Chapter Two

THE FRUITION OF LIBERALISM

I. LIBERALISM IN THE 1870'S: ECUMENICAL AND SECTARIAN

THE "generation of materialism" began not only with war and heightening militarism. It began also with certain events which seemed to betoken the triumph of liberalism: the extinction of the pope's temporal power; the establishment of a "moderate" French Republic; Bismarck's acceptance of constitutional government; Gladstone's advent to the British premiership; the abolition of serfdom in Russia and of slavery in America; the heralded discovery, in Darwinism, of scientific proof of the liberating progress which would be universally assured by free competition. Such a multiplicity of omens could not fail to render old-fashioned the strenuous conflicts of previous decades between "liberals" and "conservatives" —between "revolutionaries" and "reactionaries." Liberalism, now so obviously a part of the evolutionary process, was no longer to be regarded as "revolutionary"; and most conservatives now felt constrained to disavow any sympathy with "reaction" and to concentrate on conserving those individual liberties which they held dearest. Thus, while liberals became a bit more conservative, conservatives were becoming a good deal more liberal. It was a tribute to contemporary pragmatism no less than to the comprehensiveness of liberal philosophy.

For liberalism by the 1870's was truly ecumenical. It had become all things to all men. The one constant in it, throughout its whole development, had been, of course, a basic regard for the individual and for safeguarding his liberty against despotic authority. But "liberty" and "authority" were relative terms, signifying a wide range of objectives; and an attack upon a particular kind of authority had tended to bring forward a special set of liberties, which usually made way for a different set when the attack shifted to another kind of authority.

If one passes over the Protestant Reformation as of questionably liberal character and effect, one finds that the first successful campaigns of modern liberalism were waged against political despotism and resulted, on the one hand, in "bills of rights," guaranteeing the individual against arbitrary taxation, arrest, and imprisonment, and promising him liberties of speech, press, and association, and, on the other hand, in "constitutional parliamentary government," putting an end to monarchical absolutism and vesting abridged powers of government in elective representatives of the nation. It was the political stage of liberalism which had been illumined by England's "Glorious Revolution" of 1689 and by the subsequent American and French Revolutions.

It appeared, however, that the French Revolution, at least in its Jacobin period, was a perversion of political liberalism; that it produced a mob tyranny as destructive of individual freedom as had been the previous tyranny of kings. Hence against the "excesses" of the French Revolution, many liberals reacted. These developed an almost pathological aversion to mobs.

The political stage of liberalism had further involved a reaction against the domination of one nation by another; and with the rise and diffusion of romanticism, it had become fashionable in liberal circles to favor the freeing of "oppressed" and "enslaved" peoples from alien and therefore "tyrannical" rule. In this way liberalism became an ally of nascent nationalism, without abandoning altogether its earlier attachment to the cosmopolitanism of the Enlightenment.

Presently the political stage of liberalism led into an economic stage. As industrialization took root in England and spread to the Continent, foreshadowing a material millennium in which Europe would no longer lack food and could have wealth and creature comforts in abundance, most liberals had become convinced that the one obstacle to the realization of such a pleasant prospect was the existing tyrannical regulation of trade and industry—fitting enough for medieval economy, but not at all compatible with the new need of large-scale capitalistic enterprise—and that steps should accordingly be taken to introduce freedom of trade and freedom of contract, freedom to buy and sell commodities and to employ and

dismiss laborers with a minimum of restrictions by state, church, guilds, or trade-unions. This was the economic liberalism which stemmed doctrinally from the French Physiocrats, Adam Smith, and the Manchester School.

But certain liberals began to see a tyranny in capitalism itself and in the private ownership of the new industrial and commercial machinery; and, eager to free individual workingmen from "wage slavery," they furnished leaders to embryo socialism and anarchism. Thus the same fundamental concern with individual liberty which characterized economic liberalism entered into movements most critical of it.

Theoretically, all liberals were committed to religious toleration. But to some, the churches, and especially the Catholic Church, loomed as an "obscurantist" and peculiarly intransigent foe of individual liberty, and such liberals were impelled to move against the tyranny of "priestcraft" and "theocracy" as they had previously moved against divine-right monarchy, and at least to offer to the rising generation a secular schooling which would emancipate their minds. But it was also quite in the liberal spirit that still others should detect in anti-clerical legislation a threatening revival or extension of state despotism and should endeavor to protect individuals against it by invoking liberty of conscience and worship, and particularly liberty of religious education.

By the 1870's, therefore, there were many varieties of liberalism, affecting different persons in different ways. There was a political, an economic, an intellectual liberalism. There was a radical, an atheistic, a moderate, a conservative, a Christian liberalism. Wherefore such diverse groups as English Tories and French Radical Republicans, Italian followers of Mazzini or of Cavour, German admirers of Bismarck and German disciples of Karl Marx were all somewhere in the liberal tradition. They all adhered, in one way or another, to that "ecumenical liberalism" which had ever been actuated by a general and generous desire to free and dignify the individual and which drew support from every social class, from nobility and clergy, from bourgeoisie, peasantry, and proletariat.

Nevertheless, at the very time when such ecumenical liberalism was permeating all classes and parties and countries, something like

a calamity befell it in the sudden upsurge of a special sect of liberals. These took to describing themselves as Liberals (with a capital letter) and anathematizing anyone who did not join their coterie and embrace their detailed and exacting creed. So seriously did they regard themselves that (following a not unusual human inclination) others accepted them at their own valuation and conceded to them the magical word "Liberal." In the long run, they were to discredit the name, and with it much of what was fine in the broad liberal tradition itself.

This fateful "sectarian liberalism" was grounded in peculiar developments of the 1860's and 1870's, particularly the speeding and spreading process of industrialization, the rising vogue of materialistic philosophy, and the stirring triumph, in international as well as in national affairs, of *Realpolitik*. Its main props were bourgeois promoters of big business: bankers, speculators, builders of railways and steamships, coal and iron magnates, proprietors of expanding foundries and factories. Supporting them, somewhat in the nature of a flying buttress, was an embellishing array of intellectuals: those scientists, engineers, physicians, lawyers, professors, and literary men who aspired to the utopia promised by Auguste Comte through the yoking of science with industry and who perceived the same axiomatic character in the "inexorable laws" of liberal political economy as in the physical law of gravitation. Both industrialists and their intellectual aides were urban people, and urban-mindedness was a conspicuous feature of the sectarians they mobilized and commanded among the petty bourgeoisie and the artisan class. Hence the newer Liberalism (with the capital letter) was much more narrowly urban and bourgeois than was the older and more general liberalism; and at least with its advocates among the *intelligentsia*, it was far more doctrinaire.

Its central stress was upon economic liberty, upon the paramount importance of encouraging individual initiative and private enterprise. Wherefore it demanded the lowering or entire removal of tariff barriers to trade, evinced hostility to labor associations in so far as they might interfere with freedom of contract, and vigorously opposed any governmental regulation of commerce or industry. As further means to its economic end, it appropriated and adapted

much of historic political liberalism. The state, the Liberal doctrinaires explained, should be a "passive policeman" after the English model, with functions rigidly limited to the preservation of order, the protection of private property, the fostering of public education and necessary public works, and with a constitutional government in which the propertied classes would predominate and under which personal liberty would be large and public taxation small.

In international affairs the doctrinaires pursued what proved to be conflicting ideals. On the one hand, they realistically criticized war (in the abstract) as financially burdensome, as injurious to property and profitable trade, and as destructive of human life and liberty; and for the sake of thrift as well as of peace they sought to reduce expenditure for armaments. On the other hand, they were not averse individually to making profits from war loans and the munitions industry, and collectively they were quite patriotic and positively devoted to the belief that liberal nations must acquire and maintain leading positions in the world.

Finally, in the intellectual sphere, sectarian liberalism possessed a distinctive ethos. While in common with much of the older liberalism it postulated freedom of thought and liberty of press and speech, it placed novel emphasis upon the liberating blessings, ultimately, of technology, natural science, and "machine civilization," and immediately, of secularized popular education. Its horror of possible ecclesiastical dictation was prodigious. Religion it would concede to be a tolerable and probably temporary peccadillo of the individual's conscience, provided, of course, one's conscience was not too imperative.

II. THE VOGUE OF CONSTITUTIONAL PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT

By 1871 liberalism had aroused all over the Continent a veritable passion for patterning political institutions and practices after those of traditionally liberal England and for enshrining them (as the English had never done) in a rigid written constitution. The passion was more pronounced—at least more fruitful—in southern and especially Latin Europe than in the North, and in the sophisticated and industrial West than in the "backward" East. But wherever it

existed, it was shared by all sorts of liberals, even by some who preferred the title of Conservatives. It was certainly no monopoly of the narrowly sectarian Liberals of the 1870's: they merely accepted it and utilized it.

The English system of government—with its full complement of a bill of rights, a king who reigned but did not rule, a parliament which levied the taxes and made the laws, and a ruling ministry responsible to the parliament—all this had been formally embodied in written constitutions of Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Italy, Greece, Austria, and Hungary. In France, where there had been a plethora of written constitutions ever since the revolutionary days of 1791, the English system finally prevailed in the "constitutional laws" of 1875, except that the titular head was a president instead of a king. Written constitutions obtained in other countries, but while they provided for parliaments and ministries more or less in the English fashion, they usually left the ministry responsible to the monarch rather than to the parliament.

