

**BAVARIA**  
**(MUNICH)**



## MUNICH

### **FO 9/252: Hugh Guion MacDonell to Earl Granville, No 22, Munich, 24 April 1884**

[Received 26 April by post. For: The Queen / X, Ch.W.D. [Charles Wentworth Dilke] / Berlin for perusal, P.L. [printed letter], 14 May; G[ranville]]

*Remarks on Federal Council resolution to establish an imperial ministry responsible to parliament; wariness of various German states; Bavaria not averse to it*

The Munich journals have lately reproduced a note published by the official Journal of the Empire<sup>1</sup> regarding a resolution taken by the Bundesrath<sup>2</sup> in its session of the 5<sup>th</sup> instant on the subject of the probable establishment of an Imperial Ministry responsible to the Parliament.

Nobody here would have suspected that this question, which only figured in the programme of the new secessionist-progressist Party<sup>3</sup> could have become the subject of a debate in the Bundesrath.

The note published by the official Journal appeared incomprehensible; and the somewhat embarrassed terms in which it was worded have tended in no small degree to awaken public curiosity – in as much as the credit of the initiative seems, by the note, to be attributed to Prussia, while the other states are represented as having done no more than adhere to the proposal.

The result of the information which I have been able to obtain is that as soon as the secessionist programme had been made public, the Government of Saxony felt alarmed at the danger which would threaten the so-called autonomy of the Federal States, if Prussia should happen to favour the application of the ideas adopted by the new party. It is said therefore that Saxony instructed her delegate<sup>4</sup> to the Bundesrath to sound his co-delegates as to the views of the other states.

<sup>1</sup> *Deutscher Reichsanzeiger und Königlich Preussischer Staatsanzeiger*, 6 April 1884. For the debate and resolution in the Federal Council, see pp. 33–34.

<sup>2</sup> Federal Council.

<sup>3</sup> *Deutsche Freisinnige Partei*; see n. 3 in Berlin section.

<sup>4</sup> Oswald von Nostitz-Wallwitz.

The King of Saxony who happened to be in Berlin when the secessionist-progressist-programme was published,<sup>5</sup> fearing that the idea of a responsible Imperial Ministry would menace the interests of the other states, at once broached the subject with Prince Bismarck, and finding the chancellor somewhat doubtful as to the course to be pursued, the King lost no time in instructing his delegate to treat the matter in conjunction with his colleagues in the Bundesrath.

The President of the Council of Wurtemberg [*sic*],<sup>6</sup> on the other hand, who likewise was in Berlin at that moment, felt the same apprehensions and resolved with the approval of the Governments of several of the Federal states, to bring forward a motion with the object of drawing from the Bundesrath a declaration that the establishment of an Imperial Ministry was contrary to the spirit of the Constitution – in as much as it rests exclusively on the principle of federation, and not on that of the fusion of the German people.

Unfortunately for the promoters of this scheme Bavaria did not deem it necessary to follow them in that direction.

The Government of this Country thought that it was giving too much importance to the aims of a purely parliamentary group, to bring forward such a motion in the Federal Council. The Bavarian Government would have liked to set it aside, but “having learnt that the Prussian Government saw no objection to accepting it, the Bavarian Government no longer hesitated to adhere to it”. These are the terms used by the Bavarian Foreign Minister.<sup>7</sup>

At all events it was only after the step taken by the Bavarian Minister that the Berlin Cabinet was able to take the initiative in the proposal mentioned by the official Journal and of which doubtless Your Lordship has already been informed.

It would perhaps be unfair to conclude from this incident that the Bavarian Government will prove itself ready, if necessary, to abandon the Federal party in favor of the policy of unity. The incident simply affords one more proof of the state of subordination to the Imperial Chancery in which the Bavarian Government now finds itself – the special reasons for which I have already had the honor to lay before Your Lordship.

However, if I may venture to offer an opinion, I believe that Prussia would not have been sorry to keep her secret intentions in complete obscurity, but in presence of the determined attitude of Saxony, Baden and Wurtemberg and several of the other minor

<sup>5</sup> On 5 March 1884.

<sup>6</sup> Hermann von Mitnacht.

<sup>7</sup> Friedrich Krafft von Crailsheim. The statement is not datable.

states, the Prussian Government was forced to lead the way and assume to itself the credit of being the first to maintain the Constitutional principle of the autonomy of the Federal states.

**FO 9/252: Hugh Guion MacDonell to Earl Granville,  
Confidential, No 26, Munich, 1 May 1884**

[Received 7 May by messenger. For: The Queen / X, Ch.W.D. [Charles Wentworth Dilke] / Prince of Wales; G[ranville]]

*King's absence from installation of Knights of St George due to financial discomfiture*

The absence of the King from the ceremony of Installation of the Knights of S<sup>t</sup> George<sup>8</sup> – which took place on the 25<sup>th</sup> ultimo – has again given rise to strange reports regarding the mental condition of His Majesty.

The fact of the King deputing his uncle, Prince Luitpold, to perform the duties of grand master on that occasion, was a direct violation of the statutes of the order.

His absence from the ceremony is said to have been due to His Majesty's financial embarrassments, which are daily increasing; but I have also been privately informed that the King declined to appear in public lest the discontent of the smaller tradesmen might induce them to seize that opportunity for making some sort of demonstration. This supposition I believe to be groundless for the Bavarians are, as I have already had occasion to remark, thoroughly devoted to their Sovereign, a fact amply shown by the indulgence they have hitherto given to his eccentricities. His Majesty is, it appears, now determined that the subject of money shall not stand in the way of his whims and fancies; in consequence of which his ministers, it is sad to relate, think it right to deceive him as to the real state of things. They have even gone so far as to invent excuses for the stoppage of the works at his numerous country palaces, inducing him to believe that the stones requisite for the buildings are too heavy for transport by train. The only person admitted to His Majesty's presence is his personal attendant,<sup>9</sup> through whom he transacts all the business of the State. In spite of the mask of confidence – when his temper has been roused – he does not hesitate to descend to acts of violence against him.

<sup>8</sup> Royal Military Order of Saint George.

<sup>9</sup> MacDonell is referring to *Hofsekretär* Philipp Pfister; Ludwig's private secretary was Richard Hornig.

With regard to His Majesty's Debts, his Private Secretary has, it appears, found it impossible to procure the funds, necessary for meeting the Kings liabilities, either from the Frankfurt Bankers or with the assistance of the Imperial Government at Berlin, – Prince Bismarck having peremptorily declined to countenance any transaction of the kind. The only course at present open to them, therefore, is either to form a Syndicate of Bankers here, or to accept the offer of a London firm (Mess<sup>rs</sup> Baring & C<sup>o</sup>, I believe)<sup>10</sup>; but in both cases nothing can be done unless the consent of the “Agnates”<sup>11</sup> is absolutely guaranteed.

**FO 9/252: Hugh Guion MacDonell to Earl Granville,  
No 33, Munich, 9 July 1884**

[Received 16 July by messenger. For: The Queen / Lord Derby / Prince of Wales / X, Ch.W.D. [Charles Wentworth Dilke]; G[ranville]]

*Allgemeine Zeitung reports appreciative sympathy shown by British press towards imperial colonial policy*

Enclosed herewith I have the honor to transmit to Your Lordship the translation of an article which has recently appeared in the “Allgemeine Zeitung”<sup>12</sup> on the subject of the sympathy manifested by the English Press with the colonial policy of the Empire.

The persistent animosity formerly displayed by this Journal – when treating of matters connected with England – justifies, no doubt, the value which is here attached to the Article in question.

The “Allgemeine Zeitung” is the most important newspaper in South Germany and carries great weight especially with the middle and upper classes. Consequently it is to be hoped that the sound advice it now tenders, viz- that the Germans must henceforth moderate their ill-founded aversion for England, may be heeded and be the means of restoring friendly feeling which the “Allgemeine” itself has helped to disturb.

<sup>10</sup> In March 1884 the London merchant bank Baring Brothers & Co. offered a loan of six million marks.

<sup>11</sup> Otto, Ludwig's brother, and Luitpold, Ludwig's uncle.

<sup>12</sup> On 1 June 1884 *The Fortnightly Review* published an anti-Bismarckian and pro-French article entitled ‘England's Foreign Policy’, signed ‘G’. The speculation over its authorship, which *The Times* attributed to Gladstone, led to general assessments and comments on foreign policy and Anglo-German relations in the British and German press. Enclosure: translation of article entitled ‘Germany, England, and the “G” article in the Fortnightly Review’ (‘Deutschland, England und der G-Artikel der “Fortnightly Review”’), *Allgemeine Zeitung*, 6 July 1884.

**FO 9/252: Hugh Guion MacDonell to Earl Granville,  
No 37, Munich, 4 August 1884**

[Received 13 August by messenger. For: The Queen / X, Ch.W.D. [Charles Wentworth Dilke] / Copy to Paris / Prince of Wales; G[ranville]]

*Kölnische Zeitung echoes call in French press for re-establishment of friendly Franco-German relations; Bavarian public opinion remains anti-French*

The extraordinary articles which have lately appeared in the Paris "Figaro" would probably have passed unnoticed here had not the *Kölnische Zeitung* given undue importance to the idea, put forward by the French Journal, of the necessity of a friendly understanding if not an alliance, between Germany and France.<sup>13</sup>

I shall not examine how far the opinion of the "Figaro" may be taken as the faithful echo of the present tone of public feeling in France, nor to what degree the sentiments expressed by the *Cologne Gazette* represent the views of the (north) German people or of the Imperial Government, but, if I may venture to offer an opinion, I think that the majority of Bavarians look upon the idea of closer relations with the French Republic, at the present moment and under the present circumstances, as the fancy of a disordered mind.

The animosity professed by this part of the Empire towards France, certainly appears as keen as ever, and an understanding with the Republic would, to all appearances, be most unpopular; but, it is difficult to overlook the fact that the aversion at one time felt for Austria was perhaps stronger and more deep-rooted than the antipathy hitherto manifested towards France, – and yet no trace whatever of that illfeeling is now apparent.

I have already had the honor to state to Your Lordship that public opinion in Bavaria – especially as regards the foreign policy of the Empire – is almost exclusively governed by the Press, which in its turn seeks its inspirations at Berlin; consequently if, at any moment, it was deemed necessary to convert the Bavarians to a different way of thinking, I do not believe much difficulty would be experienced in convin[c]ing them that a cordial agreement with France is necessary for the interests and security of the Empire.

<sup>13</sup> MacDonell is referring to the articles in *Le Figaro* of 25 and 27 July 1884 entitled 'Anglais contre Français et Allemands' and 'Nos amis les Anglais, nos ennemis les Allemands' which proposed to make common cause with Germany against British predominance, and to an article in the *Kölnische Zeitung* of 29 July 1884.

**FO 9/252: Hugh Guion MacDonell to Earl Granville,  
No 54, Munich, 19 November 1884**

[Received 3 December by messenger. For: The Queen / X, Ch.W.D. [Charles Wentworth Dilke]; G[ranville]]

Reichstag *election results in Bavaria*

With reference to my Dispatch N<sup>o</sup> 45 Confidential of the 19<sup>th</sup> ultimo, I have the honour to inform Your Lordship that the result of the Bavarian Elections for the Imperial Parliament, which has only now been made public, leaves no doubt, as I had been led to anticipate, that the position of the Centre (clerical) party remains unchanged.<sup>14</sup>

The following table will perhaps show more clearly the changes which have taken place amongst the various parties since 1881.

	<u>1881</u>	<u>1884</u>	<u>gain</u>	<u>loss</u>
Catholics	32.	33.	1.	
National Liberals	9.	10.	1.	
Progressists	4.	2[.]		2.
Socialists	1.	2.	1.	
Democrats	1.	1.		
Conservatives	1.	0.		1.

The success of the Socialists in Bavaria, as in other states of the Empire, is an unquestionable fact; and has certainly caused a deep sense of uneasiness thro'out the Country – in Munich especially where of two electoral districts, hitherto represented by Catholics, the one has passed, by a small majority, to the hands of the Socialists, whilst the other has, with the aid of the latter, fallen to the lot of the Liberals[.]

Notwithstanding that the Socialists and the Liberals have loudly proclaimed their intention to act independently, no doubt seems now to be entertained that their double success was due to their joint action, if not to a compromise suggested, it is said, from Berlin; the latter supposition being based upon the support which the Socialist candidate<sup>15</sup> received from officers on half-pay and Government employés. – That the success of the Socialists was due to some such scheme is all the more evident from the fact that in Bavaria but especially in Munich, there only exists two distinct and

<sup>14</sup> Elections to the *Reichstag* were held on 28 October 1884.

<sup>15</sup> Georg von Vollmar.



important political parties, viz: the Catholics and Anti-Catholics, into which are blended – through a feeling of mutual hatred – the various groups of every political shade and colour.

The progress of the Socialists is all the more remarkable considering the legal disadvantages they have had to contend with.<sup>16</sup> It may therefore be fairly admitted that they owe their success to their own exertions and to the extraordinary activity displayed by their leaders, who have succeeded in gaining some 20,000 votes in the stronghold, so to speak, of Catholicism.

As to the Clericals, they have, relying on their former success, shown less activity, and have limited their efforts to proclaiming that they were ready to vote for any candidate, regardless of party, who was willing to oppose the May Laws.<sup>17</sup>

It is perhaps worth noting that the partisans of Prince Bismarck's new economic ideas, i.e. the Protectionists, have likewise enlisted a fair number of supporters; this is perhaps due to the general feeling prevalent in Germany, as indeed in many other Countries, that native industry, more especially agriculture, is suffering from the effects of foreign competition.

### **FO 9/254: Hugh Guion MacDonell to Earl Granville, Confidential, No 15, Munich, 15 June 1885**

[Received 17 June by Messenger. For: The Queen / Berlin for perusal; G.DI. [George Dallas], 1 July; Prince of Wales / Duke of Cambridge; G[ranville]]

*South German press denounce Bavarian support for Prussian motion to exclude Duke of Cumberland from Brunswick succession*

The decision taken at Berlin, with reference to the Brunswick succession has necessarily been the subject of general comment in south Germany, but nowhere has it been so keenly resented as in Bavaria.<sup>18</sup> – The Conservative Journals have denounced it as an act of violence, whilst the liberal organs – ever ready to “contribute” to the consolidation of the Empire – have not, on this occasion,

<sup>16</sup> MacDonell is referring to the Anti-Socialist Law of October 1878 (see n. 10 in Dresden section).

<sup>17</sup> The Prussian May Laws of 1873–1875, amongst other things, transferred the training and appointment of clergy to state authority, reformed disciplinary authority over church members, regulated the civil aspects of disaffiliation and curtailed various ecclesiastical rights. See also n. 37 in this and n. 131 in Berlin section.

<sup>18</sup> At the time of the dispatch the Prussian motion on the question of the Brunswick succession (see n. 65 in Berlin section) had been referred to the judiciary committee (*Justizausschuss*) of the Federal Council.

ventured to display their German patriotism to the prejudice of their Bavarian nationality.

Owing to the prominent and exceptional position held by Bavaria, she has – notwithstanding the manifest submission, of the King and of his Ministers, to the behests of the Chancellor – been hitherto looked upon, both by her own people and by the other Federal states, as the only member of the Confederation which could venture to take the lead in offering some sort of resistance to the encroachments which Prussia is steadily making on their autonomous rights. It is due to this circumstance that the eyes of South Germany have lately been turned towards Bavaria – in the hope that she would, at last, make a stand against the Imperial decision which so closely threatens her very existence as an independent state. The result, however, has only furnished a fresh proof of the pliability of this Government, and of the complete control which Prince Bismarck exercises over His Majesty and His Ministers.

One of the immediate consequences of the action of Bavaria, in the Brunswick question, is that some of the newspapers of this country are already discounting the effect which the new principle proclaimed at Berlin, must have in the succession in Coburg and in Wurtemberg. If so frivolous a pretext is admitted – they say – the Federal Council may now, if it pleases, declare that a Foreign Prince<sup>19</sup> in Coburg or a Protestant Prince<sup>20</sup> in Wurtemberg are incompatible with the peace of the Empire; and as regards Bavaria, should the Chancellor consider it necessary to maintain an insane King on the Bavarian throne or retain the aid of an imbecile and accommodating Government, he may, by the stroke of his pen, set aside the Wittelsbach Dynasty as dangerously ultramontane and force this country to pander indefinitely to the vices and follies of a demented Sovereign.

Furthermore – it is argued – the Federal Council, according to the constitution of the Empire, can only interfere between two states in cases of conflict which are not within the jurisdiction of an ordinary tribunal; – how can the Minister, therefore, of a Prince, who represents legitimacy itself, advise the dispossession of another Prince, equally legitimate, for state reasons.

One of the newspaper articles, to which I refer above, boldly calls the attention of its readers to the unconstitutional proceedings of the Prussian Government – “An Act”, it says, “hitherto considered in all countries as the work of violence and revolution”; and adds “well may the Liberal press turn its attention to the effect it will produce when the succession in Wurtemberg and Coburg comes to be discussed. If the Federal states tacitly countenance the Prussian Veto, and thereby

<sup>19</sup> Alfred, Duke of Edinburgh. See pp. 148–149.

<sup>20</sup> The heir presumptive, Prince Wilhelm.

invest the leading state with the power to interfere in matters of hereditary succession, they do not deserve to be leniently dealt with – the acceptance of so dangerous a doctrine will inevitably make them a prey, sooner or later, to the all-absorbing power – Prussia.”

Notwithstanding the urgent appeals of Saxony and Wurtemberg, the Bavarian Ministers decided to furnish their Representatives at the Bundesrath<sup>21</sup> with instruction,<sup>22</sup> so framed, as to meet the wishes of Prince Bismarck, without, if possible, wounding the susceptibilities of the Bavarians. To attain that object they have imagined that the easiest way was to abandon altogether the Duke of Cumberland, and to make no reference to the article of the Constitution<sup>23</sup> which the Imperial Chancellor invokes.

The following, therefore, is the form of declaration which the Bavarian Representatives have been instructed to propose: –

“The Confederate states declare that the taking of possession, by the Duke of Cumberland, of the Duchy of Brunswick is inadmissible, due to his being in a state of war with Prussia, one of the Federal states; and that in consequence of the existing Treaty which unites the said confederate States between them, it is recognised that a state of war between members of the union may imperil the territorial power of the individual states”.

