nant of his troops by his calmness and courage. Not long after, a second expedition was sent out against the French fort, in which Washington led the advance. The garrison fled at his approach, the English colors were run up, and the place was named Pittsburgh, in honor of William Pitt, then virtually prime minister of England.[1]

About the same time, the English took the forts on the Bay of Fundy, and cruelly drove out the peaceful French settlers from Acadia.[2] This gave them control of Nova Scotia. Other successes followed, by which they obtained possession of important points. Finally, Canada was won from the French by Wolfe's victory over Montcalm, at Quebec (1759), where both gallant soldiers verified the truth of the lines, "The paths of glory lead but to the grave,"[3] which the English general had quoted to some brother-officers the evening before the attack. This ended the war. Spain now ceded Florida to Great Britain, so that in 1763, when peace was made, the English flag waved over the whole eastern half of the American continent, from the Atlantic to the Mississippi. Thus, within a comparatively few years, Great Britain had gained an empire in the East (India), and another in the West (America). A few more such conquests and her "morning drum-beat, following the sun, and keeping company with the hours" would literally "circle the earth with one continuous and unbroken strain of the martial airs of England."[4]

---

1 He was secretary of state, but in point of influence was head of the Cabinet. See Paragraph No. 587.

2 See Bancroft's United States, and Longfellow's Evangeline.

3 "The boast of heraldry, the pomp of power,
And all that beauty, all that wealth e'er gave,
Await alike the inevitable hour;
The paths of glory lead but to the grave."
—GRAY'S *Elegy* (1750).

"I would rather be the author of that poem," said Wolfe, "than to have the glory of beating the French to-morrow." Wolfe and Montcalm were both mortally wounded, and died within a few hours of each other.

4 Daniel Webster, speech of May 7, 1834.

595. Moral Condition of England; Intemperance; Rise of the Methodists. — But grand as were the military successes of the British arms, the reign of George II. was morally torpid. With the exception of a few public men like Pitt, the majority of the Whig party seemed animated by no higher motive than self-interest. It was an age whose want of faith, coarseness, and brutality were well portrayed by Hogarth's pencil and Fielding's pen. For a long time intemperance had been steadily on the increase; strong drink had taken the place of beer, and every attempt to restrict the traffic was met at the elections by the popular cry, "No gin, no king." The London taverns were thronged day and night, and in the windows of those frequented by the lowest class placards were exhibited with the tempting announcement, "Drunk for a penny; dead drunk for twopence; clean straw for nothing." On the straw lay men and women in beastly helplessness. Among the upper classes matters were hardly better. It was a common thing for great statesmen to drink at public dinners until one by one they slid out of their seats and disappeared under the table; and Robert Walpole, the late prime minister of England, said that when he was a young man his father would say to him as he poured out the wine, "Come, Robert, you shall drink twice while I drink once, for I will not permit the son in his sober senses to be witness of the intoxication of his father."[1]

Such was the condition of England when a great religious revival began. Its leader was a student at Oxford, named John Wesley. He, with his brother Charles and a few others, were accustomed to meet at certain hours for devotional exercises. The regularity of their meetings and of their habits generally got for them the name of Methodists, which, like Quaker and many another nickname of the kind, was destined to become a title of respect and honor.

At first Wesley had no intention of separating from the Church

---

1 See Coxe's Memoirs of Sir Robert Walpole, and Lecky's England in the Eighteenth Century.

of England, but labored only to quicken it to new life; eventually, however, he found it best to begin a more extended and independent movement. The revival swept over England with its regenerating influence, and extended across the sea to America It was especially powerful among those who had hitherto scoffed at both church and Bible. Rough and hardened men were touched and melted to tears of repentance by the fervor of this Oxford graduate, whom neither threats nor ridicule could turn aside from his one great purpose of saving souls.

Unlike the church, he did not ask the multitude to come to him; he went to them. He rode on horseback from one end of the country to the other, preaching in the fields, under trees, which are still known throughout England by the expressive name of "Gospel Oaks," in cities, at the corners of the streets, on the docks, in the slums; in fact, wherever he could find listening ears and responsive hearts.

If we except the great Puritan movement of the seventeenth century, no such appeal had been heard since the days when Augustine and his band of monks set forth on their mission among the barbarous Saxons. The results answered fully to the zeal that awakened them. Better than the growing prosperity of extending commerce, better than all the conquests in the East or the West, was the new religious spirit which stirred the people of both England and America, and provoked the national church to emulation in good works, — which planted schools, checked intemperance, and brought into vigorous activity all that was best and bravest in a race that when true to itself is excelled by none.