Only three states were without some sort of written and quasi-liberal constitution in 1871, and these were wholly in eastern Europe[1]—tiny Montenegro and the sprawling empires of the Ottoman Sultan and the Russian Tsar. In the case of the Ottoman Empire, the Sultan Abdul-Hamid II sought to curry favor with the West by ostentatiously promulgating a typically liberal constitution in 1876, but, failing thereby to ward off foreign intervention, he speedily annulled the document. In the case of the Russian Empire, the Tsar Alexander II, confronted with domestic unrest resulting from the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878, showed signs of a mild recurrence of his youthful indiscretions with liberalism. He appointed a reputed Liberal, General Loris-Melikov, to the chief ministry in 1880 and seemed ready to listen to constitutional proposals. But then in 1881 came the assassination of Alexander II, and in the ensuing excitement General Melikov was quickly discarded and the liberal Westernizers were discredited.

Preponderantly, however, the European state system, under broadly liberal influences, had become—or was becoming—"con-

1 Exception should perhaps be made in respect of two states within the German Empire—Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Mecklenburg-Strelitz—which retained the medieval system of "estates" until 1918.

stitutional." At the same time it preserved almost everywhere at least the forms and trappings of monarchy. Republicans there were, of course, either from long-established habit, as in the democratic cantons of Switzerland and the oligarchic "free cities" of Germany (Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck), or from passionate adherence to principles exemplified in revolutionary France and America. Switzerland was and remained a republic, and so too, for their internal local affairs, did the German free cities. Only France modified the form of her government—for the third time—from monarchy to republic, and this she did hesitantly in the years from 1870 to 1875, and even then by reason less of the numerical strength of republicans than of divisions among monarchists. Spain, it is true, became a nominal republic after the abdication of King Amadeo in 1873, but at the end of 1874 the Bourbon monarchy was restored—with a constitution copied from England's. In England itself the protracted withdrawal of Queen Victoria from the public eye, following her loss of Prince Albert, cost her—and the monarchy—some popular favor, and a few Radicals, including the Birmingham manufacturer Joseph Chamberlain and the brilliant barrister Sir Charles Dilke, openly professed republicanism. Yet English republicans were curiosities, and liberal monarchy was presently raised to new heights of popularity in Britain by the resumption of the royal family's ceremonial round of laying cornerstones, unveiling monuments, holding levées, and reviewing soldiers and battleships.

Liberals could be royalist just as well as republican, if only monarchy was "limited"; and the fact that the English succeeded in reconciling the retention of a very showy royalty with the operation of an ideally liberal constitution encouraged emulative Continentals to be liberal royalists rather than liberal republicans. Republican political parties continued to flourish in France and to exist in Spain and likewise in Portugal, Italy, and Greece; and here and elsewhere on the Continent newly formed Socialist parties made light of monarchy. Yet the Republican parties, never large or compact, slowly declined in the 1870's (except in France, which in this respect was a pariah among the nations); and the Socialist groups, as they grew in size, tended to regard the overthrow of monarchy as of secondary importance compared to the destruction of capitalism.

Constitutional government with limited monarchy seemed solidly established in Europe. Wherever it existed, there was little serious effort to get rid of it or to abridge it, and in the few countries which still lacked it there was a good deal of agitation to establish it. That it would be the universal and enduring form of government for the future was ardently believed by all manner of liberals in the '70's and more or less reluctantly admitted by their critics and adversaries. Which witnessed to the past successes and continuing vitality of ecumenical liberalism, and which the sectarian Liberals of the day duly exploited.

The real questions concerning constitutional government had to do, during the era from 1871 to 1900, not so much with fundamentals as with details. (1) What should be the precise relations between king and parliament? (2) Who should participate in parliamentary elections? (3) How should parliamentary government function?

On the first question, the differences which prevailed in 1871 remained practically the same throughout the era. Wherever the titular head of the state was limited and parliament was paramount (as in Great Britain, France, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, and Spain), Conservatives joined with Liberals in maintaining full parliamentary government. On the other hand, wherever the monarch dominated the ministry and possessed some share in legislation (as in Germany, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Sweden), the introduction of real parliamentary government was consistently championed only by doctrinaire Liberals, who were not strong enough to outweigh the support accorded the existing regime by Conservatives and acquiesced in by moderates. In Austria, where the constitution of 1867 had proclaimed the responsibility of ministers to the parliament, the Emperor could actually avail himself by the '80's of an emergency paragraph in the constitution and of nationalist conflicts within the parliament to direct legislation and to make the ministers responsible to himself. On the other hand, Norwegian Liberals, in combination with a patriotic peasantry, in 1884 wrested from their king (Oscar II of Sweden) a definitive recognition of full parliamentary government.

On the second question—the question of the parliamentary suffrage—there were wider differences and greater changes. It was

not so much a question of liberalism as of democracy. So long as personal liberty was safeguarded by constitutional guarantees, it seemed of minor consequence whether the electorate was large or small, and originally at any rate the vast majority of liberals were not democratically inclined. Rather, they proceeded on the assumption that only men of wealth and higher education possessed the enlightened interest and the personal integrity and prestige requisite for choosing the makers of a nation's laws and the directors of its policies. This meant, of course, a very small electorate, and it was indeed just such an electorate which characterized most liberal states in the third quarter of the nineteenth century. For example, in England (until 1867), in Italy (until 1882), and in Belgium (until 1893), property and literacy tests restricted the suffrage to less than five per cent of the population.

The contrary proposition that everybody should participate in parliamentary elections was derived less from historic liberalism than from the egalitarianism posited by Rousseau and championed by French Jacobins (and Jeffersonian and Jacksonian Democrats in America). From the democratic standpoint, the great desideratum was the equality of all men in rights and privileges, and this could hardly be achieved by withholding from a majority the political rights which a minority enjoyed. Most democrats were undoubtedly liberal in aspiration and intent. They were fond of coupling the words liberty and equality and of affirming that individual liberties would be best assured by equal sharing of all individuals in political life. Yet, despite an increasing drift of liberals into the democratic movement, many held aloof from it if they did not actively oppose it, fearing lest it should lead, as the French Revolution had led, to "mob rule," to an inevitable sacrifice of liberty to equality, and thence to the worst tyranny and violence, ultimately perhaps (as Aristotle had foretold and Napoleon had exemplified) to military dictatorship.

Accordingly, efforts to enlarge the suffrage in a democratic direction had divisive effects among liberals. Those who favored democracy as a help to liberty were usually styled Radicals; those who frowned upon it as a hindrance or peril were known as Moderates or Conservatives. Prior to 1867 the only European countries

in which the Radicals succeeded in instituting universal manhood suffrage were France and Switzerland (in 1848) and Greece (in 1864). To be sure, the French democratic franchise had been partially neutralized by various electoral devices which Napoleon III employed from 1852 to 1870; but it became a rallying cry of his opponents, who frightened him in the last year of his reign into guaranteeing it anew and who, after his downfall, wrote it finally and fully into the constitution of the Third French Republic. Though Radical Liberals claimed chief credit for this denouement, there can be no doubt that by 1871 the vast majority of Frenchmen were so bent on exercising universal manhood suffrage that neither Moderates nor Conservatives had any serious thought of opposing it.

The French (and also the contemporary American) example of a democratic franchise appealed powerfully to Radical Liberals everywhere. In most countries, however, the bulk of Moderate Liberals and liberal Conservatives were less impressed either by logic or by French example and more inclined to extend the suffrage, if at all, very gradually and in some relation to the extension of wealth and education. Between the two camps, the issue was joined, therefore, on a broad front. The Radicals were aided by the steady growth of political consciousness and ambition among the masses and likewise by party conflicts between Moderates and Conservatives. Occasionally, some Conservative statesman sought political advantage by fathering a far-reaching electoral reform. More often the Moderates, frightened by the specter of violent revolution, accepted a compromise with the Radicals.

The outcome varied in different countries. In Great Britain, a Conservative ministry, responding to pressure from Radical Liberals, so altered existing property qualifications in 1867 as to enfranchise most urban workingmen and thus to double the electorate. Carlyle called it "shooting Niagara," and the Conservative premier, Lord Derby, admitted it was "a leap in the dark." Then in 1872 a Liberal ministry under the leadership of the moderate Gladstone sponsored the introduction of the secret ballot for parliamentary as well as municipal elections. Next in 1884, again under Gladstone's auspices, the suffrage was extended to most rural workers. Finally, in 1885, under the guidance of a Conservative ministry of Lord

Salisbury, the whole country was redistricted so that members of the House of Commons would be chosen by approximately equal constituencies of about 50,000 people each. Thus it befell that between 1867 and 1885 Britain moved away from the oligarchical government which it had previously had and toward the political democracy which Radicals from Jeremy Bentham to John Bright had long demanded. Yet, though the direction was clear, the goal was not quite reached. Some slight property qualifications remained, and the privilege of plural voting was still enjoyed by half a million men.

In the case of Germany, Prussia had adopted the form of universal manhood suffrage as early as 1850 but had qualified it by a "three-class" indirect system of voting which enabled a small minority of well-to-do landlords and businessmen to outvote the mass of artisans and peasants. Then in 1867, when the Prussianized Germany began to take shape in the North German Confederation, the supposedly reactionary Bismarck astounded his liberal critics and flattered the masses by insisting that its Reichstag should be elected by straight universal manhood suffrage, without any class system at all; and, when the Confederation was transformed into the Empire of 1871, democratic election of the federal parliament was confirmed. This, however, did not signify a decisive triumph for democracy in Germany. The powers of the Reichstag were restricted, the princes of the several states retained important prerogatives (including the appointment of ministers), and the parliaments of Prussia and all the other federated states continued to be class affairs.