This form of declaration, if not suggested by Prince Bismarck, has already met with approval.

The declarations suggested by Saxony and Wurtemberg are, I believe, in the same sense – without however admitting that a state of war exists between Prussia and the Duke of Cumberland. This difference is of no importance since the form suggested by Bavaria may be considered as accepted.

### **FO 9/254: Hugh Guion MacDonell to Marquess of Salisbury, Confidential, No 22, Munich, 4 July 1885**

[Received 6 July by post. For: The Queen / Earl of Iddesleigh / Berlin for perusal; G.Dl. [George Dallas]; Prince of Wales / Duke of Cambridge; S[alisbury]]

*Bavaria's proposal to resolve Brunswick question accepted by Federal Council; state governments uneasy about future Federal Council intervention in other matters of succession*

I endeavoured in my N<sup>OS</sup> 15 and 20 Confidential of June 15<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> last, to describe the part taken by Bavaria in the Brunswick

<sup>21</sup> Federal Council.

<sup>22</sup> On 9 June 1885.

<sup>23</sup> Article 76 of the imperial constitution; see n. 66 in Berlin section.

Succession question.<sup>24</sup> The objection raised, by the Southern States of Germany to the Prussian proposal, was one of principle, but it was easy to foresee that Bavaria, on this as on former occasion, was ready to lend herself to any arrangement which the Chancellor thought fit to suggest, however detrimental it might prove to the interests of the other autonomous states. Obligated, therefore, to agree in dispossessing the Duke of Cumberland of the Throne of Brunswick, the Federal Governments, with Bavaria as their leader, endeavoured to seek safety in the form – rather than in the substance – of an act which threatens their own existence. The Bavarian amendment to the Prussian proposal having found favor with the Chancellor, Bavaria is necessarily reproached with having deserted the Federal camp – but it is doubtful whether any of the other states, in her position, would have ventured to act differently.

The difficulty experienced by the Federal Governments in uniting to resist the encroachments of Prussia on their privileges, no doubt proceeds from the very embarrassing part which this Government is called upon to play. The ministers are not allowed to perform a single act or affix a single signature without the sanction of the King, who lives in absolute seclusion and with whom they can only treat through the medium of his private Secretary or his favorite valet;<sup>25</sup> being in a minority in the chamber they are invariably defeated and if any serious question has to be negotiated with the Imperial Government they generally discover at the last moment that it has been settled by His Majesty privately and directly with Prince Bismarck. In most cases therefore the President of the council<sup>26</sup> is only guided by what he may hear from Berlin or by the indiscretions of the King's Private Secretary. It may fairly be said therefore that it was due to this state of things that notwithstanding the gravity of the question the Bavarian Ministers did not deem it prudent on this occasion to abandon their usual reserve, by acting in concert with or advising the other states to adopt a more resolute course. – From the first, therefore, Bavaria openly avoided her intention to reject as far as possible the interpretation set by Prussia on Art. 76 of the Imperial constitution,<sup>27</sup> but, at the same time to arrive at a direct understanding, subject to the approval of the Chancellor,

<sup>24</sup> For Bavaria's conduct in this matter, see the preceding dispatch. For the Brunswick succession question and the Federal Council's resolution of 2 July 1885, see also n. 65 in Prussia.

<sup>25</sup> Philipp Pfister and Richard Hornig.

<sup>26</sup> Johann von Lutz.

<sup>27</sup> For Article 76 of the imperial constitution, see n. 66 in Berlin section.

as to the form in which the Federal Council was to set aside the claim of the Duke of Cumberland. The difficulty of the task was to find a formula applicable to the case of the Duke which would at the same time leave the principle of legitimacy unscathed.

The Governments of Stuttgart and of Saxony, having been kept ignorant of the progress of the negotiations between Prussia and Bavaria, agreed to draw up separate counter-proposals.<sup>28</sup>

The Saxon Government was of opinion that Art[.] 76 of the Constitution invoked by Prussia only aims at an existing conflict between two states, consequently the Federal Council is not competent to decide as to the merits of a conflict in anticipation, though, by the spirit of the Constitution it has the right to prevent the breaking out of such a conflict. As the Empire rests on a Federation of German Princes, which Federation was constituted by the Federal Princes themselves for the protection of their respective States; in joining the confederation they recognised and reciprocally guaranteed the integrity of their respective territories. It is difficult therefore, according to the views of the Saxon Government, to admit to the Government of one of the states of the Empire, a Prince who has not unreservedly accepted the act of recognition or of guarantee. The Duke of Cumberland has, it is true, declared his readiness to govern Brunswick according to the Constitution, but he also maintains his claim to the Kingdom of Hanover. So long as this contradiction exists in the Duke's declarations<sup>29</sup> the Saxon Government was of opinion that He could not be placed in possession of the Duchy.

In framing the above, which I am told was the purport of the counter proposal prepared by Saxony with the approval of Wurtemberg, the two Governments entertained, it is said, the hope of bringing the Duke to declare his intention with regard to Hanover; but either it has been ascertained that the Duke is bound by certain engagements not to abandon his claim to that Kingdom, or the two Governments hesitate to assume an independent attitude, the fact is that they have since adhered to the Bavarian proposal.

It is interesting to follow the many opinions expressed in South Germany with regard to this question – though everyone seems to agree that the Chancellor has gladly availed himself of the

<sup>28</sup> On 4 and 5 June the Saxon and Wurtemberg representatives to the Federal Council communicated their position with regard to the original Prussian proposal of 18 May; however, they did not file counterproposals.

<sup>29</sup> See pp. 56–57.

opportunity with a double object; – first, with a view to securing the power of dealing with those Dynasties which he deems objectionable; and secondly with a view to retaining the funds belonging to the late King of Hanover, which sum it is whispered is destined to ransom one or more of the Federal states.<sup>30</sup>

In any case Prince Bismarck has on this occasion obtained a further proof that even in matters of sovereignty, the Federal states are no longer in a position to uphold their autonomous Rights.

At an interview I had yesterday with the Minister for Foreign Affairs, His Excellency informed me that the Bavarian proposal had definitely been accepted by the Federal Council.<sup>31</sup> He assured me, however, that as it aims at preserving *intact* the principle of legitimacy, and was simply framed with a view to excluding the Duke of Cumberland from Brunswick, no fear need be entertained that this decision can ever, hereafter, be invoked as a precedent. I took the liberty of pointing out to His Excellency that according to his own sta[te]ment, he had a few days before quoted the opinion of Prince Bismarck as regards the value of the word “precedent” – “a word”, which His Excellency had represented the Prince as having said, “did not exist in the political Dictionary”[.] Whatever Bavaria may think of the declaration, His Excellency could not deny that the Federal states had now recognised the competency of the Federal Council to interfere in questions of legitimate Succession in the various states of the Empire; and on the same grounds that the Duke of Cumberland is said to have forfeited his right to Brunswick, the son<sup>32</sup> may be likewise find himself some day dispossessed of that throne. Though His Excellency would not admit the force of this argument the Saxon and Wurtemberg Ministers<sup>33</sup> here are of opinion that he fully realises the error which has been committed.

I may here observe that this is the first occasion upon which the Chancellor is supposed to have given way to one of the Federal states by withdrawing his proposal.

<sup>30</sup> The ‘Guelph fund’ consisted of the confiscated assets of King Georg V of Hanover. It was administered by a Prussian commission. See also n. 67 in Dresden section.

<sup>31</sup> Friedrich Krafft Freiherr von Crailsheim was referring to the modified proposal adopted by the judiciary committee on 1 July 1885 and passed by the Federal Council the following day.

<sup>32</sup> Prince Georg Wilhelm.

<sup>33</sup> Oswald Freiherr von Fabrice and Oskar Freiherr von Soden.

## FO 9/254: Hugh Guion MacDonell to Marquess of Salisbury, No 26, Munich, 14 July 1885

[Received 21 July by Mr MacDonell. For: The Queen; S[alisbury]]

*Circular of Vicariate of Paderborn on required qualifications for those wishing to enter ecclesiastical profession; criticism from liberal and Catholic parties*

A German Newspaper<sup>34</sup> has lately published a circular which the Vicariate General of Paderborn has confidentially addressed to the “curés” of that Diocese,<sup>35</sup> requesting them to inform all those who destine themselves to the Ecclesiastical profession that they must, before entering a seminary, follow the University classes of Theology, Philosophy and History and obtain a so-called, certificate of assiduity.

This Circular said to be dated the 27<sup>th</sup> of February last was made public at about the same time as Archbishop Melchers was called to Rome and replaced, in the see of Cologne, by Monsignor Cremens<sup>36</sup> – a prelate, known to be well thought of by the Imperial Chancellor.

The spirit of the Circular in question, and that which prompted the selection of the new Archbishop for Cologne, has led public opinion to conclude that the Holy See was by these means seeking to conciliate the Imperial Government and thus give tangible proof of the earnestness of its intentions.

The Liberal Journals at once seized the opportunity to proclaim the defeat of the clericals; whilst the Catholic journals, almost without exception observed the most marked silence as to the cause and origin of the circular. Whether due to the painful impression created amongst the Roman Catholics, or due to such remonstrances as may have been addressed to it from Rome, the Vicariate General deemed it prudent to address a note to the papers, on the 1<sup>st</sup> instant, stating that the Confidential Circular in question, was simply intended to guide theological Students in the most practical way of pursuing their vocation; by so doing no recognition of the prescriptions contained in the May Law was ever intended, on the contrary the true spirit of the Circular was in opposition to those Laws.<sup>37</sup> Their

<sup>34</sup> *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, 24 June 1885.

<sup>35</sup> The directive was addressed to the deans (*Landdechanten*) of the Paderborn diocese; it was dated 17 February 1885.

<sup>36</sup> Philipp Kremenz. News of his succession as Archbishop of Cologne circulated from early April 1885 and he was officially appointed on 30 July 1885. Melchers, having been dismissed by verdict of the Prussian Royal Court for Church Affairs for violating the May Laws, had been in exile in the Netherlands since 1876. He arrived in Rome on 13 July 1885 and was created cardinal on 27 July.

<sup>37</sup> Amongst other things, the Prussian law of 11 May 1873 introduced state supervision for the training of clergy. These provisions were attenuated by the law of 31 May 1882

only object was to relieve the seminaries of the expense of maintaining the younger Clergy. Consequently the Vicariate considers that it has conscientiously observed the respect due to the Laws of the Church and maintained intact its devotion to the Holy See and its ties with the Roman Catholic Episcopate.

This declaration has, of course, been severely criticized by the organs of both parties. The Catholics thought it constituted a withdrawal of the ill-imagined circular; whilst the liberals accepted it as an explanation, the object of which was to cover the differences which exist between the Bishop<sup>38</sup> and the more intolerant of his co-religionists. Alarmed however, at the discussion of one of the points upon which the Catholics rest their objections to the May Laws, the ultramontane organs now demand a clear and unequivocal withdrawal of the Confidential Circular of the 27<sup>th</sup> of February. As yet, no such document has appeared and it remains to be seen whether the Bishop of Paderborn will, by so bold a proceeding, succeed in conciliating the German Catholics to the objectionable Laws of May, or whether Germany is to witness a renewal of the “Kulturkampf”[.]

Whatever may result from this incident, it is now clear enough that the Holy See can no longer charge the Prussian Government with interfering in the education of the Clergy, by means of those special prescriptions which the May Laws provide, since one of its most prominent Bishops can cast a doubt on what has hitherto been considered as an essential principle of the Roman Catholic Doctrine, and with regard to which the Pope<sup>39</sup> has repeatedly proclaimed he could make no concession.

### **FO 9/257: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury, Treaty, Confidential, No 3, Munich, 28 January 1886**

[Received 15 February. For: The Queen / Prince of Wales ('abroad – not sent') / Gladstone / Western Department: 'This ought not to have been marked in the Treaty section', J.H.G.B. [John Henry Gibbs Bergne]; 'Tell him so', J.P. [Julian Pauncefote]; Berlin for perusal; R[osebery]]

*Rumours of a regency in Bavaria; ministerial representations to the king concerning his financial situation*

Various rumors respecting the extravagance of His Majesty The King of Bavaria have lately appeared in the Continental Press and

which, granted exemption from the compulsory state exams for non-theological subjects (*Kultuexamen*). This was reflected in the Paderborn circular. For the Prussian May Laws of 1873–1875, see also n. 17 in this section and n. 131 in Berlin section.

<sup>38</sup> Franz Kaspar Drobe; Bishop of Paderborn.

<sup>39</sup> Leo XIII.



hints are therein given that if this continues it may lead to a Regency being appointed in the person of Prince Luitpold the King's uncle and Heir presumptive to the Crown; further, that the Bavarian Executive have considered it their duty to make certain representations to the King with the intention that His Majesty should allow His monetary affairs to be put in order, this it is said would probably lead to a Ministerial crisis causing the present Ministers to be replaced by others belonging to the Ultramontane party under the leaderships of Baron Frankenstein a well known leader of the Center<sup>40</sup> in the Reichstag and in the Chambers.

These reports are certainly founded on fact, and as far as I learn from my Colleagues and others I am led to believe at the present moment events may be preparing which may later prove of serious importance to the Royal Family of Wittelsbach.

The King's extravagance, caused by His craze for building Castles and His complete retirement, becomes more and more a source of uneasiness not only to His Ministers but to the Royal Family of Bavaria who three years ago assisted His Majesty to procure a Loan of eight millions of marks or four hundred thousand pounds, and who are no longer inclined to make themselves responsible as security for any fresh loans. The Ministers cannot advance money from the Treasury, neither dare they bring forward a measure in the Chambers to tax the people for the King's Debts or to raise a Loan.

I have asked Baron von Crailsheim as to the truth of the report that the Ministry had remonstrated with The King as stated in the Press; His Excellency replied that they had considered it necessary to forward a statement to His Majesty<sup>41</sup> concerning the state of the Civil List and Finances of the Country and that some advice had been offered for their reputation in the future; He added, "of course I cannot say whether The King will accept the advice or even make any reply thereto neither is it necessary that He should do so; what had been carried out could only be viewed as placing before His Majesty a sketch of the state of the Finances of the Country in regard to the interests of The King".

It is to be remarked that the sensational news respecting King Louis is always originated at Frankfort or in Paris, possibly under Ultramontane influence, by the adherents of Prince Luitpold or Prince Ludwig who are known to be closely attached to that Party, (although they may have no knowledge of the intrigue) a party

<sup>40</sup> *Zentrumspartei.*

<sup>41</sup> Crailsheim was referring to the memorandum of 6 January, addressed to the court secretary and *Vorstand* of the *Hof- und Cabinettskasse*, Ludwig von Klug.

which, luckily, has never been able to gain any influence over The King, and which would therefore be glad for their own purposes to see a Regency established.

It is also significant that the Vienna “Fremdenblatt”,<sup>42</sup> which is in the habit of receiving inspirations from the Imperial Foreign Office, has lately published a letter from Rome, saying that Pope Leo XIII has repeatedly expressed his entire satisfaction and gratitude for the present liberty and protection granted to the Church in Bavaria, this the “Vienna Neue Freie Presse”<sup>43</sup> considers is put forward to clear the Bavarian Ultramontanes from the suspicion that if the reins of Government should pass into their hands they would try to unsettle the relations of Bavaria to the German Empire and adds that if this interpretation is correct it is evident that the party wish to prove their ability of taking the power into their hands at the right time.

The respectable “Bavarian Press” is very shy of writing upon the vagaries of The King and the Vulgar Press is afraid of the Procureur Général<sup>44</sup> and is thus kept in order, but so much prominence has lately been given to the matter that The Munich Press has at last been led to make some remarks.

The “Neuesten Nachrichten”<sup>45</sup> a Liberal Paper says with reference to what is stated to have occurred.

“We are not in a position to control the accuracy of the statements made, but according to our own information it is not only possible but probable that a remonstrance in some such form has taken place”; whilst the “Fremdenblatt”<sup>46</sup> an Ultramontane Paper says: “if this is so it is the newest bit of Paulprying into the private affairs of His Majesty to which the Foreign papers kindly treat us – Should the Ministry, however, have ventured to take such a step we may depend upon hearing of the nomination of other Ministers within a short time”.

I am informed, however, that although The King may be irritated on account of His Ministers’ representations He is not in the least likely to change them and they certainly have no intention of resigning their posts.

Another report lately presented to the Public was that King Louis had gone to Paris to Baron Hirsch with the object of obtaining a Loan, there is not a word of truth in this, His Majesty is residing in one or other of His Castles in the Tyrol.

<sup>42</sup> On 15 January 1886.

<sup>43</sup> On 21 January 1886.

<sup>44</sup> French: ‘attorney general’.

<sup>45</sup> *Münchner Neueste Nachrichten*, 11 January 1886; it was referring to a report in the *Frankfurter Zeitung*.

<sup>46</sup> ‘Nichts als Gerüchte’, *Münchner Fremdenblatt*, 16 January 1887.

The results which are likely to follow from the steps taken by The Bavarian Government in respect to His Majesty are not yet clear enough for me to report upon to Your Lordship, but I shall probably in a few days again refer to the critical state of the King's position.

**FO 9/256: Victor Drummond to Earl of Rosebery,  
Confidential, No 10, Munich, 25 May 1886**

[Received 2 June by Mr Vickers. For: The Queen / Prince of Wales / Gladstone / Confidential to Berlin for perusal, No 322; R[osebery], 3 June]

*Remarks on king's finances and ministerial actions; Bismarck's private address to king; possible regency*

With reference to my previous Despatches on the King of Bavaria's extravagance and the difficulty of the Government to find means of obtaining an assurance from His Majesty that He will curtail His expenses in building, I have the honour to inform Your Lordship that the Press now generally pronounce on the question; the Ultramontane portion blame the present Bavarian Ministry for not having taken measures, sooner, to impress on The King the absolute necessity to live within His means; but the Liberal Press deny this, and show that as early as 1877 the King's attention was drawn to the matter by His Secretary<sup>47</sup> and strongly supported by the King's Ministers, and again two years ago the Minister of Finance<sup>48</sup> presented a statement to the King showing how it was possible for him to arrange with his Creditors, but no attention has ever been paid to these humble remarks, made with a desire of preventing such a crisis as is now presented to the public.

