schools signing a petition, while in areas where grammar schools were less common, only parents of children at "feeder schools" would be allowed to vote. A feeder school was defined as one that had sent at least five pupils to the grammar schools over the previous three years.

To date, only one such ballot has taken place, in March 2000. Parents in Ripon voted by 67 per cent to 33 per cent in favour to keep Ripon Grammar as a grammar school. In July 2004, the Commons' Education Select Committee recommended loosening the requirements for triggering ballots in order to make it easier to abolish grammar schools.

Controversies

Grammar schools remain highly controversial, despite only educating 4 per cent of the secondary school population. Their selective ethos makes grammar schools repugnant to educational egalitarians, who believe that equality of opportunity requires all children to have the same standard of education. Labour has particularly subscribed to this view, with "Old Labour" historically regarding it as a central concern: there was outrage within elements of the party when the then Social Security Secretary Harriet Harman decided to send her son to a grammar school in Orpington in 1997.

Furthermore, the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, while banning the wholesale selection of pupils in new schools, introduced arrangements whereby "specialist" schools would be allowed to select a proportion of their pupils.

The scheme's critics argued that Specialist Schools encouraged segregation in education, insofar as the middle class parents who were long best placed to ensure favourable outcomes from school admissions regimes of grammar schools would continue to be able to get their children into the better schools, at the expense of those from poorer and socially excluded backgrounds.

The commitment to an element of selection contained in the 1998 Act was exceptionally controversial, with many supporters of the comprehensive principle accusing the Labour government of seeking to reintroduce grammar school-style selection by the back door.

While many of the criticisms of the secondary moderns were justified, the comprehensive system was not however a panacea. While Harold Wilson insisted that all schools would be as good as grammar schools after the introduction of the new system, it remained and remains the case that socio-economic factors and school management have a profound effect on the standard of education provided in comprehensive and grammar schools.

Contradictory research has been produced, showing both that grammar schools consistently perform better than comprehensives in exams, and that results are not significantly better in areas with grammar schools.

Labour's arrangements for abolishing grammar schools were also a source of enormous controversy. Many on the left condemned them as so complex and demanding as to put most people off making use of them, while supporters of grammar schools attacked the Government's apparent desire to destroy successful schools that were insignificant in number.

Equally, the Conservative party fractured over the issue in 2007, when David Cameron said he would not lead any calls to "bring back grammars". A selective system concentrating talent in a few schools would not raise standards across the board or promote social equality, he argued.

He sparked controversy within his party by accusing grammar school advocates of naivety and said calls to "bring back grammars" ignored the fact that the grammar system had been abandoned in most of the country because the 11-plus was unpopular with parents.

From "Grammar Schools". URL.: <http://www.politics.co.uk/reference/grammar-schools>

2.0n Public and Independent Schools

A public school in England and Wales is an older, student selective and expensive fee-paying independent secondary school which caters primarily for children aged between 11 or 13 and 18. The term 'public school' should not be misunderstood to mean they are public sector schools; they are in fact private sector. Traditionally, public schools were all-male boarding schools, although most now allow day pupils, and many have become either partially or fully co-educational. Scotland, having had a state-funded education system for roughly 300 years prior to England, uses the term in a different sense than its use in England, as a school administered by the local government to serve the children of that area.

Public schools emerged from charity schools established to educate poor scholars, the term "public" being used to indicate that access to them was not restricted on the basis of religion, occupation, or home location, and that they were subject to public management or control, in contrast to private schools which were run for the personal profit of the proprietors. However, unlike charity schools, public schools were fee-paying. The Public Schools Act 1868 provided the legal definition to these schools as *schools which were open to the paying public from anywhere in the country*.

Soon after the Clarendon Commission, the Public Schools Act 1868 gave the following seven schools "independence from direct jurisdiction or responsibility of the Crown, the established church, or the government": Charterhouse, Eton College, Harrow School, Rugby School, Shrewsbury School, Westminster School, and Winchester College. Henceforth each of these schools was to be managed by a board of governors. The following year, the headmaster of Uppingham School invited sixty to seventy of his fellow headmasters to form what became the Headmasters' Conference—later the Headmasters' and Headmistresses' Conference (HMC). Separate preparatory schools (or "prep schools") developed from the 1830s, which "prepared" younger boys for entry to the senior schools; as a result the latter began limiting entry to boys who had reached 12 or 13 years of age.

Public schools have had a strong association with the ruling classes. Historically they educated the sons of the English upper and upper-middle classes. In particular, the sons of officers and senior administrators of the British Empire were educated in England while their parents were on overseas postings. In 2010, over half of

Cabinet Ministers had been educated at public schools; by contrast, however, most prime ministers since 1964 were educated at state schools. In 2014, annual fees at Eton College were more than £33,000 for boarders, although around 20% of pupils there receive financial support through a range of bursaries and scholarships. However, fees at day schools in Greater London, such as Hampton School and University College School, were only around half that figure, whilst day fees at boarding schools across England, from Plymouth College to Dulwich College, Stamford School, Kent College and Durham School, were also considerably lower.

From: Public school (United Kingdom). URL:
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public_school_\(United_Kingdom\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public_school_(United_Kingdom))

In the United Kingdom, independent schools (also private schools) are fee-paying private schools, governed by an elected board of governors and independent of many of the regulations and conditions that apply to state-funded schools. Some of the older, expensive and more exclusive schools catering for the 11–18 (or 13–18) age-range in England and Wales are known as public schools. Prep schools, (or preparatory school) educate younger children up to the age of 11 or 13 to "prepare" them for entry to the public schools and other independent schools. Some former grammar schools converted to an independent fee-paying model following the 1965 Circular 10/65 which marked the end of their state funding, others converted into comprehensive schools.

There are around 2,500 independent schools in the UK, which educate around 615,000 children, some 7 per cent of all British children and 18 per cent of pupils over the age of 16. In addition to charging tuition fees, many also benefit from gifts, charitable endowments and charitable status. Many of these schools are members of the Independent Schools Council.

From: Independent school (United Kingdom). URL.:
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Independent_school_\(United_Kingdom\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Independent_school_(United_Kingdom)).

Шелестюк Елена Владимировна
**История Великобритании в международной перспективе
(с правления Якова II Стюарта до Второй мировой войны)**
Учебное пособие по лингвострановедению
Часть 2

Shelestiuk E.V.
**A History of Britain in the International Perspective
(from James II Stuart to World War II)**
Reader
Part 2

Печатается по решению Ученого совета МФ ФГБОУ ВО «ЧелГУ»
Протокол № 5 от 23.01.2018

Редактор Л. В. Попова

Подписано в печать 26.04.2018.
Формат 60×84/16. Гарнитура Таймс.
Печать офсетная. Усл. печ. л. 28,5. Уч. изд. л. 28.
Тираж 500 экз. Заказ 774 007.
Цена договорная

ООО «Геотур»
456320 Челябинская обл., г. Миасс, Октября, д. 31. кв.
20 Лицензия № 063431 от 25.08.1999

Отпечатано на полиграфической базе
АО «ГРЦ Макеева»
456300 Челябинская обл., г. Миасс, Тургоякское шоссе, 1
316