In Italy, where in 1871 only about two per cent of the population could vote, a Radical ministry sponsored in 1882 a suffrage reform, reducing property qualifications and enfranchising all men who had a primary school education, which allowed some seven per cent of the population to vote. In the Netherlands, extensions of the suffrage were made in 1887 and again in 1896, with the net result that the electorate was increased from two to fourteen per cent. In Austria, a four-class system, long limited to the propertied and professional classes, was supplemented in 1896, in response to Conservative demands, with a fifth class embracing the masses.

In a few countries, a narrowly restricted franchise was eventually replaced rather abruptly by universal manhood suffrage. Such was the case with Spain, which made the transition in 1890 under the guidance of the Liberal statesman Sagasta. Such, too, was the case with Belgium, which effected the change in 1893 under Conservative auspices—with a special provision, however, for plural voting by men with particular property or educational qualification. Such, finally, was the case with Norway which, under the leadership of a Radical ministry, introduced universal manhood suffrage in 1898.

In a number of countries, Moderate and Conservative influence was strong enough, in conjunction with that of downright "Reactionaries," to prevent, prior to 1900, any concessions to Radical demands for "electoral reform" and to maintain unimpaired the principle of mid-century liberalism that constitutional parliamentary government should be operated exclusively by an "enlightened" minority of brains and substance. This was true of most of the German states, of Sweden and Denmark, of Portugal and Serbia, and strikingly so of Hungary, where continuously from 1848 to 1918 suffrage qualifications based on age, property, taxation, profession, official position, and ancestral and national privileges kept all but five per cent of the population from any active share in political life. And, we may recall, there was no suffrage whatever in the Russian and Ottoman Empires, two states in Europe which remained without constitutional government.

Of the states which were most democratically inclined during the period from 1871 to 1900, it will be observed that universal *manhood* suffrage was the standard or goal of democratic achievement. The question of the enfranchisement of women—of really universal suffrage—was raised, at least by statesmen, seldom and not very seriously. John Stuart Mill, always as logical as he was chivalrous, did propose a woman-suffrage amendment to the British reform bill of 1867, but it was defeated in the House of Commons by a vote of 196 to 73. Though supporting it, the Radical John Bright confessed in 1871 that "I am never free from doubt as to whether my vote was a wise one. I do not think the bestowal of the suffrage on women will be of any advantage to *them*, and I fear at present, and perhaps always, it will strengthen the party

[Conservative] which hitherto has opposed every good measure [!] I think it would add to the power of priestcraft in every part of the Three Kingdoms."[2] There spoke the Radical Liberal, who when partisanship and "priestcraft" were concerned was likely to be a bit passionate. On the Continent sectarian Liberals were more in evidence than in England and still more passionate about imperiling their anti-clerical policies by enfranchising "unenlightened" females. So, despite agitation on the part of "advanced" women here and there, and occasional parliamentary discussions of the subject, woman suffrage was nowhere in Europe a reality, until the nineteenth century—and the heyday of liberalism—had passed.

If woman suffrage was a minor question, a major one was how to make constitutional parliamentary government function on the Continent as it functioned in England. The answer is, of course, that it did not and could not. Parliamentary government in England was traditional and the political customs and usages which had grown up during its long evolution made the unwritten British constitution. In England, moreover, most people, regardless of whether they possessed the suffrage, were politically minded and quite familiar and content with periodical alternations in office between two political parties, which differed only about details, which did not undo each other's constructive achievements, and which agreed perfectly in extolling "English liberties" and the "British constitution."

On the Continent, the situation was different. There, lacking any indigenous precedents, liberals wrote constitutions imitative of what they severally imagined the British constitution to be, and such constitutions created the parliaments. Then, when the Continental parliaments passed from blueprint specifications into actual houses alive with human beings, it should occasion no surprise that they seldom functioned with the experienced dignity, suavity, and authority of the "mother of parliaments." Only in Belgium did parliamentary practices and circumstances approximate those in England: two major parties—both loyal to the constitutional regime—alternating in power and providing fairly stable governments; and a citizenry obviously growing in political-mindedness and

[2] G. M. Trevelyan, *Life of John Bright* (1913), 380.

refraining from extremes. Elsewhere parliamentary government was beset by various obstacles.

One was the multiplicity of perpetually shifting political parties or "groups," which militated against the stability of ministries and put a premium on adeptness at making or breaking combinations among "groups." Another was the presence, inside the parliaments as well as outside, of extremist factions, quite out of sympathy with the newfangled constitutional government or else with the "capitalists" who operated it, and much given to obstruction, denunciation, and even threats of revolution or counter-revolution. Besides, there existed, especially in Latin countries, a widespread popular indifference to, if not suspicion of "the government," and, on the part of those active in politics, a remarkably doctrinaire and uncompromising attitude. Nor was this last peculiar to Latin countries. In Germany, for example, many parliamentarians seemed more anxious to expound a *Weltanschauung* than to amend a government bill. In certain Continental states, moreover, dissident nationalities proved a grave handicap to the successful conduct of parliamentary government. They disturbed and eventually paralyzed it in Austria. They troubled it in Hungary and also in Germany. They impeded it in the Union of Sweden and Norway. They had something to do with the unwillingness of Tsar and Sultan to follow the vogue of constitutional parliamentary government then sweeping the rest of Europe.

III. SOCIAL CLASSES AND POLITICAL PARTIES

The operation of parliamentary government required and yielded political parties. If one were sufficiently dialectical and preferred theories to facts, one might suppose that the political groupings which were a distinguishing mark of the generation of materialism from 1871 to 1900 would correspond rather precisely to social classes. For at a time when the individual was presumably pursuing his own enlightened self-interest, especially his economic interest, he would naturally gravitate toward other individuals of the same class whose economic interests were similar, and with them he would logically co-operate in political action. And the free competition and conflict between political parties would thus mirror a

class conflict, basic and needful for progress. Such reasoning was as cogent to "capitalistic" disciples of Ricardo as to "proletarian" apostles of Marxism; and by innumerable popularizers of the "economic interpretation of history" a trim formula was devised and circulated, equating "nobility" and "clergy" with "Reactionary" or "Conservative" parties, "bourgeoisie" with "Liberal" parties, and "proletariat" with "Socialist" parties.

But all this depended on individuals recognizing and following economic class interests. It ignored, moreover, the complexity of "classes" and certain permissible doubts as to whether any "class" really has coherent and characteristic "interests," and, if so, whether its individual members possess both the enlightenment and the will to follow those interests to the exclusion of others. At any rate, as soon as one examines in any detail the social classes of Europe from 1871 to 1900 and the various political parties, one fails to discover an intimate or universal correlation.

What were the social classes? There was everywhere in Europe, except in out-of-the-way areas like Switzerland, Norway, Greece, and the Balkan countries, a titled nobility. But about all it had in common as a class was some measure of pre-eminence in the world of fashion and sport, and some degree of historical or genealogical mindedness. Some of its members still possessed great landed estates and quasi-feudal privileges in particular countries, notably in Great Britain, Prussia, Austria-Hungary, Sweden, and Russia. In other countries, however, such estates and privileges were apt to be rarer and more restricted. In France and Belgium they were almost wholly reduced to the realm of memory. Besides, in most countries titled noblemen who still retained ancestral lands, newly identified themselves with industry and commerce, investing in stocks and bonds, becoming directors of business corporations, and treating their landed estates as secondary assets, perhaps merely as hunting preserves. It should be borne in mind, too, that a large percentage of the titles of nobility were of comparatively recent creation, not an inheritance from a medieval class of warrior landlords but rather an essentially modern reward for striking success in banking or manufacturing or for special service, civil and political as well as military, to state or party. In Great Britain, for example,

a nobleman might be a great agriculturist, but more often only a proprietor of distilleries, coal mines, steel works, or railways, or just a past politician.

All over Europe was a clergy, but by 1871 it was almost nowhere the richly privileged First Estate of the Middle Ages. Some of the higher clergy, like the prelates of the Protestant state churches in Britain, Prussia, and Scandinavia, and of the Catholic state church in Spain, Austria-Hungary, and Bavaria, were likely to belong to "aristocratic" families and to derive princely revenues from ecclesiastical properties, but the rank and file of Protestant pastors and Catholic priests were drawn from all imaginable social classes and were notoriously impecunious. If these had been dominated by economic interests, they might well have aimed at becoming a top crust of the proletariat.

If "clergy" and "nobility" have little meaning as designations of homogeneous classes, the phrase "agrarian classes" possesses hardly greater significance. True, the phrase applies to all who have a major interest in agriculture, and as such it applied, from 1871 to 1900, to the majority of Europeans outside of England and Belgium and to an overwhelming majority in eastern Europe. Nevertheless, differences among them were as profound as differences between them and the "city classes." The agrarian classes included some titled nobles and country gentlemen, who held large estates but who in many instances were as much interested in urban enterprise as the wealthy bourgeoisie who married into their families and found recreation on rural properties purchased from them. The agrarians also included a mass of peasant proprietors, independent owners of small farms, and these, numerous in France, the Low Countries, Denmark, Norway, Westphalia, Rhenish Prussia, parts of Italy, and the Balkans and Greece, were as hostile to big landlords as to big businessmen and as eager as any petty bourgeois to save a little money for gainful investment in government bonds and corporation stocks.