596. Summary. — The history of the reign may be summed up in the movement which has just been described, and in the Asiatic, continental, and American wars with France which ended in the extension of the power of Great Britain in both hemispheres.

GEORGE III. — 1760–1820.

597. Accession and Character; the King's Struggle with the Whigs. — By the death of George II. his grandson,[1] George III., now came to the throne. The new king was a man of excellent character, who prided himself on having been born an Englishman. He had the best interests of his country at heart, but he lacked many of the qualities necessary to a great ruler, and although thoroughly conscientious, he was narrow and stubborn to the last degree. His mother, who had seen how ministers and parties ruled in England, was determined that her son should have the control, and her constant injunction to the young prince was, "Be king, George, be king!" so that when he came to power George was determined to be king if self-will would make him one.

But beneath this spirit of self-will there was moral principle. In being king, George III. intended to carry out a reform such as neither George I. nor II. could have accomplished, providing that either had had the will to undertake it.

The great Whig families of rank and wealth had now held uninterrupted possession of the government for nearly half a century. Their influence was so supreme that the sovereign had practically become a mere cipher, dependent for his authority on the political support which he received. The king was resolved that this state of things should continue no longer. He was determined to reassert the royal authority and secure a government which should reflect his principles, and to have a ministry to whom he could dictate, instead of one that dictated to him.

For a long time he struggled in vain, but at last succeeded, and found in Lord North a premier who bowed to the royal will, and endeavored to carry out George III.'s favorite policy of "governing for, but never by, the people." That policy finally resulted in calling forth the famous resolution of the House of Commons

[1] Frederick, Prince of Wales, George II.'s son, died before his father, leaving his son George heir to the throne. See Table, Paragraph No. 581.

that the king's influence "had increased, was increasing, and ought to be diminished";[1] but it had other consequences, which, as we shall presently see, were more far-reaching and disastrous than any one in the House of Commons then imagined.

598. Taxation of the American Colonies. — The wars of the two preceding reigns had largely increased the National Debt, and the government resolved to compel the American colonies to share in a more direct degree than they had yet done, the constantly increasing burden of taxation. England then, like all other European countries, regarded her colonies in a totally different way from what she does at present. It was an open question at that time whether colonial legislative rights existed save as a matter of concession or favor on the part of the home government. It is true that the government had found it expedient to grant or recognize such rights, but they had seldom been very clearly defined, and in many important respects no one knew just what the settlers of Virginia or Massachusetts might or might not do.[2] The general theory of the mother country was that the colonies were convenient receptacles for the surplus population, good or bad, of the British Islands; next, that they were valuable as sources of revenue and profit, politically and commercially; and lastly, that they furnished excellent opportunities for the king's friends to get office and make fortunes. Such was the feeling about India, and such, modified by difference of circumstances, it was respecting America. In consequence of this feeling, the policy pursued toward these settlements was severely restrictive. By the Navigation and other laws of earlier reigns,[3] the American colonies were obliged to confine their trade to England alone, or to such ports as she directed. If they ventured to send a hogshead of tobacco or a bale of produce of any sort to another country, or

[1] Resolution moved by Mr. Dunning in 1780.
[2] See Story's Constitution of the United States.
[3] Navigation Laws: see Paragraph No. 511.

by any but an English ship, they forfeited their goods.[1] On the other hand, the colonies were obliged to buy the products of British mills and factories, whether they found it to their advantage or not; the object of the government being to keep the colonies wholly dependent.

They were not permitted to make so much as a horse-shoe nail or print even a copy of the New Testament, but they might, nay, they must, trade with England and pay taxes to her.

It was resistance to these arbitrary measures which first caused trouble. In the reign of Charles II. the colonies endeavored to evade these oppressive laws. To punish them that monarch revoked the New England charters, thus depriving them of whatever degree of self-government they enjoyed, and compelling them to submit to the absolute will of the crown. Under the tyrannical sway of Governor Andros, who was shortly after sent over by James II. to rule, or rather misrule, in the king's name, an explosion of popular wrath occurred which showed that, loyal as the colonies were, they would not continue to endure treatment which no Englishman at home would bear.