The King's father, King Maximilian, had not such a large allowance as King Ludwig has, nevertheless, He managed not only to give an allowance to His Father,<sup>49</sup> but also built many useful state Buildings (even if not of great architectural beauty) and at his death left several millions of marks. The present King if He would, could also, after a few years find himself in an equally favorable position; His Ministers, however, are evidently of opinion that the chance is small, for a short-time ago they arranged to meet in Conference<sup>50</sup> the leading Members of Parliament, Ultramontane, Liberal and Conservative, they sought together in confidence a means of solving the problem, but after more than one sitting the Conference broke

<sup>47</sup> Lorenz von Düfflipp.

<sup>48</sup> Emil von Riedel.

<sup>49</sup> Ludwig I.

<sup>50</sup> The meeting took place on 30 April 1886.

up with no result. One thing, however, was proved that no one was inclined to have recourse to a Vote of the Chambers to pay the King's Debts and it was shown that the Opposition, if the occasion offers, is not inclined to accept office until the King consents to allow himself to be governed by the advice of His Ministers.

Since the Conference last month a very humble address<sup>51</sup> has been again transmitted to His Majesty signed by each one of His Ministers showing how His Majesty's most importunate creditors may be satisfied and how easily His Debts may be paid by the Privy Purse without having recourse to a Loan, by, I am told, deducting yearly an eighth part; again an appeal was made to The King to curtail his building expenses.

This address has been treated in the same manner as that sent to His Majesty last January,<sup>52</sup> namely, by taking no notice of it.

It appears that Prince Bismarck has also addressed The King privately,<sup>53</sup> and that His Majesty has taken means to show his discontent with the remarks made in the Letters which the Chancellor of The Empire wrote to Him, and now Count Lerchenfeld, Bavarian Minister at the Court of Berlin, who arrived in Munich a few days ago,<sup>54</sup> has, it is said, been summoned here conveying a confidential communication from Prince Bismarck to the Bavarian Government, which it is hoped may assist them in finding a means to terminate the present state of affairs.<sup>55</sup>

I learn that nothing will be done until after the closing of the Chambers, which will probably happen this week. We may then expect serious events, if, as I am informed, the Government will insist on a reply to the two Messages sent by them to His Majesty, and it is possible that in case His Majesty does not submit to their conditions, the Chambers will be convoked and the whole matter brought before the Representatives of the Bavarian people; abdication is then possible and a Regency under Prince Luitpold. From the cursory remarks made to me by my German Colleague<sup>56</sup> I imagine such a result would not be disagreeable [*sic*] to Prince Bismarck, who very likely

<sup>51</sup> Report of the ministry (*Gesamtstaatsministerium*) to Ludwig, 5 May 1886.

<sup>52</sup> See n. 41 in this section.

<sup>53</sup> In a letter dated 14 April 1886, Bismarck advised Ludwig to request that the ministry should apply for the necessary sums in the Bavarian *Landtag*. In a further letter of 19 May, after the ministry's refusal, Bismarck advised Ludwig, once again, to cut his spending drastically.

<sup>54</sup> At the time of the dispatch Lerchenfeld was not in Munich.

<sup>55</sup> Drummond is referring to Lerchenfeld's conversations with Bismarck at Friedrichsruh on 23 and 24 May 1886. The report to Craillsheim mentioned in the dispatch, dated 24 May, was received on 26 May.

<sup>56</sup> Drummond is referring to the Prussian envoy, Georg von Werthern.

believes that if this scandal continues, the little surface cloud of socialism in Bavaria may by its' use grow larger. There is no doubt, harm in this sense has already been done, as the people, who formerly never paid any attention to the matter, make it now a perpetual subject of discussion and stories respecting the King's eccentricities true and untrue are bandied about.

The hearing of the demands on the King's Privy Purse before the Courts in this capital has been postponed until next month.

### **FO 9/256: Victor Drummond to Earl of Rosebery, No 16, Munich, 12 June 1886**

[Received 16 June by post. For: The Queen / Prince of Wales / Gladstone; R[osebery]]

*King of Bavaria resigns himself to medical care; medical problems declared incurable*

I have the honour to inform Your Lordship that His Majesty the King of Bavaria, has submitted Himself to the care of the Doctors<sup>57</sup> appointed by the Government to take charge of His Majesty, who arrived this morning at Schloss Berg, from Hohenschwangau.<sup>58</sup> Schloss Berg is a small Castle, very prettily situated on Starnberg Lake, with about one hundred acres of wooded Park, and one hour from Munich.

Many people it appears waited on the road to greet His Majesty on His departure from Hohenschwangau.

It is said that He thanked them in a few touching words.

I regret to state, however, that it is reported that Experts declare His Majesty's malady incurable, and He is now it is stated watched by four ordinary Keepers, under a head Keeper.<sup>59</sup> Two of these,<sup>60</sup> have already been in personal attendance on His Royal Highness, Prince Otto of Bavaria.

It is, I assure Your Lordship a very sad duty to me, to be obliged to report what has happened, for not only do I feel that the King of Bavaria's subjects have (even if only for a time) lost, by the will of God, one who they respected and were devoted to, but I am convinced that if His Majesty's mind had not been affected, He, from His extraordinary intelligence, His liberal views, and enlightened

<sup>57</sup> Bernhard von Gudden and Franz Carl Müller.

<sup>58</sup> On 9 June 1886, on the basis of a psychiatric report of 8 June, Ludwig was declared insane and placed under tutelage. On 11 June, after he was informed of the ministerial decision to appoint Luitpold as Prince Regent, Ludwig was placed in custody.

<sup>59</sup> *Oberpfleger* (head nurse) Barth.

<sup>60</sup> Nurses Braun and Mauder; the two other nurses were called Hack und Schneller.

ideas, would have been one of the most popular Monarchs of Modern times. All my Colleagues, who have had the honour of conversing with His Majesty, tell me that He is so well informed and entertaining, that however long their audience had lasted, they always left His Majesty's presence, feeling that it had been one of pleasure; only, too abbreviated [*sic*].

The story I have reported is made still sadder, by Her Majesty the Queen Mother's illness,<sup>61</sup> since the occurrence has been broken to Her.

Baron de Malsen, was commissioned by the Government to fulfill this sorrowful duty. Her Majesty has lived to see both her sons under restraint.

For such a calamity Her Majesty will assuredly receive the sympathy of all classes, especially those who have the honour to know Her and appreciate Her beautiful qualities.

The Bavarians are a most loyal, and devoted people to their Sovereign, and their Princes, and they certainly will not refuse themselves this opportunity of showing their commiseration for Their Majesties, for whom they entertain so much reverence.

**FO 9/256: Victor Drummond to Earl of Rosebery, No 18, Munich, 14 June 1886**

[Received 16 June by post. For: The Queen / Prince of Wales / Gladstone / Treaty Department; Her Majesty's condolences have been telegraphed to Mr Drummond together with the sympathies of Her Majesty's Government; R[osebery]]

*King of Bavaria and Dr Gudden found drowned in Lake Starnberg*

I have been staying these last few day, in a Country Inn, on Lake Starnberg, one hour from Munich, the Inn is only twenty minutes from the Schloss Berg, where the King of Bavaria has been, since he left Hohenschwangau, as I have already reported to Your Lordship in my Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 16 of the 12<sup>th</sup> Instant.

Yesterday, a friend of mine who had come to pass the day with me, walked over to the Schloss, to enquire in what state the King was, after His journey. He saw there, D<sup>r</sup> Gudden and Baron Washington, in attendance on His Majesty. They both said that His Majesty had passed a good night, and was as well as could be expected under the circumstances, they added that His Majesty

<sup>61</sup> Marie.

had no intention of going to Munich this week, as had been gossiped. At seven this morning, as I was about to go to Munich my servant rushed in, and told me that he had just heard, that His Majesty had last evening committed suicide. On enquiring I could only find, that this was a rumour, I sent my servant off in a boat, with a note to Baron Washington, in attendance on the King, requesting him to be good enough to inform me what truth there was in the report, and in case it was correct, I begged to express my sincere sympathy, with those who were in attendance with His Majesty.

In an hour after, I received a letter (copy herewith inclosed)<sup>62</sup> in reply to mine, from Count Töerring, verifying the rumor.

Your Lordship will see that it is not only a suicide, but a tragedy, for it appears that a tremendous struggle, must have taken place between the King and poor D<sup>f</sup> Gudden, whom His Majesty must have dragged into the Lake with Him.

I have just learned that some time after the King and Doctor Gudden had gone out, their absence being prolonged, search was made for them, and not finding any trace of them in the Park, a Gendarme was despatched to this Inn, (which is just outside the Park) to enquire of the Proprietor, if by chance, the King had come here, the Gendarme ascertaining that there was no news of Him here, returned, and the alarm was raised, and search made in the Lake, where the Bodies were discovered.

I cannot give any further details at present, but it seems extraordinary, that no precautions were taken by Doctor Gudden, for he must have known how violent the King had been at times, and it is curious that he should have suspected nothing, in the King's expressing a wish to take a walk in the Park, at that time of night, in a pouring rain.

Curious also, that whereas in the daytime Gendarmes were all round the grounds, that at night, there was not one within hailing distance.

I feel sure that popular feeling will declare itself in a very pronounced manner against the Ministry, and I must say, I think, with some reason, for their manner of proceeding has not been one which could possibly find favour with the late King's subjects, who consider that His treatment was very harshly carried out.<sup>63</sup>

<sup>62</sup> Enclosure: copy of letter (in French) from Count Toerring to MacDonell, Berg, 11 June 1886.

<sup>63</sup> For Ludwig's deposition, see n. 58 in this section.

**FO 9/256: Victor Drummond to Earl of Rosebery, No 40,  
Munich, 26 July 1886**

[Received 29 July by post. For: The Queen / Prince of Wales; R[osebery], 30 July]

*Ultramontane dissatisfaction at prince regent's decision to retain liberal ministry*

Although it is well known that the Ultramontane party in Bavaria has for years shown its' animosity towards the Liberal Government under Baron de Lutz, on account of the leanings of the Government towards old Catholicism<sup>64</sup> and remaining so long in office in spite of the repeated majorities against them in the Chambers, yet, they have now surpassed themselves in giving vent to their animus; they thought that long suffering would bring its' reward sooner or later, and on the death of King Louis II, knowing that the Government would be then obliged to place their resignation in the hands of The Prince Regent they fully believed that Baron de Lutz would disappear and Baron de Franckenstein the leader of the opposition and the Ultramontane party take his place; they were the more convinced that this would happen as they believed that The Prince Regent of Bavaria was as bigoted as themselves and that He would be glad to rid Himself of a Government who had no sympathy with the extreme Catholics.

In this they have been sadly deceived, as I made Your Lordship aware of in my Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 37 of the 7<sup>th</sup> instant,<sup>65</sup> The Prince Regent not only refused to accept the resignation of the Lutz administration, but eulogized their services to the Country and stated that the Highest Church Dignitaries had frequently expressed satisfaction as to the condition of the Roman Catholic Church in Bavaria.<sup>66</sup>

These clear expressive words of His Royal Highness have exasperated the Ultramontane Party and their Newspapers evidently feel sorely the thrust, for every day they show their indignation and rage at The Prince Regent's praise bestowed on The Lutz Ministry, they even throw doubt on the truth of the statement He made that any expressions favorable to the Ministry had been used by either The Pope<sup>67</sup> or His Bishops. They have even threatened

<sup>64</sup> The Old Catholic Church came into existence in 1871 in opposition to the First Vatican Council (1869–1870), and especially the dogma of papal infallibility. Despite political support by government officials it was not formally recognized.

<sup>65</sup> Drummond is referring to his No 36 of 7 July 1886.

<sup>66</sup> Luitpold rejected the Bavarian ministry's resignation of 5 July in his own letter the following day.

<sup>67</sup> Leo XIII.



The Prince Regent, that, unless He takes care [of] the Bavarian Roman Catholic subjects of The King will distrust Him and that this will be made apparent at the Elections which take place next year, that the veil will then be lifted and it will be shown who has the majority in the Country.

The Ultramontane cry is assured. "Down with Lutz".

The liberal party will, however, try to weaken their adversaries by using and endeavoring to prove the Prince Regent's words respecting the satisfaction of the Church Dignities with the conditions of their Church in Bavaria, and they will trust to the loyalty and devotion of the People to Their King and the Prince Regent to stultify the present cry of hatred against the Government.

The present Press War against the Ministry it is believed has its' initiative in Munich, its' object is now to raise a determined struggle for mastery at the Elections<sup>68</sup> in the hopes of securing the majority and thus forcing the Prince Regent to call upon some one of their party to form a Ministry; in this again I believe they will be deceived, for the majority of the Bavarian people, as far as I can learn, are favorable to a liberal Government which has kept the finances of Bavaria in a sound condition without a deficit and is tolerant to all confessions of faith, neither do the People desire to see a religious question sprung upon them.

The Prince Regent who has retained the services of the Lutz Ministry is what He has declared Himself to be,<sup>69</sup> a good Catholic and Patriot, with a desire to use all His efforts to strengthen the Bond of Union and friendship between Bavaria and Germany, to do all He can for the advancement and prosperity of His Country as concerns its' domestic and commercial interests and to use His authority to secure peace in the different religious denominations.

On account of the great popularity His Royal Highness enjoys in the hearts of the people and the army I think we shall see a change in the present Ultramontane tirades, which are only doing harm to their own cause, and as the Bishops in Bavaria show no signs of moving in the angry wave of party, the Electors will probably not pay any more attention to the matter.

<sup>68</sup> Elections for the second chamber of the Bavarian *Landtag* were held in July 1887.

<sup>69</sup> Drummond is probably referring to Luitpold's letter to the ministry of 6 July 1886.

**FO 9/256: Victor Drummond to Earl of Iddesleigh, Very Confidential, No 56, Munich, 20 December 1886**

[Received 24 December by Messenger Lumley. For: The Queen / Lord Salisbury; I [ddesleigh]]

*Austrian army not ready for war with Russia; Crailsheim hopes England would ally with Germany in such a war*

I have the honour to inform Your Lordship that I hear from a good source that Prince Bismarck and the Military Authorities in Berlin have every reason to believe that the Austrian army is not at present in a position to fight Russia single handed, [note in margin: 'See Sir E. Malet's N<sup>o</sup> 455 Confidential confirming this statement']<sup>70</sup> in fact that she is not prepared for a great war, neither is the opinion formed of the intelligence of Austrian Superior officers of such a nature as to give Germany much confidence in her Ally.

These facts may partially account for the determination shown by Germany not to offend Russia and for the German Official Press again trying to throw dust in the eyes of the Public, by declaring that Germany has no fault to find with Russia, that there is no reason that the two Countries should not continue to be good friends.

This time, however, the veil is too thin after the remarks in the Reichstag made by Field Marshal von Moltke and Baron de Bronsart.<sup>71</sup> Is it not rather to give time to Austria to put on her armour?

In a conversation I lately had with Baron de Crailsheim, on the present state of affairs, knowing he must be aware of what part Germany would take in a War between Russia and Austria, I remarked that it was hardly possible Germany would leave Austria in the field alone, he replied, oh Germany has nothing to do with Bulgaria,<sup>72</sup> and she would in that question let Austria fight her own battles, but I said, supposing Austria was defeated, in such a case, His Excellency said, and if Russian troops were on Austrian Territory then Germany would certainly interfere she will never allow the Russians to subdue Austria. This, as the Bavarian Government's policy is that of Prince Bismarck[,] I imagine to be the real truth.

Bavarians hope that in the next war England will be fighting on the side of Germany, fancying that we shall be fighting Russia, whilst they are fighting France, and that in such a case an Alliance between Russia and France would ensue and bring about an Alliance between

<sup>70</sup> See pp. 70–73.

<sup>71</sup> Drummond is referring to the speeches of 3 December (Bronsart von Schellendorff) and 4 December 1886 (Moltke) on the occasion of the first reading of the army bill (see n. 119 in Berlin section).

<sup>72</sup> For the Bulgarian Question, see pp. 70–73 and 75–77.

England and Germany, but man is born to be deceived and the hidden mysteries of Prince Bismarck are still undeveloped.

**FO 9/256: Victor Drummond to Earl of Iddesleigh, No 57, Munich, 21 December 1886**

[Received 24 December by messenger: For: The Queen / Lord Salisbury; Seen by Lord Iddesleigh]

Münchner Neueste Nachrichten *disappointed in German government's harsh words on British Bulgarian policy*

Little did I think when writing yesterday my Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 56 very confidential, that my last words therein would be verified so speedily, but the article which has appeared in the “Nord [*sic*] Allgemeine Zeitung”<sup>73</sup> has quite astonished everyone who has read it.

This Evenings “Neueste Nachrichten” which is the semi official paper says: it is an enigma which has yet to be unravelled, it cannot understand how at the moment – that England is showing great energy in the Bulgarian question<sup>74</sup> as regards Russia that Germany should choose that very moment to say hard words respecting her policy. This is sufficient for the moment to show that the feeling in this quarter is one of surprise and disappointment. The words of “Neuestes [*sic*] Nachrichten” are to the point. “und gerade in diesem momente die absage Deutschlands an England”! or “and just at this moment to throw over England”!

**FO 9/258: Victor Drummond to Earl of Iddesleigh, No 5, Munich, 4 January 1887**

[Received 17 January by messenger. For: The Queen / Prince of Wales / Mr Smith / Mr Goschen / Mr Stanhope / Lord G. Hamilton / Intelligence Dept, H.B. [Henry Brackenbury]; Copy to Paris and then to Berlin for perusal, 19 January; Qy: Tell Mr Drummond to send despatches on similar subjects under Flying Seal through Paris; ‘done privately’, 19 January; S[alisbury]]

*Bavarian public opinion believes war with France to be imminent*

Although this week there are more hopeful signs of Peace being maintained this year,<sup>75</sup> as given to the Public by the Press,

<sup>73</sup> *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 20 December 1886. The article stressed the need for understanding between the German and Russian governments with regard to the Bulgarian Question – in which German interests ‘are not at stake’ – and that the ‘continued concord’ between the three imperial powers was ‘inconvenient from an English point of view’.