Then, too, there were almost endless gradations of agricultural laborers, from well established and fairly prosperous "tenantry" (as in parts of England, Sweden, and Austria), through a much more precarious and penurious tenantry (as in Ireland and Spain),

to a complex class of "share croppers," and on down to a great variety of groups whose only bonds of union were that they had no share in ownership of the lands they worked or the tools they used and that they were very poor: the regular and casual "hired men," the day laborers, the ex-serfs of Russia, many of whom alternated work on farms with work in factories and might as properly be included in the "proletariat" as in the "agrarian classes." Indeed, the popular migration from countryside to city which the spread of the Industrial Revolution enormously quickened—a phenomenon which we must later discuss at some length—served to blur the historic distinctions between peasantry and bourgeoisie just as a common infatuation with material progress was lessening the historic rivalry between landowning aristocracy and machine-owning bourgeosie.

The urban "middle class"—the "bourgeoisie"—was not a simple single class but a congeries of classes. There was a moneyed bourgeoisie, growing mightily in wealth and influence and spreading ever faster across Europe from west to east. It embraced well-to-do industrialists, commercial magnates, and bankers, but even it was not a unit. Between industrialists and commercial magnates developed conflicts of economic interest and political policy; and bankers who tried to resolve the conflicts found themselves frequently assailed from both sides. There was likewise a professional bourgeoisie, comprising lawyers, physicians, engineers, journalists, professors, trained civil servants, whose background was variously supplied by aristocratic, commercial, industrial, even peasant or "proletarian" families, and whose "interests" were correspondingly diverse. There was, most numerous of all, a petty bourgeoisie, made up of small manufacturers and traders, retailers and shopkeepers, handicraftsmen and clerks, and tailing off into an artisan class. These were very bourgeois in the sense that they had "city minds" as well as city habitations and were apt to be contemptuous of rural life and occupations, but on the whole they were paradoxically both envious and distrustful of the *haute bourgeoisie*.

Nor was there, save as an abstraction, a compact urban proletariat. The majority of urban dwellers in industrialized countries, it is true, owned little or no private property, and were dependent on

wages. But between artisans and skilled mechanics, an "aristocracy of labor," on the one hand, and miners and factory operatives, on the other, a gulf existed which was hardly bridged by common disdain of unskilled, casual, or alien workers. Besides, we should remember that the chief part of the ever-growing migration of peasants into industrial and commercial towns went to swell the urban proletariat and thus to keep alive in it a considerable element of rural psychology and aspiration.

As with the so-called proletariat, so with the other conventionalized "classes" in the Europe of the age of materialism, there was a vast deal of fluidity. The doctrine of individualism, vitalized by widespread shifting from familiar agricultural to unfamiliar industrial pursuits, proved a solvent of the traditional European class system and an incentive to conflict within as well as between classes.

If now we turn from the somewhat chaotic social classes to the political parties of the '70's and '80's, we should not be surprised at the lack of any precise social pattern in the latter. Take, first, the "Reactionary" parties—those highly critical of constitutional, parliament government and bent upon restoring political and social institutions as they had been, in fact or fancy, at some date prior to the French Revolution. In England, where the Conservatives were merely moderate liberals, there were no Reactionaries at all. Yet in Germany, whose social alignment most closely resembled England's, there were numerous Reactionaries among the great landlords, the Lutheran clergy, and the military and civil services, all constituting an essentially reactionary Conservative party—the party, in popular parlance, of "the Junkers." Reactionary Conservative parties also flourished in Austria, Hungary, and Sweden, though here, as in Germany, not by any means all of the "Junkers" adhered to them. In Italy, there may have been Reactionaries, but if so they did not form a political party; the Conservative "Right" in the Italian chamber of deputies was as true to basic liberal principles as the Liberal "Left." And the same can be said of Greece and the Balkan states.

In France, however, there was a Reactionary party, the Legitimist, seeking in the 1870's to put the austere grandson of Charles X on a throne decorated with the lilies of the Bourbon family and the

oriflamme of Jeanne d'Arc, and dedicated to close union with the altar. These French Legitimists were recruited mainly from noblemen who had little but titles and memories, from Vendean peasants and Catholic clergymen who were habitually anti-Revolutionary, from socially proper army officers, and from some members of the moneyed and professional bourgeoisie who tried to be fashionable and succeeded in being snobbish. Altogether they were a small minority of the "classes," to say nothing of the masses, and in advocating the cause of monarchy as against that of republic, they were outnumbered by Orleanists and Bonapartists, who were really liberal. In Spain the Carlists, and in Portugal the Miguelists, played a role similar to that of the Legitimists in France, and with similar ill-success. In vain the Spanish Carlists revolted against the liberal Republic of the early 1870's and the restored liberal monarchy of Alphonso XII in 1876-1877; they were repressed and obliged eventually to yield the sway of Spain to liberal royalists, whether of the Conservative "Right" or of the Liberal "Left." In Russia, of course, where Reactionaries enjoyed governmental backing and favor, they were exceptionally numerous, though, curiously enough for the student of social history, their strength was less among the nobility and wealthy bourgeosie than among intellectuals, petty bourgeois, and civil servants (recruited from a wide variety of classes), who gave momentum to the Slavophil movement of the '70's and '80's.

Corresponding to Reactionaries on the extreme Right of political groupings, were Socialists and Anarchists on the extreme Left. These, nevertheless, were not so far removed from the liberal Left as Reactionaries were from the liberal Right. They represented extremes, perversions so to speak, rather than denials, of fundamental liberal principles. They surpassed ordinary liberals in devotion to materialist philosophy, and their peculiar tenets, which shocked and pained most liberals, they deduced from good liberal assumptions. The Anarchists thought that if man was better off with less government he would be best off with no government. The Marxian Socialists believed that if human welfare was first promoted by free competition between individuals it would be finally ensured by conflict between classes, with survival of the most numerous and

the fittest—that abstract "proletariat." And when they condescended to leave the realm of dogma and enter that of practical politics, as occasionally they did, they were almost invariably to be found campaigning alongside of Radical Liberals in behalf of free trade, personal liberty, political democracy, and international peace, and in opposition to "clericalism," "landlordism," and all manner of real or alleged "reaction." The Anarchists were a fanatical sect, rather than a political party, and the Socialist parties were small and feeble until the decade of the '80's. The latter particularly boasted of being "proletarian," but their following comprised only a small portion of the urban workers, and their leaders were largely of the professional bourgeoisie with a few stray scions of aristocracy and plutocracy.

Defying every attempt to correlate political parties with social classes were the confessional, or "clerical," parties which arose and flourished in most parliamentary countries on the Continent. Such were the Liberal (Protestant) party in Switzerland, the Anti-Revolutionary (Protestant) party in the Netherlands, the Catholic parties in Belgium and Switzerland, the Center (Catholic) party in Germany, the Christian Socialist party in Austria, the later Liberal Action party in France. None was "reactionary" in the sense of opposing constitutional parliamentary government. Indeed, they all championed personal liberties, and some of them were downright "radical" in advocating extension of the franchise and social reform. What distinguished them, of course, was their zeal to conserve the historic religion of their several countries and certain ecclesiastical rights, especially in education. In this sense, they were "conservative." Yet each of them cut across all social classes, and included not only clergymen but some nobles, many peasants, every sort of bourgeois, and every kind of urban proletarian.

In nearly all the political parties of the era—among "conservatives," "clericals," and "socialists," as well as among "progressives" and "radicals"—there was a good deal of liberal sentiment and liberal conviction; and every party drew adherents from all social classes. Liberalism, at least of the historic ecumenical sort, was no monopoly of any social class or any political party. Even those parties which in the '60's and '70's arrogated to themselves the

specific title of Liberal (with the capital letter) and developed a peculiarly liberal orthodoxy did not represent a single class or exactly homogeneous interests. The leaders and managers of these parties were drawn largely from the bourgeoisie, it is true, but it was a bourgeoisie of diverse elements and tendencies: the *haute bourgeoisie* of finance, industry, and commerce, who for various reasons stressed economic liberalism; and the professional bourgeoisie of lawyers, scholars, and journalists (themselves deriving from many different classes), who emphasized the intellectual aspects of liberalism. And the following of these expressly Liberal parties included some nobles, some clergymen, some peasants, many proletarians, and a preponderant portion of the numerous *petite bourgeoisie*.

Yet there can be little doubt that the sectarian liberal parties which emerged in the '70's were relatively more urban and bourgeois and much more exclusive than the older and more general liberalism, and their very vociferousness gave the impression that their particular liberalism was the complete and true liberalism and identifiable with urban-mindedness and capitalism. It must be acknowledged, moreover, that many members of these Liberal parties who were not capitalists themselves, were quite enamored of the human progress which they pictured as proceeding, under capitalistic auspices, from the advance of technology and the industrial arts, from the growth of cities and the increase of physical and material well-being.

IV. TEMPORARY PREDOMINANCE OF LIBERAL PARTIES

The heyday of the specifically Liberal parties was from 1867 to 1880. These parties, as we have said, were preponderantly bourgeois, and as such they usually comprised but a minority of a nation, though in countries where the suffrage was restricted by property qualifications they might constitute a majority of the electorate.

An interesting aspect of the newer type of Liberal parties was the prominence among them, not only of "free thinkers" of Christian antecedents, but also of Jews. Historic liberalism had fostered Jewish emancipation, and out of gratitude as well as for economic

reasons Jewish financiers and Jewish intellectuals flocked to the urbanized Liberal parties. Wherever such Jews were fairly numerous, as in Germany and Austria, they exerted a far greater influence than their mere numbers might seem to warrant.

Another, if less obvious, aspect of these Liberal parties—at least on the Continent—was their association with Freemasonry. Particularly in the Latin countries almost all Radical Liberal politicians were Freemasons, as were many of the businessmen and intellectuals for whom and through whom they functioned. Freemasonry, while not precisely a religion, was a convenient substitute for one. It made its devotees aware that they belonged to an elite, that all were brothers, that they had a mission to perform for humanity and progress. It was faintly scientific and benevolent, and, above all, it was very solemn and secret. No wonder that its lodges were attractive to somewhat prosaic or pedantic Liberals and suitable for caucuses of party leaders.