599. The Stamp Act. — In accordance with these theories about the colonies, and to meet the pressing needs of the home government, the English ministry, as early as 1764, proceeded to levy a tax on the colonies in return for the protection they had granted them against the French and the Indians. The colonists had paid, however, as they believed, their full proportion of the expense of the war out of their own pockets, and for the future they felt abundantly able to protect themselves. But notwithstanding this plea, a specially obnoxious form of direct tax, called the Stamp Act, was brought forward in 1765. It required that all legal documents, such as deeds, wills, notes, receipts, and the like, should be written upon paper bearing high-priced government stamps. Not only the leading men among the colonists, but the colonists generally, protested

[1] This was the case with all produce of any importance; the exceptions need not be enumerated.

against the act, and Benjamin Franklin, with other agents, was sent to England to sustain their protests by argument and remonstrance. But in spite of their efforts the law was passed, and the stamps were duly sent over. The people, however, were determined not to use them, and much tumult ensued. In England strong sympathy with the colonists was expressed by William Pitt (who was shortly after created Earl of Chatham), Burke, Fox, and generally by what was well called "the brains of Parliament." Pitt in particular was extremely indignant. He urged the immediate repeal of the act, saying, "I rejoice that America has resisted." Pitt further declared that any taxation of the colonies without their representation in Parliament was tyranny, that opposition to such taxation was a duty, and that the spirit shown by the Americans was the same that in England had withstood the despotism of the Stuarts, and established the principle once for all that the king cannot take the subject's money without the subject's consent. Against such opposition the law could not stand. The act was accordingly repealed, amid great rejoicing in London; the church bells rang a peal of triumph, and the shipping in the Thames was illuminated; but the good effect on America was lost by the immediate passage of another act which maintained the unconditional right of England to legislate for the colonies, or, in other words, to tax them, if they saw fit, without their consent.

600. The Tea Tax and the "Boston Tea Party," with its Results. — Another plan was now devised for getting money from the colonies. Parliament enacted a law compelling the Americans to pay taxes on a number of imports, such as glass, paper, and tea. In opposition to this law, the colonists formed leagues refusing to use these taxed articles, while at the same time they encouraged smugglers to secretly land them, and the regular trade suffered accordingly. Parliament, finding that this was bad both for the government and for commerce, now abolished all of these duties except that on tea, which was retained for a double purpose: first, and chiefly, to maintain the principle of the right

of Great Britain to tax the colonies,[1] and next, to aid the East India Company, which was pleading piteously for help.

In consequence mainly of the refusal of the American colonists to buy tea, the London warehouses of the East India Company were full to overflowing with surplus stock, and the company itself was in a half-bankrupt condition. The custom had been for the company to bring the tea to England, pay a tax on it, and then sell it to be reshipped to America, where the colonists were expected to pay a tax. To aid the company in its embarrassment, the government now agreed to remit this first duty altogether, and to impose a tax of threepence (six cents) a pound on the consumers in America. Such an arrangement would, they argued, be an advantage all around, for first, it would aid the company to dispose of its stock, next, it would enable the colonists to get tea at a cheaper rate than before, and lastly, and most important of all, it would keep the principle of taxation in force. But the colonists did not accept this reasoning. In itself the three-penny tax was a trifle, but underlying it was a principle which seemed to the Americans no trifle; for such principles revolutions had been fought in the past; for such they would be fought in the future.

The colonists resolved not to have the tea at any price. A number of ships laden with the hated taxed herb arrived at the port of Boston. The tea was seized by a band of men disguised as Indians, and thrown into the harbor. The news of that action made the king and ministry furious. Parliament sympathized with the government, and in retaliation passed four acts unparalleled for their severity. The first was the Boston Port Bill, which closed the harbor to all trade; the second was the Massachusetts Bill, which virtually annulled the charter of the colony, took the government away from the people and gave it to the king; the third law ordered that Americans who committed murder in resistance to the law should be sent to England for trial; the fourth declared the country north of the Ohio and east of the

[1] "There must be one tax," said the king, "to keep up the right."

Mississippi a part of Canada[1] — the object of this last act being to conciliate the French Canadians, and secure their help against the colonists in case of rebellion.

Even after this unjust action on the part of the government a compromise might have been effected, and peace maintained, if the counsels of the best men had been followed; but George III. would listen to no policy short of coercion: his one idea of *being king* at all hazards had become a monomania. Burke denounced the inexpediency of such oppression, and Fox, another prominent member of Parliament, wrote: "It is intolerable to think that it should be in the power of one blockhead to do so much mischief." For the time, at least, the king was as unreasonable as any of the Stuarts. The obstinacy of Charles I. cost him his head, that of James II., his kingdom, that of George III. resulted in a war which saddled the English tax-payer with an additional debt of six hundred millions of dollars, and ended by Great Britain's losing the fairest and richest dominions that she or any nation ever possessed.