<sup>74</sup> See pp. 70–73 and 75–77.

<sup>75</sup> Drummond is referring to the assurances of peace given at two New Year’s receptions in Paris by the French president, Jules Grévy, and the French prime minister, René Goblet.

nevertheless, doubts are still expressed by the community in general in this capital whether the spring will pass without a conflict between Germany and France; a friend of mine who was formerly in the German Diplomatick services and who is well informed on German Political matters is of opinion that war is certain next spring; in the Military element their conversation shows that they expect to fight the French shortly. Certainly everything that foresight can justify is being carried out to be ready for the day War is declared.

I find that the general opinion in Bavaria is that war cannot be postponed much longer, the Imperial taxes are so high and weigh so heavily on the people that any further imposts would become unbearable, in proof of this I may mention that a Gentleman employed in Trade tells me that in 1870 he paid one hundred marks on his business, that now for exactly the same, he pays seven hundred marks; the Tradespeople are at present living in a state of uncertainty and are loth to give orders; respectable people do not purchase more than they find absolutely necessary; the general feeling therefore is, how long is this to last? rather than continue in this state of suspense and with the impression that to postpone War is to play into the hands of our enemies affording them time to become stronger than we are, is it worth while hesitating longer when we are at the present moment more powerful than our opponents? of course Bavaria is only a portion of the German Empire but if the same reasoning is developed throughout Germany, then I surmise that War is probable in the Spring, in which case, I am told, there is a possibility of the German army advancing before the declaration of War reaches France, that the artillery in force will be the first to attack, for until two or three of the frontier forts are taken, it will be a difficult undertaking to push in between them, the Germans are confident of blowing up these forts with ammunition which they have had for some time, and of such a character, that, as my informant said, "not a man will come out alive from the forts", what the secret is of the explosive matter, the nature of the gun or the shell I am unable to find out and I expect very few officers in the German army know!

I am informed also that in case of War Germany will be able to produce two million five hundred thousand men, including all forces; this is, if true, a considerable higher figure than given in the official German estimates.

**FO 9/258: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury,  
Confidential, No 15, Munich, 8 February 1887**

[Received 16 February by messenger. For: The Queen / Rome for perusal, 25 February / Berlin for perusal, 1 March; J.P. [Julian Pauncefote]]

*Press publish letter from Leo XIII to papal nuncio at Munich respecting political actions of the Centre Party; tension amongst Catholic factions over whether to vote for imperial army bill*

In my Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 11 of the 27<sup>th</sup> Ultimo, I had the honour to inform Your Lordship that the Battle of Elections for the new German Parliament, is, in Bavaria, between the Centre or Ultramontane party and the National Liberal party, and the former believe they will have the same majority of Members as in the last Parliament.<sup>76</sup> Right or wrong they are determined to uphold their Leader Prince Bismark's clever antagonist, Herr von Windhorst [*sic*].

The organ of the National Liberal Party in Munich the "Neuestes [*sic*] Nachrichten" has on several occasions hinted that a Letter was in the hands of Prince Bismark from His Holiness The Pope which expressed the hope that the Centre party would vote for the Military Septennate.<sup>77</sup>

The Centre Press pretended that it was doubtful whether such a letter existed, and so the matter remained until the 4<sup>th</sup> instant, when a Letter, a copy and translation of which, in French, I have the honour to inclose herewith,<sup>78</sup> from Cardinal Secretary of State Jacobini to Monseigneur de Pietro, the Nonce<sup>79</sup> to the Court of Bavaria, was published in the Press.

This very important Letter has naturally caused astonishment in the ranks of the Centre party, particularly, as it showed the reservation of their Leader in Bavaria, Baron de Frankenstein, who has not made it known to them.

This letter explains that it has been written on account of one addressed by Baron de Frankenstein to the Nonce<sup>80</sup> in which he requested to be informed whether "the Pope considered that the existence of the Centre party in the German Parliament was no longer necessary in which case he and many of his Colleagues would no longer ask for re-election."

<sup>76</sup> Elections to the *Reichstag* were held on 21 February 1887. In the elections of 1884 the *Zentrumsparlei* won twenty-eight of forty-three seats in Bavaria.

<sup>77</sup> For the army bill, see n. 119 in Berlin section.

<sup>78</sup> Enclosures: newspaper cutting (uncited, undated) which reproduces the original dispatch (in French) from Cardinal Jacobini to the nuncio at Munich, 21 January 1887; cutting (uncited, undated) of the dispatch in German translation.

<sup>79</sup> French: 'nuncio'.

<sup>80</sup> Franckenstein to de Pietro, 16 January 1887.

To this controversial question the present Letter is a reply; His Holiness answers in words of peace, “eulogising the Centre for their services, stating that entire liberty of action has been always accorded it in political questions, but that He cannot accord to the party the right to choose their own line of proceeding in questions concerning the interests of the Church, that the Military Septennate affects matters of religious and moral importance, and His Holiness believes if the Centre had voted for the Government on this question that they would have favorably decided for the revision of the May Laws.<sup>81</sup> The Pope is therefore disposed to take every means to conciliate the friendly sentiments shown by the powerful Empire of Germany, with the view towards the amelioration of the future position of the Holy See”. These wishes the “Pope requests should be made known to Baron de Frankenstein, so that he may bring them to the knowledge of the Members of the Centre.”

This Papal Letter may be considered as a mild rebuff to Baron de Frankenstein, as it would appear that Baron de Frankenstein’s Letter to the Nonce must have been written in consequence of a previous Letter on the part of His Holiness and which has been forwarded to Baron de Frankenstein by The Nonce,<sup>82</sup> expressing the wish that the Centre party should vote in favor of the Military Septennate, and is probably the Letter originally hinted at, in the “Neuestes Nachrichten”, as above stated, and before the Vote on the army Bill was taken in the German Parliament; the contents of this Letter were, it is said, withheld from the Members of the Centre, who are already expressing some feeling at this treatment, and it will doubtless have its’ effect on the Electors at the coming Election, who can save their conscience with the help of the Ballot.

The organ of the Centre party in Munich the “Munchener Fremdenblatt”<sup>83</sup> commenting upon the Letter shows but little signs of repentance, it says: “The centre values the wish expressed by His Holiness with all due reverence, but their decision to vote a three years Military Bill cannot be shaken, the Centre has voted according to its’ conscience and it will continue to act so in future. The Pope’s letter,” it says, “is a warning to elect resolute Catholics

<sup>81</sup> For the May Laws, see n. 17 in this section.

<sup>82</sup> Drummond is referring to Lodovico Jacobini’s telegraphic instructions to Angelo Di Pietro of 1 January, which were forwarded to Franckenstein on 2 January, and to Jacobini’s more detailed dispatch to Di Pietro of 3 January. In a further letter of 12 January Di Pietro reminded Frankenstein of the wishes of the Holy See.

<sup>83</sup> ‘Papst und Septennat’, *Münchener Fremdenblatt*, 6 February 1887.

to the "Reichstag", this is "easy". It rudely finishes by adding that "the Candidates for election must be asked three questions."

"Will you vote against the Septennate?"

Will you vote against all Monopolies?

Will you vote against the restriction of the ordinary and direct elective rights?

Only he who answers, Yes! to these questions can be a Candidate for the Centre."

The opinion I have formed, is, that The Pope has used His influence on this occasion in the interests of Peace, as He did in the difficulties which arose between Germany and Spain in the Caroline Island's question;<sup>84</sup> but, naturally the real reason is to show that He has yet Power in Europe and for the purpose of gaining more influence with the German Government to regain what He considers are His sacerdotal rights in Germany.

All Parties are interested to know what the first Letter contained, for it is now acknowledged that it is in existence; In conversation with Baron de Crailsheim this morning I asked him if this was so, he replied, certainly, and that it had been shown to him when he lately visited Berlin,<sup>85</sup> I inquired then, whether he thought it would be made public, he said, yes, and before long, he added, that it was to the same effect as the Letter which has caused so much sensation.

I may here mention that Baron de Soden, the Minister for Wurtemberg, who had seen Baron Crailsheim two days before told me that His Excellency was then of opinion that the letter would not be promulgated, so he must have only just been informed that it would appear when I saw him.

This first letter will in one sense be of more interest than that just disclosed, as it is evident that it is the one referred to in Prince Bismark's speech on the 24<sup>th</sup> of January last, when he said: "he believed that the action of the Centre would not be approved of in Rome and that before the Elections the voters would be enlightened as to whether and how far they enjoyed the countenance of the Roman Curia in the revolutionary attempts against the German Empire which they favored."

<sup>84</sup> The conflict between Germany and Spain was resolved by the arbitration of Pope Leo XIII, whose verdict of 24 October 1885 acknowledged Spanish sovereignty over the Caroline Islands and granted the freedoms of trade and settlement to Germany.

<sup>85</sup> Crailsheim visited Berlin from 18 to 22 January 1887.

**FO 9/258: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury,  
Confidential, No 23, Munich, 25 February 1887**

[Received 28 February by messenger. For: The Queen / Berlin for perusal, 30 March / Rome for perusal, P.L. [printed letter], 11 March; S[alisbury]]

*Press dispute over motives for publishing Leo XIII's letter advising Centre party to vote for imperial army bill*

With reference to my Despatches N<sup>os</sup> 15 and 18 marked confidential of the 8<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> instant, inclosing translations of two Letters from Cardinal Jacobini to Monsignor The Nonce in Munich,<sup>86</sup> showing that The Pope desired the Centre Party in the Reichstag to vote for the Military Septennate Bill, I have the honour to inform Your Lordship that no sooner were these letters published, when remarks appeared in the Ultramontane Press, accusing the Prussian Government of having published them; thereupon, the “Nord Allgemeine Zeitung”<sup>87</sup> [*sic*] declared this observation to be a “grobe lüge”<sup>88</sup> or “clumsy lie” and stated that, on the contrary, the order for publication of the letters was sent from Rome to show the Pope’s annoyance at the attitude of the Leaders of the Ultramontane Party in not carrying out the wish expressed by His Holiness.

I have been assured to day that the Bavarian Government had the letters published, doubtless, with the knowledge of The Chancellor of The Empire.

With respect to this matter I may here mention that Baron de Frankenstein, the Leader of the Centre party in Bavaria, sent a letter on the 15<sup>th</sup> instant to the “Augsburg Postzeitung”,<sup>89</sup> in which he makes a declaration that Cardinal Jacobini’s letter of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Ultimo, mentioned in my Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 18, had never been communicated to him, that the first time he saw it, was, when it appeared in the “Münchener Allgemeine Zeitung”,<sup>90</sup> This pleading may be expressed as “throwing dust in the eyes of the public” for although the letter itself may not have been communicated to him nor to Herr von Windhorst [*sic*], nevertheless, both leaders were informed of the “wish”, expressed in the letter, on the part of The Pope, that they should influence their followers to vote for the

<sup>86</sup> For the letters of 3 and 21 January addressed to the papal nuncio at Munich, Angelo Di Pietro, see previous dispatch.

<sup>87</sup> *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 10 February 1887.

<sup>88</sup> *Grobe Lüge*: ‘gross untruth’.

<sup>89</sup> Published on 15 February 1887.

<sup>90</sup> On 9 February 1887.



Septennate. Baron de Frankenstein therefore, may be considered to have committed “une indiscretion superficielle”[.]<sup>91</sup>

The “Liberal Press”<sup>92</sup> have been insisting that a third letter would be addressed by The Pope to the German Catholic Bishops requesting them to point out to the new Members of the Center [*sic*],<sup>93</sup> elected to the Reichstag, the importance of their now voting in favor of the Military Septennate Bill when again presented to the German Parliament; this letter is a stretch of “Press” imagination for I hear on the highest authority that there is no reason for such a statement and as Monsignor The Nonce said to me lately, “Why should a third letter be found necessary if two have no effect, and when it is clear that Prince Bismarck has already a sufficient majority to pass the Bill in question.[”]

### **FO 9/259: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury, Treaty, No 58, Munich, 22 June 1887**

[Received 27 June. For: The Queen; J.P. [Julian Pauncefote]]

*Queen Victoria's Golden Jubilee celebrations in Munich*

I have the honour to inform Your Lordship that yesterday, on the occasion of the Queens Jubilee, the following Programme was carried out in this Capital to show the rejoicings of Her Majesty's Subjects resident in Munich[.]<sup>94</sup>

In the morning, at 11 a.m., a special service was held in the English Church which was honoured by the presence of His Excellency Baron de Crailsheim, Minister of the Royal Household and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and the Diplomatic Body, all appearing in Uniform, like myself. “God Save the Queen” was heartily sung by the whole Congregation.

In the daytime I received visits from the Marshal of the Court<sup>95</sup> of His Royal Highness Prince Leopold as also from the Lady<sup>96</sup> in waiting to Her Royal Highness Princess Leopold,<sup>97</sup> to present their felicitations; also from the Court Dignitaries, the Diplomatic Body, The Bürgermeister of Munich,<sup>98</sup> and members of the Court society[.]

<sup>91</sup> French: ‘minor indiscretion’.

<sup>92</sup> Drummond is referring to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of 25 February 1887.

<sup>93</sup> *Zentrumspartei*.

<sup>94</sup> The 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Victoria's accession as queen was on 20 June 1887.

<sup>95</sup> Max du Jarrys Freiherr von La Roche.

<sup>96</sup> Klementine Freiin von Limpöck.

<sup>97</sup> Gisela.

<sup>98</sup> Alois von Erhardt.

In the evening at 9 pm Her Majesty's Legation was beautifully illuminated on the street side, the piece in gas jets consisting of the letters V.R. with the Royal Crown above surrounded by stars, while all the windows of the Legation were lit up with Candles.

In the same hour I invited His Excellency Baron de Crailsheim, the Diplomatic Body and all the British Residents in Munich to an illuminated Garden Party and supper. The Garden was lit with Coloured Fires, the Band of the "Erstes Leib Regiment[?]", one of the finest on the Continent, played during the whole evening, which was fresh and still rendering the entertainment a complete success[.]

At 10 p.m. Baron de Crailsheim in a few but very graceful[.] touching and courteous words proposed the health of our Gracious Queen, the Band playing "God Save the Queen".

I immediately acknowledged the compliment to Her Majesty by proposing the health of the Prince Regent<sup>99</sup> of Bavaria the Band playing the Bavarian National Anthem, and continuing afterwards with the "British Grenadiers" and "Rule Britannia".

Dancing then took place until midnight at which hour the Band played the English and Bavarian National Anthems and so ended one of the most lovely entertainments of rejoicing given in honour of our Beloved Queen.

Crowds remained in the street until the last moment the Police however kept the street clear for the arrival and departure of my guests in their usual exact but amiable manner.

Great interest has been taken in the success of The Queen's Jubilee rejoicings by all classes in Munich and the Bavarian Press generally have published articles laudatory of the Queens public and private life during Her Majesty's Reign.

**FO 9/258: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury,  
Confidential, No 63, Munich, 11 July 1887**

[Received 14 July by post. For: The Queen / Prince of Wales; S[alisbury]]

*Rumours of change to constitution regarding regency; government measures to increase popularity of prince regent*

With reference to my Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 59 Confidential of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Ultimo relative to the State of King Otto's Health and my observations thereupon I have the honour to state further in respect of these

<sup>99</sup> Luitpold.

that I have for some time heard rumours that in the Court Circles here it was considered possible that in the next Parliamentary session a proposal might be made for altering the wording of the articles of the Constitution concerning the Regency, modifying them so as to admit of the Prince Regent being named to the throne in the place of his nephew, as it is disadvantageous to the interests of the kingdom to have a King only in title who does not govern, whose state of health, is hopeless and whose reign is unreal.<sup>100</sup>

A change such as above indicated has been since mentioned in the North German and Austrian Press, causing comment on the part of the Bavarian Press: curiously the latter, in expressing their doubts as to the feasibility of carrying out such a substitution, base them chiefly on the open secret that His Royal Highness The Prince Regent being opposed to such a proceeding, it is not likely that his desire will be interfered with.

This I believe; but certainly everything has been done to impress upon the Bavarians that The Prince Regent is their Ruler and friend. His visits to the cities in the provinces have been carried out in the greatest state, he has showered decorations in profusion, large sums of money have been distributed to the poor and different institutions, immense enthusiasm was excited, no doubt partially caused by the amiable[,] charming and frank manner with which all classes were received by His Royal Highness. All Court Ceremonies are now carried out with every possible magnificence, His Royal Highness attends constantly solemnities both in the City and Country such as processions of the shooting or other societies, the unveiling of statues etc.

On the other hand since the Prince Regent has assumed the reins of Government orders have been given by the Authorities that on King Otto's Birthday and Nameday<sup>101</sup> a Te Deum alone is permitted; no holiday is allowed as is the case on the Prince Regent's fête Days.

The Government indeed, it would appear, take every means to make the people forget their real king and feel that the Prince Regent has alone authority over them.

Whatever the rumours, which I have brought to Your Lordship's notice, may signify, the events of last year still remain in the People's mind,<sup>102</sup> and therefore whatever the wishes of some may be in respect

<sup>100</sup> Otto suffered from severe mental illness. From the first day of his reign (13 June 1886) Luitpold, under the provisions of the Bavarian constitution of 1818 (*Titel II*, Articles 9–22), continued to serve as regent, a position which he had already assumed on 10 June 1886 under Ludwig II.

<sup>101</sup> On 27 April and 30 June.

<sup>102</sup> Drummond is referring to the end of Ludwig II's reign.

to a change in the Constitution it is, in my opinion, one which cannot be ventured upon for yet some time; however I am informed by several persons of position that such a result may be reached, that the Government and those surrounding His Royal Highness desire that it should take place, while on the other hand others who speak with authority think that nothing will be attempted, although if certain circumstances should arise, favourable to such an event, it might be practicable[.]

An observation made to me this day is to the point; on asking the opinion of a person of high standing belonging to the Commercial Community he said “It is possible but not probable, for is not His Royal Highness to all intents and purposes King already?”

I attach no importance to the existing rumours but at the same time I have thought it right to present them to Your Lordship as foreshadowing an unlikely but not impossible event.