In Great Britain the Liberal party of Gladstone was dominant from 1868 to 1874 and again from 1880 to 1885, and during the intervening years, when Disraeli and the Conservatives held office, it constituted a large and influential "opposition." It was doubtless less sectarian than the corresponding parties on the Continent. It still included some Whig landlords and commercial aristocrats, as well as more vulgar commoners and workingmen. It was not enmeshed in a political Freemasonry, and, though more sympathetic on the whole with religious non-conformity than with the established Church of England, it was not markedly anti-clerical, and its inveterate premier, Gladstone himself, was as pious in his Anglicanism as in his Liberalism. Altogether, despite personal distaste for it on the part of Queen Victoria, the British Liberal party was almost as socially respectable as its Conservative rival. Yet if one examines the roster of its cabinet officers from 1868 to 1885, one is struck by the predominance of the *haute bourgeoisie* in its councils. Gladstone himself came from a wealthy commercial family of Liverpool, and so too did his able war secretary, Edward Cardwell. George Goschen was a banker and William Harcourt a lawyer. From the ranks of eminently successful industrialists were drawn Bright and Chamberlain, Forster and Mundella, and

Campbell-Bannerman. Titled nobles there were, but most of them represented contemporary promotions from the middle class: Cardwell, who was made a viscount in 1874; Henry Bruce, a coal magnate, who became Baron Aberdare in 1873; and Robert Lowe, lawyer and economist, who was created Viscount Sherbrooke in 1880. Earl Granville, a second-generation peer, and the Earl of Rosebery, one of the fifth generation, were chiefly ornamental: the former was more admirable in the role of after-dinner speaker than in that of foreign secretary; and Rosebery was exquisitely gilded, especially after his marriage into the Jewish banking family of the Rothschilds.

In Germany, sectarian Liberals were distributed among three parties: the radical Progressives (or Freethinkers as later they frankly called themselves), who first appeared in the early '60's; the moderate National Liberals who seceded from the Progressives in 1867; and the Free Conservatives (or Imperialists), who separated, likewise in 1867, from the reactionary Conservatives. The National Liberal party topped all others in the Reichstag from 1868 to 1878, and in co-operation with the smaller Free Conservative and Progressive parties it shaped most of the legislation of the Hohenzollern Empire during its first decade. The leaders of both the National Liberals and the more stridently sectarian Progressives were almost entirely bourgeois, either of the "capitalist" or of the "intellectual" variety. Rudolf von Bennigsen, chief among the National Liberals, was a lawyer and civil servant, and his most zealous aides included the banker Ludwig Bamberger, the lawyer Eduard Lasker, and such academic personages as Gneist, Sybel, and Treitschke. The outstanding spokesmen for the Progressives—and, as Bismarck complained, they always spoke at length—were Eugen Richter a lawyer, Schulze-Delitzsch an economist, and Rudolf Virchow a physician and scientist. The Free Conservative leaders, on the other hand, were mainly landed aristocrats, though they enriched themselves not so much by cultivating ancestral estates as by promoting industrial and commercial enterprise. Their head was Wilhelm von Kardorff, owner of agricultural property in Silesia and also heavy investor in banks, railways, and coal com-

panies, and founder (in 1875) of the Central Association of German Industrialists.

In Austria an intensely doctrinaire Liberal party—patriotically German and emphatically urban and bourgeois—exercised a controlling influence from 1867 to 1880. Its titular leader, to be sure, was the scion of an ultra-aristocratic family, Prince Adolf Auersperg, who was prime minister continuously from 1871 to 1879. But Auersperg was extraordinarily romantic in his devotion to "freedom" and "progress," and behind his imposing front was a solid array of professional men and businessmen, including the bulk of the Viennese Jewry. In the Dutch Netherlands, also, a similar urban constituency backed Liberal ministries from 1871 to 1879.

It was likewise with Belgium, though here, thanks to a somewhat earlier industrialization, a sectarian Liberal party had gotten control as early as 1857. In 1870 it encountered an electoral reverse at the hands of the rival Catholic party, less urban and more Flemish, but in 1878 it was back in power, under the guidance of a fanatically Liberal lawyer, Walther Frère-Orban, and so remained until 1884.

In Italy almost all the parliamentarians were aggressively Liberal in the tradition either of Cavour (the so-called "Right") or of Mazzini and Garibaldi (the so-called "Left"). The "Right" supplied the ministries of Domenico Lanza, a physician, and of Marco Minghetti, an engineer, from 1869 to 1876. Thenceforth until 1891 the ministries were formed from the "Left" by a succession of professional lawyers and politicians—Depretis, Cairoli, and Crispi.[3] In 1891 the "Right" returned to office under the Marquis di Rudini, one of the wealthiest landlords in Sicily, but he, unmindful of his landed interests, had been a supporter of Garibaldi and now pursued policies hardly distinguishable from those of the "Left." In Italy, at any rate, the predominance of sectarian Liberalism did not cease with the 1870's but continued into the twentieth century.

A similar sort of abstract Liberalism cropped up in Spain and Portugal, appealing to intellectuals in the learned professions and

[3] Cairoli had been a Garibaldian army officer during the *Risorgimento*, and both Depretis and Crispi had been disciples of Mazzini and Garibaldi.

also in the army. Army officers like General Prim and Marshal Serrano, with a civil engineer like Sagasta, played decisive roles in the Spanish revolution of 1868 and in the establishment of the short-lived Liberal regime of Amadeo of Savoy from 1871 to 1873; and the guiding spirit and practical dictator of the ensuing and even briefer Spanish Republic was a very theoretical Liberal, Emilio Castelar, lawyer and professor of history. With the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy in January 1874, a more practical group came to the fore, led by an army officer, Marshal Campos, and by a lawyer and journalist, Canovas del Castillo. These, though styled Conservatives, were sufficiently liberal to maintain constitutional forms and to tolerate the return of Sagasta and even Castelar to active politics. Indeed, from 1881 to 1897, Canovas and Sagasta amicably rotated the honors and emoluments of public office between them; and much the same arrangement was worked out in Portugal between a Canovas-like party of "Regenerators" and a Sagasta-like party of "Progressives." In both Portugal and Spain, the word Liberal had an irresistible attraction to professional politicians under the respective constitutional monarchies, but the thing itself was less real to them than to the smaller groups of middle-class intellectuals who made up the dissenting Republican parties. Republicanism was the supreme Iberian expression of sectarian Liberalism.

The narrowly restricted suffrage which obtained in Austria, the Netherlands, Belgium, Italy, Spain, and Portugal was doubtless a prime factor, along with industrial developments, in assuring the supremacy of expressly Liberal parties in the parliaments of those countries. In England and Germany, where the suffrage was wider, a similar result was achieved by the relatively greater spell which a prodigious access of industrialization cast over persons of moderate political opinion (representing diverse classes and "interests") and which induced them, at least temporarily, to collaborate with radical Liberals. The two most democratic countries of Europe—France and Switzerland—presented further variations from the norm.

In Switzerland the nominally Liberal party was really a confessional Protestant party analogous to the so-called Clerical party

among Swiss Catholics. Both were liberal in a general and historic sense, and both were committed to democracy and republicanism. But it was a third party, with the title of Radical, which most nearly resembled the specifically Liberal parties of Austria, Italy, and Belgium. It was largely urban and bourgeois, and markedly anti-clerical; and ever since the civil war of the 1840's it had championed a centralizing policy in the Swiss Confederation. This policy was undoubtedly popular and helps to explain why the masses assured to the Radical party a majority in the federal parliament throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. After the 1870's, however, the ascendancy of the Swiss Radicals was more apparent than real, for the democratic electorate displayed a sobering tendency to utilize the peculiar institution of the referendum in order to block pet measures sponsored by Radical deputies.

France, much more permeated with abstract liberal principles than any other nation on the Continent, was unique in possessing no expressly Liberal party.[4] Indeed, France hardly had definitely organized political parties of any kind, but merely political groups clustering about particular politicians. And most of such groups, kaleidoscopic in external appearance, were in principle and profession quite faithful to the general liberal tradition. Only a minority of the royalists in the National Assembly from 1871 to 1875, the so-called Legitimists, were anti-liberal. The majority of royalists, the Orleanists, were devoted to the liberalism exemplified by the constitutional monarchy of 1830 and newly expounded by their leader, the Duc de Broglie; and all the republican groups vied with one another in paying at least lip service to liberal tenets. The Radicals among the latter played the role in France analogous to that of sectarian Liberal parties in Germany, Austria, Belgium, and Italy.

The emergent republican regime in France was one of professional politicians, closely associated with law and journalism and with capitalistic industry, usually too with Freemasonry, and overwhelmingly middle class. Of fifteen more or less typical republican leaders in France during the '70's and '80's, seven were lawyers

[4] Except, very late, the small party of Catholic Republicans which followed the leadership of Count de Mun and Jacques Piou and took the name of *Action libérale* in 1899.

with some journalistic experience (Grévy, Gambetta, Dufaure, Ferry, Brisson, Spuller, and Floquet), three were wealthy industrialists (Waddington, Rouvier, and Casimir-Périer), two were engineers (Freycinet and Sadi-Carnot), two were teachers (Jules Simon and Dupuy), and one (Clemenceau) was physician and journalist. These differed greatly in degrees of radicalism, and on many matters of practical policy they quarreled and made up with fascinating suddenness and warmth. Some were known as Moderates, others as Extremists, but most of them nourished a sectarian liberalism of which the central feature was anti-clericalism. Jules Ferry, for example, though reputed a Moderate, was as radical in respect of the Church as his Extremist critics, Brisson or Clemenceau.