601. The American Revolution; Recognition of the Independence of the United States. — In 1775 war began, and the fighting at Lexington and Bunker Hill showed that the Americans were in earnest. The cry of the colonies had been, "No taxation without representation"; now it had got beyond that, and was, "No legislation without representation." But events moved so fast that even this did not long suffice, and on July 4, 1776, the colonies, in congress assembled, solemnly declared themselves free and independent. As far back as the French war there was at least one man who foresaw this declaration. After the English had taken Quebec, Vergennes,[2] an eminent French statesman, said of the American colonies with respect to Great Britain, "They stand no longer in need of her protection; she will call on them

[1] Embracing territory now divided into the five States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

[2] Vergennes (Vĕr'zhĕn').

to contribute toward supporting the burdens they have helped to bring on her; and they will answer by striking off all dependence."[1]

This prophecy was now fulfilled. Then the English ministry became alarmed, they were ready to make terms, they would in fact grant anything but independence;* but they had opened their eyes to the facts too late, and nothing short of independence would now satisfy the colonists. It is said that attempts were made to open negotiations with General Washington, but the commander-in-chief declined to receive a letter from the English government addressed to him, not in his official capacity, but as "George Washington, Esq.," and so the matter came to nothing. The war went on with varying success through seven heavy years, until, with the aid of the French, the Americans defeated Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown in 1781.[2] By that battle France got her revenge for the loss of Quebec in 1759, and America finally won the cause for which she had spent so much life and treasure.

On a foggy December morning in 1782, George III. entered the House of Lords, and with a faltering voice read a paper in which he acknowledged the independence of the United States of America. He closed his reading with the prayer that neither Great Britain nor America might suffer from the separation; and he expressed the hope that religion, language, interest, and affection might prove an effectual bond of union between the two countries. Eventually the separation proved, as Goldwin Smith says,[3] "a mutual advantage, since it removed to a great extent the arbitrary restrictions on trade, gave a new impetus to commerce, and immensely increased the wealth of both nations."

[1] Bancroft's History of the United States.

[2] It is pleasant to know that a hundred years later, in the autumn of 1881, a number of English gentlemen were present at the centennial celebration of the taking of Yorktown to express their hearty good will toward the nation which their ancestors had tried in vain to keep a part of Great Britain.

[3] Goldwin Smith's Lectures on Modern History (the Foundation of the American Colonies).

* This was in 1778, after the French treaty with the U. S.

602. The Lord George Gordon Riots. — While the American war was in progress, England had not been entirely quiet at home. In consequence of the repeal of the most stringent of the unwise and unjust laws against the Roman Catholics, — certainly unwise and unjust in their continuance for so many generations, if not in their origin, — Lord George Gordon, a half-crazed Scotch fanatic, now led an attack upon the government (1780). For six days, London was at the mercy of a furious mob, which set fire to Catholic chapels, pillaged many dwellings, and committed every species of outrage. Newgate prison was broken into, the prisoners released, and the prison burned.[1] No one was safe from attack who did not wear a blue cockade to show that he was a Protestant, and a man's house was not secure unless he chalked "No Popery" on the door in conspicuous letters; or, as one individual did in order to make doubly sure, "No Religion whatever." Before the riot was finally subdued a large amount of property had been destroyed and many lives sacrificed.

603. Impeachment of Warren Hastings. — The same year that the American war came to an end Warren Hastings, governor-general of India, was impeached for corrupt and cruel government, and was tried before the House of Lords, gathered in Westminster Hall. On the side of Hastings was the powerful East India Company, ruling over a territory many times larger than the whole of Great Britain. Against him were arrayed the three ablest and most eloquent men in England, — Burke, Fox, and Sheridan. The trial was continued at intervals for eight years, and resulted in the acquittal of the accused; but it was proved that the chief business of those who went out to India was to wring a fortune from the natives, and then go back to England to spend it in a life of luxury; this fact, and the stupendous corruption that was shown to exist, eventually broke down the gigantic monopoly, and the country was thrown open to the trade of all nations.[2]

[1] See Dickens's Barnaby Rudge.

[2] See Burke's Speeches; also Macaulay's Essay on Warren Hastings.

604. Liberty of the Press; Law and Prison Reforms; Abolition of the Slave Trade. — Since the discontinuance of the censorship of the press,[1] though newspapers were nominally free to discuss public affairs, yet the government had no intention of permitting any severe criticism. On the other hand, there were men who were equally determined to speak their minds through the press on political as on all other matters. In the early part of the reign, John Wilkes, an able but scurrilous writer, attacked the policy of the crown in violent terms. A few years later a writer, who signed himself "Junius," began a series of letters in a daily paper, in which he handled the king and the king's friends still more roughly. An attempt was made by the government to punish Wilkes and the publisher of the "Junius" letters, but it signally failed in both cases, and the public feeling was plainly in favor of the right of the freest expression,[2] which was eventually conceded.