**FO 9/258: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury, Confidential, No 80, Munich, 29 October 1887**

[Received 5 November. Qy: X; S[alisbury], 6 November]

*German press resentful of crown prince being attended by Morell Mackenzie; observations on German character and reliance on prejudiced press articles for information about Britain*

The German Press has lately shown extreme sensibility respecting the treatment of their Crown Prince by an English Physician, and I am sorry to notice that not only is the Press guilty of this jealous feeling, but many German doctors and other intelligent persons.<sup>103</sup>

To an unbiassed [*sic*] mind, it appears strange that a great people should give way to such feelings, instead of rejoicing in the fact that the most learned authority on the special disease from which the Crown Prince Imperial is suffering, (although a foreigner) should be employed to destroy it, but a rational mind cannot understand the German character, the little generosity and the small amount of reasoning power that is to be found in the German nature, this may appear inexact, but, it is in my humble opinion, really true, in as far as regards the body of the German people, and to bring a case besides the present unwarrantable envy at seeing Sir Morell [*sic*] Mackenzie attending their Prince Imperial, this is also shown in a remarkable manner by the false views held by the German

<sup>103</sup> Friedrich Wilhelm, who suffered from laryngeal cancer, had been treated by Morell Mackenzie since May 1887. Mackenzie's initial assessment indicated a benign tumour. In October Mackenzie attended the crown prince at St Remo.

Press and by the German people in regard to England's Home and Foreign Policy, its' administration and social life. This impression, I humbly submit, should always be taken into account by Her Majesty's Government, and I will offer a few observations in respect to it.

Constantly, I notice in the German Press the blame attached to Her Majesty's Government by the Irish Nationalist and British opposition Press,<sup>104</sup> but arguments in favor of the policy of her Majesty's Government hardly ever appear. Why is this? and why has German feeling generally been and apparently is not generous to England? the reason is not far to explain, the "Kölnische Zeitung" is perhaps the chief source which nourishes this feeling, for information respecting English affairs is generally quoted by the German Provincial Press from that Paper, it never tires of showing its' unfriendliness for England except when it is necessary for Germany's own advantage to gain England's goodwill, then, its' remarks become toned down, but this never lasts long. Neither Editors of the German Provincial Press, as far as I learn, nor do Germans in general, (outside of the principal Trade Centers) read the English Newspapers, so that the German Public may be said to have their ideas of what concerns England formed from extracts from Papers which give a one sided view, thus, the public, even some of the most rational and intelligent, only see the course of events in one light, as they never see the true light in the evidence of the other side. The consequence is (outside of Berlin and Trade Centers) ignorance and incapacity for Germans to master the true position of our affairs.

I apprehend, from conversation with Germans, that they are not so logical as we believe them to be, they abide by what they happen to have read or heard; to argue with them and explain that their opinion is erroneous is of no avail, nothing will turn them out of the path they have taken, until you show them in black and white that they have only a Knowledge of one side of the question and that the wrong one.

In illustration of their pertinacious and confined views, I mention the following story.

Some years ago, Müller, a German was sentenced to death and hung in England for the murder of M<sup>r</sup> Briggs.<sup>105</sup> I remember it

<sup>104</sup> Drummond is referring to the reportage on the Irish Home Rule movement.

<sup>105</sup> On 9 July 1864 Thomas Briggs was robbed on a train journey and died after being thrown out of the carriage. The suspect, Franz Müller, who maintained his innocence, was convicted for murder (the first British railway murder) and publicly hanged on 14 November.

caused a great sensation at the time, as the German Press argued the case in favor of their Countryman and that they roundly abused the English Courts of Justice.

A friend of mine in Munich tells me, that then as now, the Professors of the University here attended a Debating Club every Saturday Evening; the Wife of one of the Professor's in conversation with my informant spoke very harshly at the time respecting the English Judge<sup>106</sup> and Jury by whom Müller was condemned, insinuating it was owing to Müller's nationality; my friend expostulated and being very angry at not making any impression on the Lady in his exposé of what really had happened, and of the justice of the sentence, said to her, "I can clearly see that you are merely repeating what your husband has told you, now, I am sure he can never have read the Judge's summing up nor the speech of the Prosecuting Counsel<sup>107</sup> or the evidence proving Müller's guilt for he is too clever and honorable a man to speak as he does if he had done so, I will give you a Newspaper containing these facts, on the condition that you will promise that your Husband will read them and bring them before his Colleagues at their next meeting" – the lady promised, the consequence being, that a message was sent to my friend on the part of the Professors, stating "that they had been grossly deceived by the Newspapers which had only given a onesided version, that they all agreed after reading the evidence against Müller and the Judges summary, that the Verdict and the hanging of Müller was a most just sentence and that no trial could have been fairer".

This one case is good for all cases.

In anything which concerns England the German Press are always ready to expose her shortcomings, whatever the matter may be, such as the bursting of a gun, defective bayonets, the remarks made in England that German Commercial Houses are ousting British trade from distant lands where it has been hitherto supreme, etc. It is pleasant to feel, however, that the German Press is now handicapped in one item of news; which it was always so pleased to make much of. I refer to that where Naval officers were obliged to bombard native Villages of Savages who had murdered our people on the African Coast or the Islands of the Pacific, this was boldly set forth as an uncivilized act, now, since Germany has a strong Navy and has been forced to perform similar punishment, such necessary operations are no longer condemned. Germany's Naval policy has become nearly assimilated to ours.

<sup>106</sup> Sir Jonathan Frederick Pollock.

<sup>107</sup> William Ballantine.

The Moral to be drawn from what I have stated and from the present case of envy and jealousy of Sir Morel Mackenzie being entrusted with the case and treatment of the malady from which His Imperial Highness suffers, shows that the German people in general are not generous in their nature, and that they never will accept anything to be right except from a German point of view which is in most cases prejudiced.

**FO 9/260: Henry Cadogan to Marquess of Salisbury,  
Confidential, No 3, Munich, 20 January 1888**

[Received 24 January by post. For: The Queen / Berlin for perusal, P.L. [printed letter], 3 February; S[alisbury], 24 January]

*Remarks on publication of papal encyclical to bishops of Bavaria; relations between church and Bavarian state since 1817*

The Papal Encyclical<sup>108</sup> to the Catholick Bishops of Bavaria having attracted general attention in this Country and caused much comment, I venture to point out to Your Lordship the causes which, as far as I can ascertain, have led to its publication[.]

In order to do this, it is necessary to remind Your Lordship that in October 1817 a Concordat was drawn up and signed between King Maximilian I of Bavaria and The Pope.<sup>109</sup> Its clauses were however considered by the King's advisers to be so incompatible with the internal Government of the Country, that its publication was temporarily withheld, and it was not till the following year that it appeared in the form of an appendix to the New Constitution, which had meanwhile been drawn up.<sup>110</sup>

This course considerably diminished its importance, as its provisions – which went in some cases beyond the articles of the Constitution – were no longer final, but rather formed an integral part of an act which could only be altered by the joint decision of the Crown and Parliament, and the question of its independent validity gave rise to continual Parliamentary conflicts between the Liberal and Catholick Parties.

<sup>108</sup> Pope Leo XIII's encyclical *Officio sanctissimo* (On The Church in Bavaria), dated 22 December 1887, was published in Bavaria on 3 January 1888.

<sup>109</sup> Pius VII.

<sup>110</sup> The Concordat of 24 October 1817 was published as an appendix to the *Religionsedikt*, which itself formed part of the Bavarian constitution of 26 May 1818.

Four years later – in 1821 – King Maximilian issued a Royal decree, better known as the “Tegernsee Declaration”<sup>111</sup> by which the Concordat was declared independent of the Constitution, and the Catholic cause was still further strengthened in 1852 by King Maximilian II who issued a Decree<sup>112</sup> in which still further concessions were granted to the Church of Rome.

During the long period in which the “Culturkampf” raged in Prussia, Bavaria was the scene of a Liberal movement which, though it did not take the form of legal repressive measures, was directed with much persistence against the pretensions of the Ultramontane Party. Of this Liberal or “Old Catholic”<sup>113</sup> party Baron Lutz, the then Minister of Public Worship was a strong partisan.

The Ministry were constantly accused in Parliament of having broken the Concordat, and disregarded the Royal Decrees of 1821 and 1852.

Baron Lutz however maintained that the Concordat had been incorporated with the Constitution, and that the former could only be valid so long as its provisions coincided with the articles and stipulations of the latter; that the King alone had no power to alter the Constitution, and that the Decrees were only worth the paper they were written on.

This occurred in 1882; but since that time the relations between Church and State have much improved. The Government have made several concessions, notably with regard to school matters, and the education of the Clergy, and it appears that His Holiness has frequently expressed his sense of the improved state of things.

When the late King died in 1886, the Ministers sent in their resignation in consequence of the great difficulties which lay in their way owing to the growing opposition which was manifested to them by the ultramontane Party.<sup>114</sup>

The Prince Regent refused to accept their resignation, and embodied the refusal in a manifesto<sup>115</sup> in which His Royal Highness maintained that his confidence in them remained unbroken, and that he was confident that they would continue to guard the interests of his subjects both in civil and spiritual matters: with respect to the latter he was glad to be able to remind them that “the highest authority of the Catholic Church has repeatedly declared himself completely satisfied with the position of the Catholic Church in Bavaria.”

<sup>111</sup> On 15 September 1821 Maximilian I Joseph declared that the Concordat was to be regarded as state law.

<sup>112</sup> Royal decree of 8 April 1852.

<sup>113</sup> See n. 64 in this section.

<sup>114</sup> See pp. 488–489.

<sup>115</sup> Letter from Luitpold to the Bavarian ministry (*Gesamtministerium*), 6 July 1886.



This utterance of the Prince Regents is, my Lord, the probable reason for the publication of the Encyclical.

It is true that Baron Crailsheim hardly admitted this when talking to me on the subject, and maintained that not only had the Pope repeatedly expressed himself in the above sense, but that His Holiness had never protested against the accuracy of the statement.

The whole tone of the Liberal Press coincides with Baron Crailsheims view, that the Pope has been urged to this course by the “Intransigent” Party for purely party purposes.

On the other hand Monsignore Guidi, Auditore of the Nuncio,<sup>116</sup> assured me that the Pope, while expressing his pleasure at the improved position of the Church in Bavaria, had never said anything which could be construed in the above sense; that His Holiness had privately protested through The Nuncio, against the accuracy of the Prince Regents manifesto, and had only been prevented from doing so publicly out of consideration for the difficult position of the Ministers at the time of the crisis in 1886.

From what I hear it is extremely doubtful whether The Pope would ever have gone the length of expressing himself entirely satisfied: His Holiness had already considerably weakened the cause of the Ultramontane Party by his interposition at the time of the Septennate Bill,<sup>117</sup> and such an utterance as above would not only have precluded them from seeking any further assistance from Rome, but would be entirely inconsistent with the purpose of the Encyclical.

The general opinion is that the Encyclical is intended as an answer to, if not a protest against the Prince Regents manifesto.

The Encyclical, which I have the honour to forward to Your Lordship here with, together with a précis translation,<sup>118</sup> is very moderate in tone, being for the most part a historical retrospect of the Church in Bavaria, and containing general advice and instruction as to the education of the Clergy. The only allusion to the Concordat expresses a regret that its provisions have been abrogated, and a hope that the Prince Regent will soon take measures for the well being of the Church.

On the question of the education of the laity the Encyclical is more precise, and mentions the Pope’s regret that “children are still forced to attend schools where the name of God is either never mentioned, or where false instructions concerning Him is given”.

<sup>116</sup> Fulco Luigi Ruffo-Scilla.

<sup>117</sup> See pp. 493–497.

<sup>118</sup> Enclosures: original encyclical (*Sendschreiben Unsers Heiligsten Vaters Leo XIII durch göttliche Vorsehung Papst and die Erzbischöfe und Bischöfe Bayerns*), 1888; précis translation of the papal encyclical addressed to the Catholic episcopacy of Bavaria, 22 December 1887.

This Paragraph shews that His Holiness has been misinformed on the subject as the day schools in Bavaria are not “religion-less” (confessionslos) but mixed – that is to say that even in cases where Protestants[,] Catholicks and Jews attend the same Day school, then each obtain religious teaching from a priest or clergyman of their own confession.<sup>119</sup>

Baron Crailsheim told me that His Excellency had at first feared that the Publication of the Encyclical would cause difficulties to the Ministry. But since the full text has become known its moderate character has become apparent to everyone, and as the Ultramontane Party have allowed the Estimates for Public Worship and Schools to pass without opposition<sup>120</sup> it is clear that their line of action has not been much influenced.

Its inaccuracy as regards the schools is regretted by the Catholicks themselves who admit that its value has been thereby diminished.

As the Encyclical is addressed to the Bishops Baron Crailsheim told Monsignore Guidi that the Government did not propose making any official answer to it. Monsignore Guidi hinted that perhaps the Bishops would draw up and present a petition to the Prince Regent on the subject.

Baron Crailsheim informed him however that this would probably do more harm than good; that the present relations of Church and State in Bavaria were more favourable than they had been for some time, and that if the Government who had already made several concessions were to make further ones under compulsion, they had better at once resign and make way for an Ultramontane Ministry – a course which they do not contemplate.

### **FO 9/260: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury, No 5, Munich, 7 February 1888**

[Received 13 February by post. For: The Queen; S[alisbury, 14 February]]

*Publication of terms of Austro-German alliance; patriotic speech by leading member of National Liberals illustrates Bavarian devotion to German Empire*

The publication of the terms of the German-Austrian alliance of October 7. 1879 has been welcomely received in Bavaria.<sup>121</sup> The

<sup>119</sup> The establishment of non-denominational schools was enabled by Royal Ordinance of 29 August 1873 which introduced the formation of school districts on the basis of municipality rather than parish. However, a revision of the ordinance on 26 August 1883 reinstated confessional schools as the norm.

<sup>120</sup> Crailsheim was probably referring to the deliberations in the finance committee of the second chamber (*Finanzausschuss*); the reading of the budget of the ministry for church and school affairs began on 24 January 1888.

<sup>121</sup> For the secret treaty of 7 October 1879 (published on 3 February 1888), see n. 489 in Berlin section.

Bavarian Press agree that owing to the present threatening attitude of Russia on the German Austrian Frontier<sup>122</sup> it was necessary to show that Power what the conditions of that alliance are with respect to their position in case of an attack.

It is hoped that Russia may now be induced to withdraw a portion of her forces and give a guarantee of her peaceful intentions which she so prominently sets forth in words not in deeds.

There is no doubt that the publication of the Treaty is for the purpose of ensuring Peace, but it is here believed at the same time that in any case it will force Russia to show her hand and declare what her real views are and enable Germany and Austria to decide on their future policy.

In my Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 47 of November 9. 1886 I informed Your Lordship of the complete state of Bavarian Military organisation, nothing being wanting for the Bavarian army to march at twelve hours notice.

The German and Austro-Hungarian armies are now no longer two armies but one army for the present.

Everyone here is quite calm owing to this feeling of security and from the knowledge that everything that foresight can determine upon is provided for in the present and future.

This feeling has been strengthened by the Chancellor's recent speech in the German Reichstag<sup>123</sup> and the Bavarian press is unanimous in the assertion that, come what may, Bavaria will be in the front rank in its devotion to the Cause of the Empire.

During a debate, in today's sitting of Parliament,<sup>124</sup> on the vote for national school teachers[,] a handsome tribute to The German Chancellor was paid by D<sup>r</sup> von Schauss, a leading member of the Liberal Party, who ended his speech with the following words: –

“A Teachers profession is at all times full of responsibility, and is now doubly so in Germany, as none of us can foretell what is in store for the coming generation. Yesterday Germany witnessed a day which, though peaceful, yields in importance to no national event of the last twenty years.”

“The unity of German's princes[,] peoples, and political parties was yesterday displayed in – I may say – an emotional manner.”

<sup>122</sup> Drummond is referring to the movement of troops from the interior of Russia to Russian Poland (Vistula Land) and the Austro-Hungarian frontier.

<sup>123</sup> In the speech of 6 February, to which Drummond is referring, Bismarck famously stated ‘We Germans fear God and nothing else in the world’.

<sup>124</sup> Second chamber of the Bavarian *Landtag*; Schauf delivered his statement during the reading of the budget for elementary schools.

“Foreign Countries should know that in questions which concern the preservation and power of our Fatherland Bavaria is unanimous.”

“We all agree with the German Prince in wishing for peace, but if war be inevitable, Bavaria – conscious of her historical traditions – will yield to no other German race in patriotism and selfsacrifice.”

“Love for the Fatherland unites us all: Love for the Fatherland is the battle cry which, if war be inevitable, will preserve that unity.”

**FO 9/260: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury, Very Confidential, No 14, Munich, 20 March 1888**

[Received 23 March by post. For The Queen / Prince of Wales / Berlin / Treaty Department; S[alisbury], 23 March]

*Public sensibilities offended by prince regent's discourteous attitude towards past and present German emperors*

I regret to report to Your Lordship a sudden irritation in public feeling in Munich towards His Royal Highness The Prince Regent,<sup>125</sup> this feeling has even taken possession of a portion of the army in garrison here, this makes it of more importance.

The causes arise from, first, that His Royal Highness did not attend at the Railway Station to greet The Emperor Frederick on His way to Berlin from San Remo.<sup>126</sup> Secondly, that He gave no orders for the proper observance throughout Bavaria of the day of the late Emperor's funeral;<sup>127</sup> no Flags were hoisted at half mast on the public Buildings, no Church Bells were tolled, no minute guns fired, no orders were given to the Troops.

Thirdly, His Royal Highness did not attend the Emperor's funeral.

The excuse given officially for the Prince Regent not appearing at the station, is that He requested The Emperor by telegraph to allow Him to present His respects on His Majesty's arrival at Munich but that The Emperor replied begging Him not to appear, people, however, ask why His Royal Highness should telegraph? as it was almost an invitation for a refusal on account of the early hour 8.20 a.m.[.] when the train arrived. As Ruler of the Kingdom He had a perfect right to do what He liked under the circumstances; the Queen

<sup>125</sup> Luitpold.

<sup>126</sup> Upon hearing the news of Wilhelm I's death, on 10 March, Friedrich III, accompanied by his wife Victoria, left San Remo for Berlin and arrived at Munich the following day.