In eastern and far northern Europe, "Liberal" was much used as a party label, though seldom with the precise sectarian connotation which it possessed in central and western Europe. In Greece it was appropriated by personal followings of two rival lawyers, Tricoupis and Delyannis, whose recurrent premierships covered much of the period from 1874 to 1897. In Norway it designated a coalition which was formed in the '70's between a "lawyer's party" and a "peasant party" and which took charge of the government in 1884. In Denmark it represented a similar fusion (in 1872) of middle-class intellectuals with peasants, although in this case the majority which it gained in the lower house of parliament was flouted and successfully defied from 1875 to 1894 by a Conservative dictatorship. In Sweden, certain landed proprietors called themselves Liberals, but it was not until 1905 that a predominantly bourgeois and radical Liberal party was enabled to take office.

In Hungary, Liberalism was professed by groups of nobles and country gentlemen, with a sprinkling of middle-class intellectuals. Most sectarian, and at the same time most nationalistic, was the minority group that composed the Independence party of Kossuth. Scarcely less nationalistic, though more opportunist, was the larger Liberal party led by Count Koloman Tisza, great landlord and determined Calvinist, who held the premiership continuously from 1875 to 1890.

In the Balkan states, Liberalism was hardly more than a slogan.

In Rumania, Ion Bratianu, a man of considerable wealth who had been a student at Paris and an army officer, was instrumental, as a "Liberal," in deposing Prince Ion Cuza in 1866 and installing the Hohenzollern Charles I; and from 1876 to 1888 Bratianu was the latter's dictatorial prime minister. In Serbia, Jovan Ristić, who had been trained in law at Berlin and Paris, was the author of the constitutions of 1869 and 1889, and, as "Liberal" leader, directed the government almost continuously during the '70's and again from 1887 to 1893. In Bulgaria, Stephan Stambulov, who had been educated in Russia for the Orthodox priesthood but had abandoned it for the study of law, entered politics as a "Liberal" in 1879, and was president of parliament in 1884, regent in 1886, and virtual dictator from 1887 until 1894.

In the Ottoman and Russian Empires, the lack of parliamentary government involved, of course, the absence of formal Liberal parties. Yet in both areas, the "westernizing" movements which gathered headway in the '70's reflected the general liberalism of the West. An example of the Turkish Liberal of the time was Kiamil Pasha, a native of Cyprus and a graduate of the military school of Alexandria, who conceived an intense admiration for the parliamentary government and material prosperity of England; and as a member of the Sultan's ministry from 1878 to 1885 and Grand Vizier from 1885 to 1891 he advocated a gradual adaptation of Turkish political institutions and economic policies to the English Liberal norm. Kiamil failed to sway the Sultan Abdul-Hamid II or to overcome the entrenched forces of Turkish conservatism, but he inspired many younger men who eventually, in the twentieth century, would attempt a Liberal revolution.

Nor did the westernizing movement produce any immediate results in Russia, except some occasional halting deference to it on the part of the Tsar Alexander II and a multiplication of repressive measures against it by Alexander III. Yet, below the surface, it was much stronger and deeper in Russia than in Turkey; it involved more persons and groups and begot factions of more radical tendencies. A generation of idealistic young people representing all ranks and classes, from a Prince Kropotkin to common workingmen, undertook to "enlighten" the peasant masses and to bring Russia

into step with Western "progress," and extremists among them espoused anarchism or socialism and resorted to terrorism. More respectable and probably more truly liberal were a goodly number of middle-class intellectuals—professors and journalists, engineers and retired army officers—and likewise numerous country gentlemen and lesser nobles in the local governmental bodies, the zemstvos, which Alexander II had established in 1864. The attitude of both these groups was indicated in the petition which a zemstvo despatched to the Tsar in 1879: "The Tsar in his care for the Bulgarians . . . has found it necessary to accord them self-government, inviolability of personal rights, independence of the judiciary, and freedom of press. The zemstvo of the province of Tver ventures to hope that the Russian people . . . will be granted the same benefits. . . ." A like attitude was manifest, moreover, among intellectuals of "oppressed" nationalities within the empire, notably Finns, Poles, and Jews, and it presently found favor among capitalistic beneficiaries of the industrialization which proceeded apace in Russia in the '80's and '90's. Nevertheless, fruition of the westernizing movement was belated in the Empire of the Tsars, as in that of the Sultans; and what it subsequently brought forth in the twentieth century was something quite different from the particular Liberalism in party and policies which flourished in the 1870's.

V. SECTARIAN LIBERALISM IN ACTION IN THE '70'S

In central and western Europe the decade of the '70's was blossomtime for sectarian liberalism, although the duration and luxuriance of its blooming varied somewhat from one country to another, depending upon local peculiarities of intellectual climate and material soil. In Britain the flowers, though crossed with others and rather pale of hue, had been almost perennial since 1846 and were at their prime from 1868 to 1874. In Germany and Austria they were comparatively short-lived but from 1867 to 1879 very gaudy. In Switzerland and the Netherlands they were less showy and longer-lived. In Belgium they bloomed anew in 1878 and then faded in 1884. In France they opened fully in 1879 and thenceforth remained in bloom. In Italy they were brilliant before the '70's and long afterward. In Spain and Portugal they blossomed spas-

modically, and in the case of the former from 1868 to 1874 quite orchidaceously. In Hungary they peeped out in the '70's but their maturity was delayed until the '90's. In other countries they were mere exotic products of hothouse cultivation.

All this liberalism, wherever it flourished, had common characteristics: a solicitude for personal liberty, especially for freedom of the press; an almost religious devotion to science and secular schooling; a robust anti-clericalism; a curious kind of nationalism; and a sublime confidence in the rich blessings of material prosperity, to be attained through parliamentary government and the strict practice of economic liberalism.

Economic liberalism was indeed, along with constitutional government, the most obvious concern of the Liberal parties of the time, the most convincingly urged and the most widely fruitful. Everywhere it involved a positive and a negative program: positive, in support of legislation conducive to free trade and free industry and hence helpful to private capital; negative, in opposition to labor legislation. Under Liberal auspices the positive part of the program was extensively realized. Free trade became a European phenomenon in the 1870's. In Great Britain it had been sensationally inaugurated by the repeal of the old corn laws in 1846 and of the hoary navigation acts in 1849, carried forward by the sweeping reforms of Gladstone as chancellor of the exchequer in 1853 and 1860, and consummated by the removal of the tariff on timber in 1866 and on sugar in 1875. In Germany the tariff of the *Zollverein*, already reflecting the relatively liberal Prussian tariff of 1818, was further liberalized step by step in 1856, 1865, and 1867, so that when the Hohenzollern Empire was created it was largely a free-trade regime; and in 1873 it abolished remaining duties on iron.

In France the Cobden commercial treaty of 1860 with Britain and similar treaties of the next few years with Germany and other powers resulted in the annulment of all prohibitive tariffs and the scaling down of other duties by at least half; and this arrangement continued in force until 1882. In the Netherlands and Belgium, where tariffs had been high prior to 1850, they were gradually lowered until from 1860 to 1880 they were little more than nominal.

In Switzerland trade barriers between the cantons had been swept away in 1848 and the external tariff was slashed in the '60's. In Italy the free-trade policy which Cavour had derived from England and applied to Piedmont in the '50's was extended to other parts of Italy in the '60's and remained the national policy until near the end of the '70's. In Austria-Hungary a moderately protective tariff, introduced in 1848, was further moderated in 1860 and still more by a liberal trade treaty with Germany in 1868. Among the nations of western and central Europe only Spain and Portugal maintained high tariffs throughout the '70's, and they were "backward" countries and their Liberalism, hardly popular, was predominantly intellectual rather than material.

With free trade went a variety of other aids to commercial and industrial development. The political unifications of Germany and Italy and the compromise (*Ausgleich*) of 1867 between Austria and Hungary permitted and invited the establishment, for greatly enlarged areas, of uniform systems of coinage, weights and measures, credit and banking, public taxation and budgeting; and Liberals were quick to utilize all such opportunities. Everywhere, moreover, they sponsored legislation easing and expediting the formation of private corporations for manufacturing and trade. Likewise they were stout and practical champions of the right of free migration whether from country to city or from nation to nation; they would assure to expanding industry in their own lands a cheap labor supply and at the same time benevolently encourage the oversupply to seek its fortune in other lands, preferably overseas. The nuisance of passports fell into desuetude in the '70's, not to be revived until the illiberal reaction of a later date.

Improvement and extension of means of communication appealed strongly to Liberals. Under their constant patronage railway construction forged rapidly ahead from 1855 to 1880, not only in Britain, Germany, and France, but in Italy, Austria, and Hungary, while simultaneously national postal systems were perfected and uniform postage rates established. In general, Liberal governments subsidized from public funds the building of railways as needful "public works," but, convinced of the advantages of "private enterprise," they usually entrusted to chartered companies the owner-

ship and operation of profitable railways. This was true in Britain, France, Italy, and most other countries, though in the case of Prussia the state, for military reasons, took over the railways as early as 1876.