Up to this time Parliamentary debates had rarely been reported. In fact, under the Stuarts and the Tudors, members of Parliament would have run the risk of imprisonment if their criticisms of royalty had been made public; but now the papers began to contain the speeches and votes of both Houses on important questions. Every effort was made to suppress these reports, but again the press gained the day; and henceforth the nation learned whether its representatives really represented the will of the people, and so was able to hold them strictly accountable, — a matter of vital importance in every free government.

Another field of reform was also found. The times were brutal. The pillory still stood in the centre of London;[3] and if the unfortunate offender who was put in it escaped with a shower of mud and other unsavory missiles, instead of clubs and brick-

[1] See Paragraph No. 550.

[2] Later, during the excitement caused by the French Revolution, there was a reaction from this feeling, but it was only temporary.

[3] The pillory (see Paragraph No. 580) was not abolished until the accession of Queen Victoria.

bats, he was lucky indeed. Gentlemen of fashion arranged pleasure parties to visit the penitentiaries to see the wretched women whipped. The whole code of criminal law was savagely vindictive. Capital punishment was inflicted for upwards of two hundred offences, many of which would now be thought to be sufficiently punished by one or two months' imprisonment in the house of correction. Not only men, but women and children even, were hanged for pilfering goods or food worth a few shillings.[1] The jails were crowded with poor wretches whom want had driven to theft, and who were "worked off," as the saying was, on the gallows every Monday morning in batches of a dozen or twenty, in sight of the jeering, drunken crowds who gathered to witness their death agonies.

Through the efforts of Sir Samuel Romilly, Jeremy Bentham, and others, a reform was effected in this bloody code; and by the labors of the philanthropic John Howard, and forty years later of Elizabeth Fry, the jails were purified of abuses which had made them not only dens of suffering and disease, but schools of crime as well. The laws respecting punishment for debt were also changed for the better, and thousands of miserable beings who were without means to satisfy their creditors were now set free, instead of being kept in useless life-long imprisonment. At the same time Clarkson, Wilberforce, Fox, and Pitt were endeavoring to abolish that relic of barbarism, the African slave trade, which, after twenty years of persistent effort both in Parliament and out, they at last accomplished.

605. War with France; Battle of the Nile; Trafalgar; Spain. — In 1789 the French Revolution broke out. It was a violent and successful attempt to destroy those feudal institutions which the nation had outgrown, and which had, as we have seen, disappeared gradually in England after the Wars of the Roses. At first the revolutionists received the hearty sympathy of many of the

[1] Five shillings, or $1.25, was the hanging limit; anything stolen above that sum in money or goods sent the thief to the gallows.

Whig party, but after the execution of Louis XVI. and Queen Marie Antoinette,[1] England became alarmed not only at the horrible scenes of the Reign of Terror, but at the establishment of that democratic Republic which seemed to justify them; and joined an alliance of the principal European powers for the purpose of restoring the French monarchy. Napoleon had now become the real head of the French nation, and seemed bent on making himself master of all Europe. He undertook an expedition against Egypt and the East which was intended as a stepping-stone toward the ultimate conquest of the English empire in India, but his plans were frustrated by Nelson's victory over the French fleet at the battle of the Nile. With the assistance of Spain, Napoleon next prepared to invade England, and was so confident of success that he caused a gold medal to be struck, bearing the inscription, "Descent upon England." "Struck at London, 1804." But the combined French and Spanish fleets on whose co-operation Napoleon was depending were driven by the English into the harbor of Cadiz, and the great expedition was postponed for another year. When, in the autumn of 1805, they left Cadiz harbor, Lord Nelson lay waiting for them off Cape Trafalgar,[2] near by. Two days later he descried the enemy at daybreak. The men on both sides felt that the decisive struggle was at hand. With the exception of a long, heavy swell the sea was calm, with a light breeze, but sufficient to bring the two fleets gradually within range.

> "As they drifted on their path
> There was silence deep as death;
> And the boldest held his breath
> For a time."[3]

Just before the action, Nelson ran up this signal to the masthead of his ship, where all might see it: "ENGLAND EXPECTS EVERY MAN TO DO HIS DUTY." The answer to it was three ringing cheers from the entire fleet, and the fight began. When it

[1] See Burke's Reflections on the French Revolution (Death of Marie Antoinette).
[2] Cape Trafalgar (Traf-al'-gar).
[3] Campbell's Battle of the Baltic, but applicable as well to Trafalgar.