<sup>127</sup> On 16 March 1888.

Mother of Bavaria<sup>128</sup> went to the station and was received by their Imperial Majesties, this led the Press to make The Queen Mother a pretty speech, saying, that “the thanks of the Bavarian people were due to Her for Her attendance”; Her Majesty had, however, telegraphed requesting permission to be present which The Emperor had graciously acceded to on account of Her Majesty being an own Cousin.

No excuse is given to the public for the second cause I mention.

The reason given for the third, is that The Prince Regent believed that although Bavaria as a German State ranked next to Prussia He would have had to accept an inferior position to the King of Saxony and this He was not inclined to do. I am, however, informed that delicate points of precedence had been carefully arranged at Berlin and that His Royal Highness would have been in line with the Sovereigns present, how far this statement is correct I cannot say. The displeasure of the people and officers in garrison in Munich towards The Prince Regent is confirmed to me by my Colleague of Wurtemberg<sup>129</sup> who has a Son<sup>130</sup> in the Cavalry.

Next Thursday night there is to be an imposing Torch light Funeral Procession in memory of the late Emperor William at which all the Societies of Munich will be represented, they are to finish their programme by presenting themselves before the Palace where they will sing the Bavarian National Hymn ending with a thundering Cheer “ein donnerndes Hoch” for The Prince Regent.

This performance will possibly show the real feelings of the Munich population towards their Ruler, a fine moonlight night and good Bavarian Beer, it is to be hoped, may divert the feelings of displeasure in the breasts of those who have been expressing their disapproval of His Royal Highness, who has always shown the Bavarian people His consideration and a sincere desire to please them.

### **FO 9/262: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury, No 5, Munich, 14 February 1889**

[Received 18 February by post. For: The Queen; S[alisbury]]

*Prince regent modifies regulations for Bavarian court balls with respect to rank of British and French chargés d'affaires*

In his Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 3 of February 4, 1875 Sir R Morier, at that time Her Majesty's Representative at the Court of Bavaria, addressed to

<sup>128</sup> Marie.

<sup>129</sup> Oskar von Soden.

<sup>130</sup> Heinrich von Soden.

Lord Derby his remarks on a point of etiquette, respecting his position and that of his French Colleague<sup>131</sup> who, as Chargés d’Affaires, were not permitted to sit, at the Royal Supper Table at the Court Balls, with their Colleagues, who all held the rank of Envoys. They were thus put on the same footing as Second Class Bavarian Officials.

Sir R Morier informed the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Baron de Pfretschner, that, as a permanent accredited Chargé d’Affaires and Representative of Great Power, he would never consent to such an arrangement, and stated that he should in future, after attending the Royal Circle, absent himself from the Ball.

This he carried out, as did also his French Colleague, with or without the excuse of indisposition.

The Earl of Derby, in his Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 4 of February 11, 1875 approved of the course Sir R Morier had adopted.

A Court Ball was given here a short time ago,<sup>132</sup> and two days before Baron de Crailsheim called upon me and said, “I have come to give you some good news: The Prince Regent<sup>133</sup> has in future consented to the Representatives of Great Britain and France having seats at the Royal Table at Supper at the Court Balls.”

His Royal Highness had done this on his advice and after consulting with our Colleagues. It was only natural, he said, that the Representatives of such Great Powers as Great Britain and France should not be separated on any occasion from their Colleagues, and His Royal Highness had fully concurred; but, His Excellency added, the line must be drawn between permanent Chargés d’Affaires and Chargés d’Affaires ‘ad interim’.

In thanking Baron de Crailsheim for his communication I said that I was delighted to be freed from the annual excuses for not attending the Court Balls and that it pleased me much that he should have been the author of the new Regulation.

His Royal Highness The Prince Regent afterwards requested The Master of the Ceremonies<sup>134</sup> to tell me how pleased His Royal Highness was to see me at His Table.

I have troubled Your Lordship with this account of the favour so graciously granted by His Royal Highness The Prince Regent as shewing the good position Her Majesty’s Representative and his French Colleague<sup>135</sup> hold at Court, and to record it as a precedent in future.

<sup>131</sup> Édouard de Lefebvre.

<sup>132</sup> On 21 January 1889.

<sup>133</sup> Luitpold.

<sup>134</sup> Maximilian Joseph Pergler von Perglas.

<sup>135</sup> Camille Barrère.

**FO 9/262: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury,  
No 40, Munich, 28 July 1889**

[Received 1 August by post. Print (Western Europe); For: The Queen / Circulate / Copies to: Berlin / Vienna; S[alisbury]]

*Prince Ludwig's speech at inaugural dinner of gymnastic festival (Deutsches Turnfest)*

I have the honour to inform Your Lordship that His Royal Highness Prince Ludwig – eldest son of The Prince Regent,<sup>136</sup> and Heir Presumptive to the throne of Bavaria – made a speech at the inauguration dinner of the German Athletic Associations which has attracted general attention in the German and Austrian Press.<sup>137</sup>

His Royal Highness, in the course of his speech, recapitulated the events in German history since the beginning of the Century and pointed out how essential it was that the German Unity which had been gained should be maintained 'by keeping true to Emperor and Empire'.

Turning to the Austrian associations who were present His Royal Highness dwelt on the firm friendship of Germany for the House of Hapsburg and said "Hold fast to Your German language and Your German Sentiment."

This speech has been much applauded by the German press who hold it as a good omen that the Heir Apparent to one of the largest German States should proclaim his Imperial and German sentiments in such an outspoken manner.

**FO 9/262: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury,  
No 49, Munich, 26 September 1889**

[Received 30 September by post. For: The Queen; Qy: Copy to Rome; Berlin for perusal, 9 October; S[alisbury]]

*Bavarian Catholic Convention at Munich*

Referring to my Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 16 of the 12<sup>th</sup> of April last, respecting the Memorial of the Bishops' of Bavaria addressed to His Royal Highness the Prince Regent<sup>138</sup> and the reply thereto by Baron de Lutz in the name of His Royal Highness, which I stated was not satisfactory to the Ultramontane party,<sup>139</sup> I have the honour to inform

<sup>136</sup> Luitpold.

<sup>137</sup> The speech was held on 27 July 1889 at the opening of the seventh *Deutsches Turnfest* at Munich.

<sup>138</sup> Luitpold.

<sup>139</sup> In a memorandum of 14 June 1888 the Bavarian bishops compiled their grievances regarding the state of the Catholic Church in Bavaria. Minister president Lutz replied on

Your Lordship that a proof of their dissatisfaction has just been shown at a Congress<sup>140</sup> held in Munich on the 23<sup>rd</sup> instant, under the authority of the Bavarian Catholick Church Committee, about ten thousand persons drawn from Munich & the different Provinces attended the Congress.

The object of the Congress as set forth by the various speakers and by the resolutions, ultimately carried, was to clear away the obstacles which prevent the Church of Rome exercising its' authority in all religious-political and school matters such as those mentioned in my Despatch referred to above, the Catholick Members of Parliament being requested to use their best endeavors to force the Bavarian Government to accede to their demands.

A protest was made against the late manifestations at Rome in honor of Giordano Bruno,<sup>141</sup> with expressions of deep sympathy and sorrow with the Pope's<sup>142</sup> present position and declaring that the temporal Power in His Holiness must be reaffirmed,<sup>143</sup> indignation was expressed with the reply of Baron de Lutz to the Bishops' Memorial; the Liberal Press was much abused and all true Roman Catholicks were advised to boycott it from their homes as it insulted the Church.

The proceedings were brought to a close with cheers for His Holiness The Pope and His Royal Highness the Prince Regent<sup>144</sup> of Bavaria.

### **FO 9/262: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury, No 58, Munich, 18 November 1889**

[Received 15 November. For: The Queen; Rome for perusal, No 257; S[alisbury]]

*Debate on motion by Centre Party to change interpretation of placet regium; attacks on government policies towards the Catholic Church*

Referring to my previous Despatch I have now the honour to report more fully on the Debate mentioned therein and which causing the

28 March 1889, and, while making various concessions, insisted on the precedence of state law over ecclesiastical law and the continued practice of the *placetum regium* (royal approval; see n. 146 in this section). He also repudiated the demands for compulsory daily school masses and the introduction of confessional middle schools (as a rule).

<sup>140</sup> *Bayerischer Katholikentag* (Bavarian Catholic Convention).

<sup>141</sup> A statue of Giordano Bruno was unveiled at the Campo de' Fiori in Rome on, 9 June 1889 (Whit Sunday). The festivities included a procession, a gala dinner and conferences (which had started on the previous evening and ended on 10 June).

<sup>142</sup> Leo XIII.

<sup>143</sup> Temporal papal sovereignty ended in September 1870 when the Italian army entered Rome.

<sup>144</sup> Luitpold.



defeat of the Government has given rise to much comment in Bavaria.

The Leader of the Centrum party in the Chambers Herr Geigner [*sic*]<sup>145</sup> opened the Debate, he made a long speech, in which he stated that his party desired no change in the Constitution itself but only that it should be carried out as it was before 1870 when the Crown of Bavaria in regard to the “*placet regium*”<sup>146</sup> showed its benevolence in favor of the Pope and the Church. He attacked Baron de Lutz severely saying, that he was the cause of the present controversy and held him responsible for the withdrawal of the Church privileges. He referred to Prince Bismarck who had made concessions to the Roman Catholic Church,<sup>147</sup> he had made them on a large scale and Baron de Lutz might have made them on a small scale, but he had not even met them half way, he was responsible for the decrease in faith and morals in Bavaria.

Respecting the old Catholics he said, we wish to shake off that association altogether, for have they not separated themselves from us?<sup>148</sup>

Calling on all Catholics to vote for the motion, given in full in my previous Despatch, he finished by declaring that his party wished the authority of the Church to be equal to that of the State, adding, damaging the authority of the Church damages that of the State.<sup>149</sup>

Baron de Lutz<sup>150</sup> replying to the accusation that he had been the cause of the difficulties between Church and State said, there are others who have brought the Church into antagonism with the State, it is a very old story and no one will live long enough to see it finished.

The “*placet*” relates to all matters of Faith of all Confessions. It is Law and the oath of the Constitution is Law and in matters of Law one has no will of his own but only the word, must. (“*muss*”).

To believe you and your Press it is I who have invented the present state Laws in regard to the Church, but they have existed long before I was a Minister, I am not the author but the Executer. Why am I

<sup>145</sup> Joseph Geiger, on 6 November 1889.

<sup>146</sup> The requirement for a *placetum regium* (“royal approval”) of the publication of ecclesiastical laws and ordinances was stipulated by the constitutional edict of 1818. In 1870 (rescript of 9 August) the *placetum regium* was extended to the decrees of the Vatican Council.

<sup>147</sup> See 000–000.

<sup>148</sup> The Bavarian government formally regarded the Old Catholics (see n. 64 in this section) as part of the Catholic Church.

<sup>149</sup> The motion was dated 19 October 1889. It requested the Prince Regent, Luitpold, to instruct his ministry, firstly, to declare that the *placetum regium* as defined in section 58 of the constitutional edict of 1818 did not extend to religious dogmas and ethical doctrines, and, secondly, not to treat the Old Catholics as part of the Catholic Church. The motion was passed on 8 November with a majority of 81 to 78 votes.

<sup>150</sup> On 6 November 1889.

reproached because you find the “placet” intolerable? That should have been considered when it was added to the Constitution.

In negotiations with Rome the rights of the State in regard to the Church have always been upheld and Rome has never acknowledged them and never will.

In regard to the motion that a petition shall be presented to the Regent, according to the rules of the Constitution He cannot answer it. The Regent must interchange His views with His responsible Ministers. If the motion is passed here and even in the Upper house and a dissolution should result what will happen then? Nothing! “Nichts”. It will only cause a still further breach between Church and State. Baron de Lutz finished by declaring that the “placet” in Church affairs had never been abused and as to the Old Catholics, nothing had ever been done to favour them, neither did he believe that he was in favor with them.

The Minister of Finance<sup>151</sup> followed stating that he and his Colleagues in the Ministry agreed with Baron de Lutz in all he had spoken and done as Minister of Public Worship.

D<sup>r</sup> Daller, rector of Freising College, closed the Debate in a violent speech,<sup>152</sup> saying, he could understand the enunciations set forth by Baron de Lutz as a Professor but not in his position as a statesman, who had trampled on the rights of three million of his countrymen and brought agitation amongst the people. He lost his temper on being interrupted and used the following words which caused great excitement in the Chamber, “We saved the existence of the Royal House of Bavaria in 1886”<sup>153</sup> these words were received with shouts of indignation from the supporters of the Government and by the public in the Gallery.

D<sup>r</sup> Daller continued, the position of affairs is so serious that we on our side have determined to make a Declaration, the terms of which I gave in my Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 57 of yesterdays date.<sup>154</sup>

The reasons for this vehement attack on Baron de Lutz I have every reason to believe arise from the Prince Regent’s Manifesto after the King’s death in 1886 in which He stated that the Highest Authority of the Church has repeatedly said that he was entirely satisfied with the position of the Church in Bavaria, this was not relished

<sup>151</sup> Emil von Riedel, on 6 November.

<sup>152</sup> On 8 November 1889.

<sup>153</sup> In reaction to an interruption from the left side of the chambers, Daller said that, if provoked, he might ‘speak about the year 1886, when we [i.e. the Right] saved the material existence of the Bavarian royal house’.

<sup>154</sup> Daller declared that the *Zentrum* faction could not accept Lutz’ interpretation of the constitutional edict of 1818 and would retain this position in the reading of the budget for the ministry of cultural affairs.

by the intransigent party who succeeded in making their views known to the Pope,<sup>155</sup> and it is said, this was the cause of the Encyclical addressed in 1887 to the Archbishops of Bavaria, and mentioned in Mr Cadogan's Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 3 confidential of January 20<sup>th</sup> 1888.<sup>156</sup> Another reason is the answer made by Baron de Lutz in the name of The Prince Regent to the Memorandum of the Bishops of Bavaria, as reported in my Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 16 of the 12 April last, and particularly the Prince Regents' letter to Baron de Lutz "approving" what he had written.<sup>157</sup> This has not been forgiven by the Intransigents and it led, I am told, to the Catholic Congress in Munich, reported in my Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 49 of the 26<sup>th</sup> September last,<sup>158</sup> when a resolution was passed to urge the Deputies of the Centrum to bring forward the motion which has now been presented to the Chambers, and which will from its' result, reach on their own too impetuous zeal, as assuredly the Prince Regent cannot retreat from His approval of Baron de Lutz' Letter to the Bishops, even were the petition passed by the Upper Chamber and presented to Him, which it is allowed on all sides cannot happen.

On Wednesday the 13<sup>th</sup> next the second motion mentioned in my last Despatch will be brought forward in the Chambers by Herr Geigner, thus; that "a petition he presented by the Chambers to The Prince Regent urging His Royal Highness to request His Ministers to arrange that in the Council of the Empire<sup>159</sup> means shall be taken to repeal the Law of the 4<sup>th</sup> July 1872 relating to the order of Jesus in favor of the Congregation of The Redemptionists."<sup>160</sup>

This motion, likewise, I believe, even if voted by the Lower Chamber<sup>161</sup> will be thrown out by the Upper Chamber.

My own belief is that the Centrum party were deterred to show The Pope that He may count upon them in any emergency and with the view to show His Holiness their devotion and zealous attachment for Him in His present wounded position. In this they have succeeded and in showing their durable animosity to Baron de Lutz but in their endeavour to make an impression on the Bavarian people

<sup>155</sup> Leo XIII.

<sup>156</sup> See pp. 503–506.

<sup>157</sup> Luitpold approved of Lutz' reply (of 28 March 1889) to the Bavarian bishops on 24 June 1889. See n. 139 in this section.

<sup>158</sup> See pp. 511–512.

<sup>159</sup> *Bundesrat* (Federal Council).

<sup>160</sup> The Jesuits Law of 4 July 1872 banned the Jesuit Order in the German Empire. It was amended in 1904 and repealed in 1917. On the Redemptorist question, see pp. 534–535.

<sup>161</sup> On 8 November 1889 the motion, dated 19 October 1889, was carried with 81 to 74 votes.

to influence them in the next Elections I doubt their obtaining any success.

**FO 9/263: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury,  
No 22, Munich, 11 March 1890**

[Received 14 March by post. For: The Queen; S[alisbury]]

*Catholic Centre Party rejects budgetary estimates for the arts following dispute with government over placetum regium; anti-Centre protests by students and press*

With reference to my Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 15 of the 19<sup>th</sup> ultimo, in which I pointed out the manner in which the Centrum party showed their discontent with the Government for not agreeing to their views on the interpretation of the “Placetum Regium”, and on the Old Catholic and Redemptorist Questions,<sup>162</sup> I regret to say that although Baron de Crailsheim Acting Minister for Public Worship and Instruction has been very conciliatory to the opposition they have nevertheless continued their irritant policy of, at intervals, rejecting credits demanded for necessary purposes, such as heating the National Picture Galleries, the maintenance of the annual Exhibition of Pictures, for the purchase of pictures for the National Galleries etc.<sup>163</sup> This unfortunate policy was commented upon in the National liberal paper the “Münchener neueste Nachrichten” of the 6<sup>th</sup> instant in an article headed “Little pigs in their sty”, – insulting to the Leaders of the Centrum who made a request to the Government in the Chambers that the article should be suppressed and the Editor<sup>164</sup> punished.

The anger of the Professors and students of the Academy of Art has also been aroused and the latter on the night of the 8<sup>th</sup> instant made a demonstration before the house of D<sup>r</sup> Orterer one of the Centrum leaders; they were dispersed by the Police after serenading the Doctor with “cats’ music”,<sup>165</sup> and they then retired to a Brewery and drank the health of His Royal Highness The Prince Regent<sup>166</sup> and the Ministers, ending with ‘Pereats’<sup>167</sup> for the Centrum Leaders.

<sup>162</sup> For the dispute over the *placetum regium* and the Old Catholic question, see the previous dispatch. On the Redemptorist question, see pp. 534–535. The Old Catholic question was partly resolved by a ministerial regulation of 15 March 1890, which denied Old Catholics the right to be recognized and treated as Catholics.