Liberal regimes, while directly encouraging private enterprise and fostering the creation of commercial, banking, and industrial corporations for the enrichment of their several directors and investors, were indirectly serving the same ends by opposing large governmental expenditures, which would heighten the taxation of capital, and by rejecting proposals for labor legislation, which, it was argued, would hamper and burden business. "Retrenchment" was peculiarly sacred to Gladstone and his fellow English Liberals: it connoted that the state was not an eleemosynary institution, dispensing alms in an idealistic spirit, but a business affair to be managed by financiers expertly and with a keen eye on costs; and, allowing for greater human frailty on the Continent, Liberal statesmen there eloquently extolled "retrenchment" if they did not practice it quite so rigorously.

Of labor legislation there was almost none, either in England or on the Continent, during the Liberal ascendancy. A French law of 1874, limiting the employment of women and children and providing for factory inspection, was enacted by the monarchical and partially "reactionary" National Assembly, and it was almost nullified by exceptional decrees of subsequent liberal republican ministries. British statutes of 1874 and 1878, forbidding the labor of children under ten years of age and consolidating earlier factory legislation, were achievements of Disraeli's ministry rather than of Gladstone's, and they were scarcely epochal. By and large, Liberals in every country were hostile to state regulation of wages, hours of labor, or working conditions. They generally accepted the thesis that labor is a commodity like iron or cotton or cash and that it would be sufficiently regulated by the natural operation of the economic laws of demand and supply and by individual bargaining between employer and employee.

Liberals who upheld the right of employers to form partnerships and associations could not logically deny a similar right to employees. Actually, however, they were as suspicious of trade-unions

as they were sanguine of industrial corporations and chambers of commerce. They perceived in the former a potential menace to the prosperity and progress promoted by the latter. Trade-unions were not "respectable." They were recruited from the lower classes. They were exposed to demagoguery. They stood for the heretical and very dangerous principle of collective bargaining, which, through sheer weight of proletarian numbers, would operate in practice to the disadvantage of employers and might lead, through strikes, terrorism, and socialistic exactions, to the utter ruin of capitalistic industry and hence of what was best and most promising in contemporary civilization. Yet workingmen pressed for the legalization of trade-unions, and certain Radical Liberals backed them, not because it was the logical thing to do, but because it seemed expedient.[5] Workingmen might thereby be aligned, out of gratitude, with the Liberal political parties, and given useful co-operative experience in self-help and thrift. If simultaneously the masses were educated (and public education, to most Liberals, was a panacea for all ills), they would become "enlightened" about the proper functions of trade-unionism and thoroughly alive to the necessity of making it an ally, rather than a foe, of capitalistic industry. With these considerations in mind, trade-unions were formally legalized in England in 1871, and in France, more hesitantly, in 1884. Likewise, legal favors were bestowed upon co-operative stores, savings banks, and "friendly societies" (fraternal insurance companies), as special aids to thrifty members of the lower middle and skilled laboring classes.

There can be no doubt that the economic policies of European Liberals in the '70's contributed potently to the swift progress of industrialization in the greater part of the Continent, most strikingly, perhaps, in Germany and Austria. Both free trade and improved means of communication stimulated commerce enormously, and this in turn spurred the large-scale mechanical production of goods.[6] Furthermore, free migration and the almost complete lack of any effective labor legislation permitted unprecedented profits

[5] Notably, John Bright in England, Schulze-Delitzsch in Germany, and Waldeck-Rousseau in France.

[6] For some details of the growth of commerce and industry during the whole era from 1871 to 1900, see below, pp. 88-102.

to accrue to investors in banks, railways, shipping, mines, and manufacturing plants. The '70's were indeed a gilded decade of capitalism —and of wildcat speculation.

Sectarian Liberals put a premium on money-making, ultimately, they all avowed, for the sake of those mystical entities described as "civilization" and "humanity," but immediately, in concrete instances, for themselves. Groups of intellectuals among them may have retained an unspotted altruism and vestal innocence. But some of the most influential elements in the Liberal parties were not virginal; they evidenced no qualms of conscience about playing the stock market, consorting with shady promoters and jobbers, resorting to bribery of electors, legislators, and newspapers, and using public office for private gain. Corruption was, of course, no novelty of the 1870's. It was a chronic and hydra-headed manifestation of human nature. But now it was freer—more liberal. It could be manifested on a wider front, by more persons, with greater seeming justification, and with less restraint from religious or other traditional sanctions. Not that those who practiced corruption called or even recognized it by that name. They called it, in economics, "promoting progress," or, in politics, "assuring the triumph of liberty."

The prospect of a material millennium and of individuals getting rich quick, loomed large at the close of the Franco-Prussian War in 1871. There was a sudden spurt of business, an infectious enthusiasm for newly-formed companies, especially banks and building societies, and a feverish activity on the stock exchanges. Promoters and speculators had a merry day, and of the crumbs which fell from the festal board Liberal parliamentarians and officials partook.

There was a "morning after," however. A financial crisis was presaged by soaring prices at Vienna in 1872, was checked temporarily by lavish spending for a world's fair at the Austrian capital, and then eventuated in a terrifying panic there in May 1873. Stocks tumbled, banks closed, companies failed, trading halted, factories shut down, thousands lost their savings and tens of thousands were thrown out of work, bread lines formed, and a major economic depression was in full swing. A like panic, though of

less intensity, ensued in Italy in July. In September a frightful one seized New York and speedily affected the whole United States. In October Berlin was smitten, and by the end of 1873 every German city was in the grip of "hard times." Meanwhile, in November, London experienced a panic, and, with lesser and varying consequences, so did the commercial towns of the Netherlands, Belgium, and Scandinavia. France, strangely, was least touched by the epidemic: her turn came considerably later, following a succession of bank failures in 1882.

The panic of 1873 was succeeded by numerous civil and criminal trials at Vienna, Berlin, Rome, and elsewhere, in which a galaxy of Liberals—bankers, entrepreneurs, public officials, cabinet ministers—were charged with such unpleasant things as fraud, peculation, bribery, and conspiracy. There were relatively few convictions, but many unsavory or suspicious disclosures. In Austria, for example, the long trial of Ofenheim, a railway magnate, on the charge of fraud, though it resulted in his acquittal (February 1875), brought out damaging evidence against some of the most distinguished members of the governing Liberal party, including at least two members of the ministry. In Germany, a libel suit against Rudolf Meyer, while bringing about his conviction (in February 1877), showed that even Bismarck had been unduly influenced in financial matters by the Jewish banker, Gerson von Bleichröder. And apart from the washing of much dirty linen in the public law courts, there were implications of still more uncleanliness in the concurrent series of suicides in Austria and duels in Germany.[7]

The association of sectarian Liberalism with economic and political corruption was not isolated in time or place. It gradually assumed the aspect of a set and almost universal pattern. Only English Liberalism appeared incorruptible, and it was least sectarian. In Belgium the return of the Liberals to power in 1878 was celebrated by gargantuan frauds in the state bank. In Italy the financial dishonesty of Nicotera, minister of the interior in 1876, was so flagrant that he was excluded from the cabinet, but this did not deter his Liberal chief, Depretis, from continuing the practice

[7] See Max Wirth, *Geschichte der Handels Krisen* (Frankfort, 1883), and the article by Albert Schaffle in *Zeitschrift für Staatswissenschaft* (Stuttgart, 1874).

of bribery on a princely scale; and despite charges of embezzlement (and proof of bigamy) Crispi held the premiership for many a year. In France a sterling Liberal, Jules Grévy, was shoved out of the presidency of the Republic (1887) because his son-in-law was caught selling decorations of the Legion of Honor, and subsequent exposure of the colossal Panama-Canal scandals involved such conspicuous Radical statesmen as Freycinet, Floquet, and Rouvier, along with the Jewish financial adventurers Cornelius Herz and Baron de Reinach. In Hungary political corruption became a fine art under Tisza; and in Rumania, under Bratianu.

Economy of public expenditure and hence of taxation was a maxim with Liberals, as we have said, but on the Continent they tended in time to honor it more in the breach than in the observance. Although there was stalwart niggardliness about expenditures which labor legislation might entail, there was little or none about outlays for public education, internal improvements, and national armaments, or for placement of "deserving" party members in governmental service. With accompanying reluctance to increase direct taxes or to impose customs duties, and with consequent heightening of interest charges on bank loans, Liberal regimes faced ever greater difficulty in balancing their budgets. In Germany the imperial budget showed an alarming deficit in 1877. In Belgium a deficit of six million francs in 1881 grew to twelve million in 1882 and to twenty-five million in 1883. In France the public debt, already large, mounted sharply in the '80's and the nation became accustomed to seeing the budget estimates exceeded by the actual expenditure. In Italy, despite frantic efforts of Liberals of the "Right" to balance the budget, and despite the continuation of extraordinarily burdensome taxation, the "Left" spent money riotously and brought the state to the verge of bankruptcy.

Most sectarian Liberals represented a curious compromise between the pacific cosmopolitanism which was part of the humanitarian tradition of the eighteenth century, and which free trade and free migration enhanced in the nineteenth century, and the belligerent nationalism which had recently been stimulated by the series of international wars from 1859 to 1871. As opposition to tariff protectionism was a reflection of their cosmopolitanism, so support of

competitive military preparedness was a sign of their patriotism, and incidentally an important source of financial embarrassment to their governments. The Radicals of France, the Left Liberals of Italy, the doctrinaires of Austria were more hearty protagonists of the militaristic development of the late '60's and the '70's than any Conservative or "reactionary" group; and the German Liberals were less troubled by the military aspect of Bismarck's measures than by the constitutional.

Besides, all the Liberal statesmen of the time, while professing the broadest tolerance for minorities and an interest in the development of local self-government, pursued policies of administrative centralization and of nationalistic unification. In Austria the Liberals were popularly and properly called the Centralists; being drawn mainly from the German parts of the empire and convinced of the superiority of German culture, they opposed concessions, political or cultural, to provinces peopled by Czechs, Slovenes, Poles, Italians, or Rumanians. In Hungary Tisza pressed still more drastically a process of "Magyarization." In Germany the National Liberals and Free Conservatives were in the forefront of a campaign for strengthening the federal government at the expense of the states and for discriminatory legislation against Poles. In Belgium the Liberal government of Frère-Orban marked the ascendancy of French over Flemish inhabitants. In Italy the Liberals of the Left were stout upholders of centralization and zealous prompters of colonial ambition. In France the Radicals not only preserved but intensified the administrative centralization of Richelieu, Louis XIV, and Napoleon, and they proscribed more than their Jacobin forerunners the dissident languages of Breton, Basque, Provençal, and Corsican. In Spain Sagasta no less than Canovas was the advocate of Castilian supremacy and the opponent of autonomy for Catalans and Basques. Even in England Gladstone came to espouse Irish home rule late in life and chiefly as a political maneuver, and then could not carry with him such Radical Liberals as Chamberlain and Bright.

The great interest which Liberals had in popular education and the very real contributions which they made to its advancement were motivated by various considerations. Intellectuals among them

were undoubtedly guided by the positivism of the era: by faith in "science" and in the human progress which would result from the wide diffusion of scientific knowledge. Those less purely intellectual and more richly endowed with material goods could afford to be benevolent, particularly in respect of an undertaking which, under Liberal auspices, would implant and spread sound economic principles among the masses and thus fortify them against revolutionary impulses and prepare them to take their appropriate places as cogs in the industrial machinery of a bright new age. Then, too, popular state education would be a most effective means of propagating national patriotism, of fitting individuals for intelligent participation in political democracy, in military service, and in their several trades and occupations, and also of undermining those forces, especially ecclesiastical, which still barred the way (or were supposed to bar the way) to salutary freedom of thought and behavior.

Elaborate systems of state-supported and state-directed elementary schools, whose teachers would be lay employees of the government and in which normally no religious instruction should be given, were inaugurated in Hungary in 1868, in Austria in 1869, in England in 1870, in Switzerland in 1874, in the Netherlands in 1876, in Italy in 1877, in Belgium in 1879, in France between 1881 and 1886; and in Germany, where state schools had long been the rule, they were largely secularized in the '70's. Schools under ecclesiastical control might be suffered to continue, but they were reduced to the status of private schools and in most instances, as a kind of protective tariff against them, they were deprived of public funds and subjected to other disabilities. Nor did the Liberals evince any squeamishness about invoking in behalf of popular education that very principle of compulsion which they were credited with abhorring. In one country after another the establishment of public schools was accompanied or soon followed by decrees for the compulsory attendance of every child. There was variation in the enforcement of such decrees. It was notoriously lax in Italy, for example, and remarkably strict in Germany and England. Nonetheless there succeeded everywhere a noteworthy increase of literacy, if not of intelligence, among the masses.

Formally, at any rate, the Liberal regimes were favorable to

religious toleration, the right of every individual to adhere to any or no religion as he might choose. This was a legacy from the older and more ecumenical liberalism, and by the middle of the nineteenth century it was pretty well established in Great Britain, Belgium, France, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Germany, although in most of these countries special privileges were still accorded to particular religious bodies: in Britain, to the Anglican Church; in Germany and the Netherlands, to both Protestant and Catholic Churches; in France and Belgium, to Judaism and Protestantism as well as to Catholic Christianity.[8] In overwhelmingly Protestant Scandinavia and in overwhelmingly Catholic Austria, Spain, and Portugal, religious toleration had been proclaimed a bit later; partially in Norway in 1845, in Denmark in 1849, in Sweden in 1860, in Portugal in 1864; and fully in Spain and Austria in 1868. In Italy it had attended the territorial expansion of Piedmont. In Britain, still greater gains for religious toleration (and equality) were hailed in the disestablishment and disendowment of the Anglican Church in Ireland (1869) and in the final recognition, as an outcome of the celebrated Bradlaugh case,[9] of the right of an avowed atheist, no less than of a Christian or a Jew, to be a member of Parliament (1886).

To the legacy of religious toleration, Liberals of the '70's added an emphasis upon secularization, upon the transference of many social functions and agencies from church to state. The most important of these were educational. Church schools, which had hitherto enjoyed almost a monopoly in the instruction of youth, were supplemented and largely supplanted, as we have already pointed out, by lay state schools. Not only elementary schools but institutions of higher learning were affected. In most Continental countries the universities were rapidly secularized and made centers of anti-clerical activity. In France, for instance, one of the first fruits of Radical ascendancy was a law of 1879 excluding clergymen from

[8] In France and Belgium, for example, the state salaried not only Catholic bishops and priests but also Protestant pastors and Jewish rabbis and (in French Algeria) Moslem imams.

[9] Charles Bradlaugh (1833-1891), a resolute "infidel" with real talents for popular oratory and journalism, was elected to Parliament as an advanced Liberal in 1880. For six years conflict raged over Parliament's refusal to let him take the deistic oath prescribed for admission. He was finally admitted by simple affirmation in 1886.

the Council of Higher Education and confining the name of university and the privilege of conferring degrees to state institutions. Indeed the series of steps actually taken in France to secularize and laicize education is illustrative of efforts put forth by Liberal regimes, with greater or less success, in all the countries which they dominated. A decree of 1880 closed Jesuit schools and those of other "unauthorized" orders. A law of 1881 forbade priests and members of any religious community to conduct schools without a state license, and a law of 1882 prohibited them from teaching in the public schools. Presently, in 1884, another series of enactments carried the campaign into other fields: religious emblems were to be removed from law courts, God was to be omitted from oaths, hospitals were to be laicized, divorce was to be freely granted by the state, and religious communities were to be denied the benefits conferred that very year on other associations.

Marriage, also, under most Liberal governments, was secularized. Persons might still be married in churches and by clergymen, but in France every marriage, to be legally valid, must be performed by a state official, and elsewhere civil marriage was accorded equal validity with religious marriage. Civil marriage was introduced in Austria in 1868, in Italy in 1873, in Switzerland in 1874, in the German Empire in 1875, in France in 1881, and it obtained in Spain from 1870 to 1876.

Suppression of religious orders, especially the Jesuits, and confiscation of their goods were even more characteristic of the period of constitutional Liberalism than of the era of "enlightened despotism." Following Cavour's suppression of 334 convents, housing 4,280 monks and 1,200 nuns, in the Kingdom of Piedmont in the 1850's, a law of 1866 expropriated the majority of monastic establishments (and many seminaries and benefices) throughout Italy, and in 1873 its provisions were applied to Rome. In Portugal and Spain attempts which had been made in the 1830's to outlaw religious communities were renewed in the '60's. Portugal dissolved certain congregations in 1861 and banned in 1862 all those which had been established since 1834. Spain in the revolutionary year of 1868 suppressed the Jesuits and all communities founded since 1837, and confiscated their property, although in this instance partial

restitution followed the Bourbon restoration in 1875. Germany expelled the Jesuits in 1872, and in 1875 Prussia abolished all other orders except those engaged in nursing. Switzerland in 1874 banished the Jesuits and forbade the founding of new communities. Norway excluded Jesuits and monks by special legislation of 1878. In Austria the Liberals sponsored in 1876 a bill for the suppression of all monastic establishments, but it encountered serious popular opposition and eventually failed of passage. In France the Radicals accomplished by ministerial decree in 1880 what they could not achieve by parliamentary enactment, the expulsion of the Jesuits and the closure of their schools, the requirement of governmental licensing for all other orders, and the dissolution of 261 "unlicensed' convents.

The grandiose name of Kulturkampf—"battle for civilization"—was given by the eminent scientist Virchow (who was also an eminently partisan Progressive) to the anti-clerical and anti-Catholic campaign which German Liberals fought in the 1870's for the secularization of education, the limitation of ecclesiastical authority, and the suppression and confiscation of religious orders, and which necessitated a most illiberal utilization of police force and prison duress against recalcitrant clergymen. It was a curious kind of fighting for professed Liberals, as a leading Lutheran Conservative, Ludwig von Gerlach, was not slow to remark. In a parliamentary debate of 1873, after reminding the Liberals of their traditional tenets, he went on to say: "Now their watchword is the police—police to the right, police to the left, police in the rear, police in front—ministerial decrees and arbitrary courts without appeal. Are these the same Liberals who in 1848 hardly shrank from assailing the throne? Does the Left no longer know what it is to fight with the intellect? Does it know nothing but policemen, fines, and imprisonment in the realm of faith and the spirit?"

The answer to Gerlach's rhetorical questions was that the Liberalism of the '70's was essentially sectarian and that a distinguishing feature of its sectarianism was firm belief in the supreme menace of ecclesiastical authority, particularly that of the Catholic Church, to the material and intellectual and national progress of a new age, a conviction so compelling as to justify the taking of extreme and

exceptional measures. Nor was such a conviction or the action springing from it confined to Germany. Both were common to all Liberal countries on the Continent. In fact the name of Kulturkampf might appropriately be applied not only to the anti-clerical measures in Germany in the '70's but to those simultaneously introduced in Austria, the Netherlands, and Switzerland, and to those in Spain from 1868 to 1874, in Belgium from 1878 to 1884, in France from 1879, and in Italy continuously from the '60's. Of this Kulturkampf as a whole, of its manifold sources (in church as well as in state) and its varying subsequent fortunes, more will be said in another place. Here it has sufficed to connect a crucial stage of it with the Liberalism of the 1870's.