<sup>163</sup> Drummond is referring to the decisions of the finance committee of the second chamber of the Bavarian *Landtag* on 5 March 1890.

<sup>164</sup> Georg Hirth.

<sup>165</sup> Noisy protests, discordant singing (charivari).

<sup>166</sup> Luitpold.

<sup>167</sup> Latin ‘*pereat*’: ‘down with’.

D<sup>r</sup> Orterer the next day requested explanations from the Government and what protection would be afforded to him, blaming the Police Authorities for permitting demonstrations which the Law declares are not permitted during the sitting of the Chambers within a distance of six hours from the Capital.

Baron de Crailsheim in his reply<sup>168</sup> regretted the incident, declared that Members would be protected and that such scenes as had taken place would not be permitted and that the Authorities of the Academy and University had been requested to take measures to prevent any excesses on the part of the Students, – and with respect to the article in the “Münchener neueste Nachrichten” – “Schweinchen in den Stall” – and an appeal in that paper to the people of Munich to make a great demonstration in favour of His Royal Highness The Prince Regent on his birthday tomorrow, Baron de Crailsheim remarked that the Minister of Justice<sup>169</sup> had already taken measures to prosecute it.

I am informed that it is possible that some arrangement may be made in a day or two conducive to an understanding between the Government and the Centrum party which will facilitate the business of the Chambers, and prevent the existing controversy.

### **FO 9/263: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury, No 33, Munich, 23 April 1890**

[Received 2 May by bag. For: The Queen; T.V.L. [Thomas Villiers Lister]]

*Bavarian Reichsrath propose increased budget for purchase of works of art*

With reference to my Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 22 of the 11<sup>th</sup> ultimo<sup>170</sup> on the debates in the Bavarian Chambers as to the refusal of the majority, formed of the Ultramontane party, to vote the amount demanded by the Government for Art purposes, I have the honour to inform Your Lordship that when the Reichsrath<sup>171</sup> had before them yesterday for their consideration the Bills passed in the Lower House,<sup>172</sup> that for buying works of art which had been cut down from 120,000 to 60,000 marks was debated and a proposal for its' increase to 100,000 marks was agreed to.

<sup>168</sup> On 10 March 1890.

<sup>169</sup> Leopold Freiherr von Leonrod.

<sup>170</sup> See preceding dispatch.

<sup>171</sup> First chamber of the Bavarian *Landtag*.

<sup>172</sup> On 28 March 1890.

Curiously enough His Royal Highness Prince Louis whom the Ultramontanes have always considered as favourable to their views made the most effective speech in favour of the larger amount. His Royal Highness, forcibly laying stress upon the importance of having an annual Exhibition of Pictures and Works of Art, showed that thus the Munich artists would be enabled to see the best pictures of their rivals and, learning from them, perceive their own defects and improve their knowledge and talent, but, for this purpose, His Royal Highness said, a building specially adapted should be erected, – plans had already been before the Artists Committee for a long time, but on account of want of Funds the foundation stone had not yet been laid.

It remains now to be seen whether the Ultramontane party, the majority in the lower House, will retreat from the ground they have taken up and assent to the proposal of the Upper House.

There is a satisfactory indication in the Speech of His Royal Highness Prince Louis, which is, that He shows Himself independent in character and free from the prejudices of the Ultramontanes, who are always inclined to determine State matters by permeating them with an overflow of religious dogma.

**FO 9/263: Horace Augustus Helyar to Marquess of Salisbury, No 53, Munich, 19 June 1890**

[Received 23 June by post. Print; A.G. [Anglo-German] neg[otiation]s; S[alisbury]]

*Heligoland-Zanzibar Treaty*

I have the honour to transmit herewith to Your Lordship Extracts [note in margin: ‘Translation’] from the *Allgemeine Zeitung*<sup>173</sup> relating to the Anglo = German Convention and expressing the view taken here of the weighty concessions made by Germany therein.<sup>174</sup>

At the usual reception today of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Baron de Crailsheim in the course of conversation remarked that the Convention must be regarded with satisfaction by the Bavarian Government as a settlement of difficulties always pending and as a guarantee for the future. He added that while Heligoland was no doubt precious in the eyes of all Germans, there could be no doubt about the very serious and highly valuable concessions in Africa made by Germany.

<sup>173</sup> Enclosure: translated extracts from the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of 18 and 19 June 1890.

<sup>174</sup> For the Anglo-German agreement of 1 July 1890, see n. 436 in Berlin section.

**FO 9/263: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury,  
No 66, Munich, 4 September 1890**

[Received 8 September by post. X; T.H.S. [Thomas Henry Sanderson]]

*Death of Johann von Lutz*

With sincere regret I have the honour to inform Your Lordship that the Minister of State Baron de Lutz, until lately Minister of Public Worship and Education and President of the Council of State, died yesterday after a long illness, which began with Inflammation of the Lungs, and severe attacks of Asthma.

Baron de Lutz was born in 1828, he was named in 1867 by the late King Louis II, Minister of Justice and afterwards Minister of Public Worship.

Friendly to the Roman Catholic Church, of which he was a member, he still incurred the displeasure of the Ultramontane party by not conceding to all their demands in Church matters.

From the moment the German Empire was proclaimed, and as long as he was enabled to serve his Country he used all his influence to strengthen and secure German unity. He was a clever statesman, charming in conversation, full of humour, and very amiable. His loss will be much felt by His Royal Highness, The Prince Regent of Bavaria,<sup>175</sup> and outside the Ultramontane party, by all Bavarians.

**FO 9/264: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury,  
No 2, Munich, 5 January 1891**

[Received 9 January by messenger. For: The Queen / Prince of Wales / Mr Stanhope / Berlin perusal, No 15; S[alisbury]]

*Wilhelm II to attend Bavarian army manoeuvres*

The Newspapers here have lately been engaged in controversy, respecting the German Emperor's intention to inspect, next September, the two Bavarian army Corps at the time of their Manoeuvres.<sup>176</sup>

The first statement given in the Press mentioned these Manoeuvres as Imperial, thereupon, the Ultramontane Press commented as to

<sup>175</sup> Luitpold.

<sup>176</sup> The manoeuvres were planned from 9 to 11 September.

this appellation, declaring that there could be no such thing in Bavaria, as the Bavarian army was under the orders of The King, and at present under those of the Prince Regent<sup>177</sup> acting for His Majesty.

The Liberal Press followed, explaining that Imperial Manoeuvres meant merely that His Imperial Majesty would honour the Manoeuvres with His presence, which He has the Authority to do at all times in accordance with article LXIII paragraph 3 of the German Constitution of April 16<sup>th</sup> 1871, wherein, it states that it is the right and duty of the Federal Commander in Chief<sup>178</sup> to inspect the different armies of the Empire and convince Himself as to their fitness and capacity deciding the result of the Inspection with the Sovereigns of the respective armies.

The late Emperor William I never assisted at the Bavarian Manoeuvres out of regard for the late King Louis of Bavaria who had a dread of meeting His Brother Sovereigns and had no sympathy with Military spectacles neither had He any skill or the necessary Knowledge in Military matters. The Crown Prince Frederick was, therefore, at that time<sup>179</sup> named Inspector General of the Bavarian army which He had often led to victory in the war of 1870<sup>180</sup> and to whom that army was devoted, on His death after He came to the Throne, Field Marshal Count von Blumenthal was entrusted<sup>181</sup> with the Inspector Generalship, he had also fought with the Bavarians when he was Chief of the Staff of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Corps d'armée and his appointment was thoroughly appreciated by the Bavarian army.

The Liberal Press endeavour to show that The German Emperor's visit next September is owing to an invitation from His Royal Highness The Prince Regent, but from what I learn from one of my German Colleagues, The Emperor informed the Bavarian Minister at Berlin<sup>182</sup> that He had the intention of attending the Bavarian Manoeuvres to inspect the two army Corps and on this decision of His Imperial Majesty being announced to The Prince Regent, He, immediately sent word to The Emperor that it would give Him the greatest pleasure to receive His Imperial Majesty.

<sup>177</sup> Luitpold.

<sup>178</sup> Article 63 refers to the Emperor.

<sup>179</sup> On 16 June 1871.

<sup>180</sup> As commander of the III German Army Corps.

<sup>181</sup> On 12 April 1888.

<sup>182</sup> Hugo Graf von Lerchenfeld.



**FO 9/264: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury,  
No 13, Munich, 10 February 1891**

[Received 12 February by post. X; S[alisbury]]

*Allgemeine Zeitung* opinions on foreign policy; remains ill-disposed towards Britain

I have the honour to enclose a Précis, in translation, of an article from the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of February 8<sup>th</sup> which as usual shows its unfriendliness to England.<sup>183</sup>

It certainly has not failed on the present occasion to do so, as also to make splenetic remarks in respect to Your Lordship's policy towards Germany, bestowing at the same time a thrust at General Caprivi for not taking into account the national feeling of Germany (the *Allgemeine Zeitung's*) in respect to her African Colonies. But the most important remark is that Germany should draw closer to Russia and encourage friendly relations between Russia and Austria-Hungary so as to leave England isolated in case of war with Russia.

**FO 9/264: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury,  
No 44, Munich, 12 September 1891**

[Received 15 September by post. For: The Queen / Mr Matthews; S[alisbury]]

*Foreign press overstate tension between Prussia and Bavaria; conversation with Crailsheim on integration of Bavaria within empire; emperor's visit to Munich*

English[,] French and Russian Newspapers have lately commented upon a certain friction between Prussia and Bavaria as shown by the German Northern and Southern Press; this is said to have arisen by certain Prussian papers advocating the assimilation of the Bavarian exceptional Laws to those of Prussia. It did not appear to me to be of any importance for a skirmish of this kind is of old date and is renewed from time to time, but, as the English and French Press still give the matter more importance than it deserves I have made enquiries of my German Colleagues as well as of Baron de Crailsheim whether it is a matter in which the Prussian and Bavarian Governments are seriously concerned or whether it

<sup>183</sup> Enclosure: précis translation of article in *Allgemeine Zeitung* of 8 February 1891. The article provided a commentary on the *Reichstag* debates which took place from 3 to 6 February, concerning colonial and African affairs. It criticized Caprivi's remarks about British sympathies towards Germany as being detrimental to German interests.

is only newspaper effervescence. The former say there is nothing in it [.] that they have not given any attention to the matter. Baron de Crailsheim says that its origin was through insignificant newspapers both in Prussia and in Munich; – those in Munich he had never heard of – and it was astonishing how newspapers of high standing should have paid any attention to their bickerings.

In reply to certain questions I asked, Baron de Crailsheim said that no demand had lately been made by Prussia to assimilate Bavarian postage stamps to those of Prussia,<sup>184</sup> – that the Bavarian Government would endeavour to bring about a Reform in the Bavarian marriage Laws in the sense of the proposal mentioned in my despatch N<sup>o</sup> 43 of this day's date;<sup>185</sup> – that as to the negotiations to have the same rules throughout the Empire in the Military criminal procedure,<sup>186</sup> this matter had not up to the present been brought before the Bavarian Government, – that it was a personal matter between the Prussian and Bavarian Ministers of War,<sup>187</sup> – that if any alteration of the present procedure is advised by the Prussian Minister of War it will have to be laid before the Federal Council, and there the opinion of the Bavarian Government would make itself heard. His Excellency added, Bavaria has no exceptional privilege in respect to the military Law and if it is necessary to change it there is no infringement of Bavaria's rights. Baron de Crailsheim further said that when the Chancellor<sup>188</sup> of the Empire passed some time with him on last Wednesday night, he had purposely avoided asking him any question concerning the negotiations between the Ministers of War. He had mentioned to His Excellency the foolish remarks of the Press, but the Chancellor said he had paid no attention to the articles published, – in fact the matter is one to which I may say Her Majesty's Government need not give any attention, and which I have only reported to Your Lordship to expose the hollowness of these exaggerated newspaper reports.

In any case, the Emperor's visit to Munich<sup>189</sup> will still further strengthen the bond of union between North and South as it has

<sup>184</sup> The right to maintain a separate postal system and to issue stamps was stipulated in the November (Versailles) Treaties of 1870.

<sup>185</sup> Dispatch No 43 is not included in FO 9/264.

<sup>186</sup> The question of a German Military Penal Code, which had already been under discussion between 1871 and 1881, was taken up by the imperial government in 1890. At the time of the dispatch the draft code, developed by a commission of the Federal Council, was put on hold. The new Military Penal Code was ultimately passed in 1898; it replaced the Bavarian code of 1869 and the Prussian code of 1845. See also p. 525.

<sup>187</sup> Hans Karl von Kaltenborn-Stachau and Benignus von Safferling.

<sup>188</sup> Leo von Caprivi.

<sup>189</sup> Wilhelm II attended the manoeuvres of the first and second Bavarian army corps at Munich from 7 to 11 September.

the personal relations between their respective rulers, which as the *Allgemeine Zeitung* remarks,<sup>190</sup> proves the actual unity of the whole of Germany; and this shows how insignificant is the quarreling of certain newspapers about this and that detail of the relations between Northern and Southern Germany.

**FO 9/264: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury, Confidential, No 60, Munich, 8 December 1891**

[Received 7 [*sic*] December by post. Private Secretary; T.H.S. [Thomas Henry Sanderson]; (Seen by Lord Salisbury)]

*French government intend to promote their diplomatic representative to rank of envoy*

Referring to my telegram of this date, I have the honour to inform Your Lordship that Monsieur Barrère my French colleague sent me word last night that as he was unwell he wished me to call upon him, having a communication to make to me. I accordingly saw him this morning when he said "I think it only fair to you to inform you that I have received a Note from Monsieur Ribot stating that if agreeable to His Royal Highness The Prince Regent,<sup>191</sup> the French Government intend accrediting me to His Royal Highness as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary.<sup>192</sup> I have seen Baron de Crailsheim who appeared much pleased and said that he would bring the matter to His Royal Highness' consideration immediately on his arrival from the country today."

M<sup>r</sup> Barrère added "You have been here so much longer than I have that I feel in fairness to you that you should have the precedence, and I therefore thought it proper to inform you of what is to take place in order that you might inform Lord Salisbury in case your Sovereign is disposed to have Her Representative of equal rank to that of your colleagues, in which case and that Letters of Credence are sent to you before the end of the year I would delay presenting my letters before yours to enable you to have the precedence."

Monsieur Barrère is going to Paris where he intends to study the question of Egyptian sanitary matters and take the instructions of his Government before attending the Egyptian International

<sup>190</sup> *Allgemeine Zeitung* of 10 September; the article in question was an excerpt from the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* of the same day (morning edition; transmitted by telegram).

<sup>191</sup> Luitpold.

<sup>192</sup> Barrère was accredited as permanent chargé d'affaires from 1888; Drummond held the rank of minister resident at Munich and Stuttgart.

Conference for the reorganization of the Alexandrian Sanitary Commission which is to meet at Venice on the 5<sup>th</sup> of December and to which Monsieur Barrère has been appointed as French Delegate.<sup>193</sup>

Your Lordship will learn from the above the good terms existing between the French and English Legations, I am happy to say that as far as Her Majesty's Legation is concerned they are the same existing with other foreign Legations in Munich.

I thanked Monsieur Barrère very heartily, for the confidence he had shown me.

**FO 9/265: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury,  
No 10, Munich, 15 March 1892**

[Received 18 March by bag. For: The Queen; S[alisbury]]

*Munich press advocates press freedom*

The German Emperor's speech at the Banquet of the Brandenburg Chamber of Deputies has been much commented upon in the Bavarian Press, and I have the honour to give herewith the opinion of the most important newspapers published in Munich.<sup>194</sup>

The "Allgemeine Zeitung"<sup>195</sup> declares that the articles of those newspapers confiscated for "Lèse Majesté" are not treasonable, but express the critical opinions of many classes of the Nation, which have also been expressed before in a vigorous manner among members of the Reichstag and Landtag, adding that magnanimity and disregard of personal amour propre in a Monarch are among his greatest claims to respect, and of this Wilhelm I German Emperor was a brilliant example. To protect the freedom of the Press, legislation is necessary, but at present it is not believed that it would have any chance of passing the Reichsrath<sup>196</sup> and the Bundesrath;<sup>197</sup> the

<sup>193</sup> The Sanitary, Maritime and Quarantine Council in Egypt (successor to the Sanitary Administration of Egypt) was founded in 1881 and consisted of fourteen European and nine Egyptian members. Following the international conference at Venice just four Egyptian members remained on the council and an international convention for the protection against cholera was adopted.

<sup>194</sup> Wilhelm II's speech at the banquet of the Provincial Diet of Brandenburg on 24 February 1892 was criticized for its neo-absolutistic stance. He depicted opponents to the imperial government as grumblers and ended with the remark, 'My course is the right one, and I shall continue to steer it'.

<sup>195</sup> On 13 March 1892.

<sup>196</sup> First chamber.

<sup>197</sup> Federal Council.

remedy for the present undesirable confusion of affairs is the responsibility of the Ministry as representing the Throne.

The Munich *Neueste Nachrichten*<sup>198</sup> considers that the articles complained of were certainly not treasonable, but may be described as sharp but well meant criticisms; the Press ought to be given free course to do its' duty, and express itself as its conscience directs it. The trials now pending will have to undergo the verdict of public opinion.

In general in South Germany the feeling is widespread that the Monarch should be kept above and apart from the strife and personalities of parties.

### **FO 9/265: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury, No 41, Munich, 20 July 1892**

[Received 22 July by bag. For: Mr Stanhope; Intelligence Department: War Office, E.F.C. [Edward Francis Chapman]]

*Bavarian Military Penal Code to be subsumed into that of Prussia; press predict widespread discontent*

In my despatch N<sup>o</sup> 55 of the 11<sup>th</sup> of November last I informed Your Lordship that the Bavarian Chambers voted an address to the Prince Regent of Bavaria to maintain the present Bavarian Military jurisdiction.<sup>199</sup>

It now appears that the project for a general assimilation of German Military jurisdiction is to be brought forward in the next German Parliamentary Session and it is reported that this will be in the form of the present Prussian Military jurisdiction.

The Bavarian Press show that if this is carried out it will cause a very deep and painful impression in Bavaria, and a very unfavourable impression amongst the people.

A surrender of this kind to Prussia will be too dearly bought with the nomination of His Royal Highness Prince Leopold as Inspector of the Fourth German Army Inspection and will be a rebuff to the Bavarian House of Representatives.<sup>200</sup>

<sup>198</sup> On 8 March 1892.

<sup>199</sup> The second chamber made an address on 4 November 1891 in which it asked Luitpold to advise the Bavarian plenipotentiaries to the Federal Council to consent only to a German Military Penal Code if the principles of the Bavarian Military Penal Code of 1869 were maintained.

<sup>200</sup> Leopold was appointed on 27 June 1892.

**FO 9/265: Horace Augustus Helyar to Marquess of Salisbury, No 43, Munich, 28 July 1892**

[Received 1 August by post. For: The Queen / Prince of Wales; S[alisbury]]

*Kissingen demonstration in honour of Bismarck; Bismarck's speech; mixed response from South German press*

I have the honour to enclose herewith to Your Lordship a translation of the full text of the speech made by Prince Bismarck on Sunday at Kissingen<sup>201</sup> at the large and enthusiastic popular demonstration made in his honour by thousands of admirers from all parts of South Germany and especially from Baden[,] Hesse, Thuringia and the Palatinate.

The demonstration passed off without a hitch, and the language used by the Prince was more guarded and less calculated to give offence in high quarters than that of some of his recent speeches.

Prince Bismarck's visit to Kissingen has not passed without comment in the South German Press.

The 'Allgemeine Zeitung'<sup>202</sup> a short time since attacked in no measured terms the organs of General Caprivi for their criticism of Prince Bismarck especially as to the latter's alleged 'want of patriotism', stating that the South German people have known and appreciated Bismarck's patriotism these last thirty years and asking if gratitude is only the duty of the people, and not also the duty of the Government?

On the other hand the Wurttemberg 'Beobachter' a leading Stuttgart paper concurs in and emphasises the attacks upon Prince Bismarck while at Kissingen,<sup>203</sup> whom it accuses of being the cause of Social Democracy, Clericalism (sic); and Antisemitism, and ends by saying "He was a misfortune to our Fatherland"<sup>204</sup>

On the whole however, the attitude of the South German Press towards Prince Bismarck while at Kissingen may be described as sympathetic and respectful.

The Prince leaves Kissingen on the 30<sup>th</sup> instant for Jena.

<sup>201</sup> Enclosure: translation of Prince Bismarck's speech at Kissingen on 24 July 1892.

<sup>202</sup> On 12 July 1892.

<sup>203</sup> Bismarck stayed at Kissingen from 26 June to 30 July 1892.

<sup>204</sup> *Der Beobachter: Ein Volksblatt für Schwaben*, 12 July 1892. The article in question ended with the remark, 'It was misfortune for our Fatherland, that Prince Bismarck had not been removed from the helm of the state long ago.'

## FO 9/265: Victor Drummond to Earl of Rosebery, No 51, Munich, 29 October 1892

[Received 2 November by post. For: Mr Campbell Bannerman / Intelligence Department War Office, E.F.C. [Edward Francis Chapman]; Berlin for perusal, 9 November; R[osebery]]

*Press reaction and public opinion on imperial army bill; Catholic voters follow individual political instincts rather than obey instructions*

With respect to the Provisions of the new German Army Bill now before the Federal Council of the Empire,<sup>205</sup> I have the honour to state that until their publication by the “Cologne Gazette”<sup>206</sup> the Bavarian Press although supplying Columns of Extracts from the North German Press have furnished but few comments upon the possibilities of what the hitherto assumed provisions of the New Army Bill might lead to, leaving the Public to draw their conclusions; acknowledging, however, the benefit which would be rendered to the Empire if two years service with the colours was adopted instead of three years as is now the case.

The Provisions of the Army Bill as now published have produced an uneasy impression in Bavaria, as it is believed that the estimated expenditure will be far exceeded.

The following Extracts from the National Liberal and Ultramontane Press demonstrate the present unfriendly attitude towards the New Army Bill. The Socialist Organs also are opposed to any increase to the present strength of the army.

I. Neueste Nachrichten	of	October	19, 1892.
II. “ ”	of	”	26, 1892.
III[.]Fremdenblatt	of	”	26, 1892. s <sup>207</sup>

With respect to the feeling evinced against the New Army Bill I may mention a very important incident as regards the Roman Catholic or “Centrum” Party, which has taken place at Kelheim in lower Bavaria at an election there a few days ago<sup>208</sup> of a new Member for the Bavarian House of Representatives.

Two candidates offered themselves, both being Roman Catholics of the Ultramontane party which led to disunion in the ranks of

<sup>205</sup> On the army bill presented to the Federal Council on 20 October 1892, see pp. 143–144.

<sup>206</sup> *Kölnische Zeitung*, 24 October 1892.

<sup>207</sup> Enclosures: précis translations of articles in *Münchner Neueste Nachrichten* of 19 October and 26 October 1892 and *Münchner Fremdenblatt* 26 October 1892.

<sup>208</sup> On 19 October 1892.

their party, for D<sup>f</sup> Sigl, who offered himself in opposition to the clerical candidate Herr Rauchenecker, was only defeated by a few votes in a constituency having 11,000 voters; and this happened owing it is stated from the fact that Herr Sigl is opposed to the New Military Bill. That Roman Catholic voters should have voted in such large numbers in disregard of the advice of their party leaders tends to show that at the General Election next year<sup>209</sup> it is not impossible that many of the Roman Catholic Working class voters will give their votes in a more liberal sense, and in accordance with their own personal interests, and not at the dictation of those who consider themselves their advisers. If this happens it will be a revolution in the records of Ultramontane chronicles, one which would greatly agitate the Holy See, and heartily grieve and displease His Holiness.<sup>210</sup>

There is no doubt that since the death of D<sup>f</sup> Windthorst, and Baron de Franckenstein the loss of their extraordinary influence (especially that of D<sup>f</sup> Windthorst) over the Roman Catholic bourgeoisie and working classes is seriously felt by the Ultramontane party and that those who have succeeded them have not the authority their predecessors had on the hearts of their coreligionists in those classes mentioned above.

The affection of the people for D<sup>f</sup> Windthorst and the admiration for his courage in his political battles (the *Culturkampf*) with Prince Bismarck inspired the Roman Catholics throughout Germany. They have now no leader who can produce these feelings. The election at Kelheim proves this, and now Roman Catholic voters have had the courage to vote in accordance with the dictates of their own consciences, at the General Election many may follow the example given; if this should take place it might eventually lead to a breach in the unity of the 'Centrum' party and cause the present majority they hold in the Imperial Parliament to be divided on any important political or administrative questions brought forward by the Government although on religious questions they would in all probability be united.

### **FO 9/267: Victor Drummond to Earl of Rosebery, No 39, Munich, 11 May 1893**

[Received 15 May by post. For: The Queen / St Petersburg / Berlin; R[osebery]]

Münchener Neueste Nachrichten *on russification of Baltic provinces*

Since 1876 Europe has witnessed the gradual Russification of the Baltic Germans in Courland Livonia and Esthonia, who had from

<sup>209</sup> The *Reichstag* elections were held on 15 June 1893.

<sup>210</sup> Leo XIII.



the year 1800 enjoyed exceptional privileges retaining their old manners and customs with the free use of their language.<sup>211</sup>

The continued oppression pursued by Russia has at different times been severely animadverted upon by the German Press and hints have been thrown out that Germany might be in the position some day to annex the persecuted provinces.

Upon this subject a very interesting article appeared in the "Münchener Neueste Nachrichten" of the 6<sup>th</sup> instant, a précis of which I have the honour to annex herewith in translation.<sup>212</sup> The article is headed "The future of the Baltic provinces in Russia", and is interesting as it not only produces historical facts to prove that neither the late Chancellor of the Empire Prince Bismarck nor the present Chancellor General Caprivi have countenanced or would countenance under any circumstances the annexation of these Provinces, but it also furnishes a statement made by a Livonian Nobleman<sup>213</sup> now settled in Austria who formerly played a prominent rôle in Livonian affairs, and who declares that the Baltic Germans have always been and are true and loyal subjects of the Emperor of Russia and that though undoubtedly feeling they are suffering from through the changes now being carried out in order to Russianize them, they will never offer any resistance, beyond endeavouring to carry out their old German customs and ways of living in their own homes; and that if the Russians publish<sup>214</sup> a belief that Germany is inclined, if the opportunity offered itself, to annex the Russian Baltic provinces, it is only a pretence for further persecution and for their more complete Russification.

### **FO 9/267: Victor Drummond to Earl of Rosebery, No 40, Munich, 15 May 1893**

[Received 19 May by post. For: The Queen / Prince of Wales; R[osebery]]

*Impending Reichstag elections; uncertain future of army bill; anti-Prussian sentiments dominate Bavarian political scene*

The Dissolution of the German Parliament at Berlin owing to the rejection of the Huene compromise in the German Army Bills has

<sup>211</sup> Curonia, Livonia, and Estonia were Baltic governorates of the Russian Empire. In 1876, as a prelude to the russification measures of the 1880s, the office of the Baltic Governor-General, established in 1800, was abolished.

<sup>212</sup> Enclosure: translation of article 'The Future of the Baltic Provinces of Russia', *Münchener Neueste Nachrichten*, undated.

<sup>213</sup> Name not traceable.

<sup>214</sup> The article was referring to the Russian press in general and in particular to the *Novoye Vremya*.

not at present produced any excitement in Bavaria, although each party is preparing for the coming struggle at the elections on the 15<sup>th</sup> of June for the new Parliament.<sup>215</sup>

What the result of the elections will be it is quite impossible to foresee; it is doubtful whether they will be decided on the Huene compromise of the Army Bill, for it must be remembered that the Parliament is elected for a term of five years, and there are other internal questions of State of importance which will have to be decided, considered by many to be of more importance than new Army Bills, matters concerning the economic interests of the Empire.

With respect to the recent Votes given by the Centre party against the Huene compromise it is to be observed that there is in the Ultramontane ranks a certain amount of antipathy to Prussia, in fact this feeling pervades more or less the Bavarian people. This has been lately shown in a speech made by D<sup>r</sup> Daller the leader of the Bavarian Centre fraction just before the rejection of the German Army Bill.

He said "If the Bavarian Members of the Prussian Centre voted for the Army Bill the Members of the Bavarian Centre must separate themselves from them."<sup>216</sup> The Bavarian people were dissatisfied with the measures of the Imperial Government. Imperial Finances were so exhausted that if it were anything but the Empire in question it would have to be put in wardship and guardians appointed. Were we not right to defend ourselves in 1866?<sup>217</sup> Prussia is a Military State and has no mercy for its' subjects certainly none at all for us Bavarians".

Again, D<sup>r</sup> Sigl proprietor of the Munich newspaper "Vaterland" a few days ago<sup>218</sup> issued an article in which he says that in the next war Bavarian millions and the sacrifice of Bavarian lives will cause Prussia to become more powerful than she is, and will determine the future of Bavaria, if Germany is defeated there is an end to the German Empire, although the victors probably would spare Bavaria; if Germany is victorious then Bavaria will become a Prussian Province and Bavaria will cease to exist as an independent kingdom. Thereupon the "Kreuz Zeitung"<sup>219</sup> put forth a statement that D<sup>r</sup> Sigl is on very friendly terms with the Bavarian Ministry, thus, as Baron von Crailsheim has remarked to me, insolently insinuating that they

<sup>215</sup> The *Reichstag* was dissolved on 6 May 1893. For the rejection of the army bill and the compromise proposal, see nn. 312 and 322 in Berlin section.

<sup>216</sup> In his speech at Neubeuern of 16 April 1893, Daller was referring to the Bavarian members of the *Zentrum* faction of the *Reichstag*.

<sup>217</sup> Daller was referring to the Austro-Prussian War of 1866.

<sup>218</sup> On 5 May 1893.

<sup>219</sup> *Neue Preussische Zeitung (Kreuzzeitung)*, on 10 May 1893.

were responsible for the article. D<sup>r</sup> Sigl has indignantly replied that there is not a word of truth in the insinuation.

The causes of Bavarian dislike of Prussia (in Wurttemberg it also exists) arise from the idea that Prussia wishes to extinguish Bavaria's reserved rights,<sup>220</sup> religious differences, the late endeavours of Prussia to oust Bavarian Military Jurisdiction,<sup>221</sup> assimilating it to the Prussian; and the German Commercial Treaties with Austria and Italy and the proposed Commercial Treaty with Russia,<sup>222</sup> emanating from Prussia, are not regarded with any favour by the agricultural population of Bavaria (i.e. the majority); – complaints are made that Bavarian officers in garrison with Prussian officers are looked down upon by the latter; neither are the people contented with the Old Age Insurance Laws;<sup>223</sup> – these are some of the causes which do not fail to make an impression on the Bavarian people unfavourable to their Prussian kinsfolk.

This anti Prussian feeling in Bavaria however must not be regarded as showing any opposition to German Unity which is upheld as strongly as ever.

There is also a gradual democratic spirit showing itself in the ranks of the peasantry and the small farmers of Bavaria. Agrarian meetings have lately been held in several of the Bavarian Provinces where the Speakers have had the courage to speak against the Bavarian nobility and the clergy. One speaker<sup>224</sup> last week declared that “agriculturists were no longer properly represented by Priests or Nobles in Parliament. Religion is sacred to us, and in fact there is more religion and morality with us than in the Castles”.

Another speaker<sup>225</sup> compared “the Nobility to Drones in the Beehive who live on the rents extracted from the labour of the farmers.[?]”

The Ultramontane party have taken alarm at the views expressed at these meetings by forming Christian Farmers meetings, and are endeavouring to counteract in every possible way their effect.

The coming elections therefore for the Federal Parliament next June are looked forward to with much interest and fears are expressed that many Votes which have been given to the

<sup>220</sup> Bavaria's sovereign rights were upheld in the November (Versailles) Treaties of 1870. These *Reservatrechte* included the maintenance of separate postal and railway systems, military command to be retained by the king in peacetime, property insurance regulations, citizenship laws, and beer and brandy taxes.

<sup>221</sup> See nn. 186 and 199 in this section.

<sup>222</sup> On the commercial treaties, see nn. 319 and 354 Berlin section.

<sup>223</sup> Law concerning Disability and Old-Age Insurance of 22 June 1889.

<sup>224</sup> Benedikt Bachmaier at the peasant's meeting in Poigham on 8 May 1893.

<sup>225</sup> Name not traceable.

Ultramontane Party will be given to the Democratic or Socialist Party; certainly some members of the aristocracy who held seats in the late Parliament have refused to seek reelection as they are afraid of not being reelected.

There is an uneasy feeling amongst the better classes. The speech of His Majesty The German Emperor a few days ago to His Staff has not assisted to allay this feeling, the Bavarian Press express regret at the words used towards certain members of the Federal Parliament as to their want of patriotism and to expressions made use of not worthy of cultivated men.<sup>226</sup>

It is impossible to foretell what the result of the elections in Bavaria will bring forth but my own personal opinion is that there will be but little change in the different parties, for the Ultramontane leaders have a great hold on the peasantry, and where a second ballot is necessary they will be almost certain to obtain a majority of votes.

### **FO 9/267: Victor Drummond to Earl of Rosebery, No 61, Munich, 15 August 1893**

[Received 18 August by bag. For: Rome for perusal, No 155, 1 September / Eastern Department; 'This is the best thing we have had from Munich', R[osebery]; Returned from Rome, 2 October]

*Bavarian press comments on relations between France, Russia, England, and the Triple Alliance*

When France a few days ago sent her ultimatum to Siam,<sup>227</sup> a portion of the German Press endeavoured to impose on the German Public by demonstrating that England would be glad to see Germany remonstrate with France against her annexationist policy in Siam and against her declaration that if her ultimatum to Siam was not accepted, Siamese ports would be blockaded, as Germany was interested in preventing such measures owing to her holding the most important position after England in the Siamese trade and the same newspapers declared that Germany would certainly not pull the chestnuts out of the fire for England – on the contrary it was a pleasure to Germany to see France occupied in the East, in China and Siam, and Germany would certainly do nothing to prevent her carrying out such a policy. The Munich “Allgemeine

<sup>226</sup> Drummond is referring to Wilhelm II's speech of 9 May in which he criticized the rejection of the army bill.

<sup>227</sup> The Franco-Siamese War took place in 1893. On 20 July 1893, at Bangkok, the French presented Siam with an ultimatum, demanding that she renounce her claims to the left bank of the Mekong River.

Zeitung"<sup>228</sup> upon this remarked that England will certainly keep clear of being drawn into a war with France, and Germany has no reason to spill the blood of her sons to compensate England for her military weakness, adding that it is not for Germany to seek English sympathy and popularity by being drawn into conflict with France; and other newspapers have hinted that England's true policy is to join the Triple Alliance.<sup>229</sup>

There has now appeared in the Ultramontane newspaper the "Bayerischer Kurier"<sup>230</sup> published in Munich, a communiqué stated to be from a valuable source, a former diplomat<sup>231</sup> being hinted at. It is of some interest as it pretends to expose the intrigues of Baron de Mohrenheim the Russian Ambassador in Paris in his endeavours to bring Austria into more friendly relations with Russia with the view probably of a "rapprochement" later between the two Empires, and of loosening the Triple Alliance. Baron de Mohrenheim, it is surmised, believes England may later be drawn nearer to the Triple Alliance and Austria drawn away from it. The writer of the communiqué therefore proposed that Germany should take the steps to insure the friendship of England for the Triple Alliance for the reasons he sets forth.

Again with reference to the Triple Alliance a statement has been lately made in the Munich "Allgemeine Zeitung"<sup>232</sup> that Italy has concluded a separate convention with Russia, which, however, has been denied by the "Agenzia Stefani";<sup>233</sup> whereupon the "Allgemeine Zeitung"<sup>234</sup> publishes a statement that the denial gives no ground for doubting the truth of the report. It explains that it is in the form of a mediation of Russia in a particular case, a step, it says, which Italy sees itself impelled to by the absolute unreliability of military aid to be given her by England.

I enclose translations herewith of the abovementioned communiqué, together with the article on the assumed Convention between Italy and Russia.<sup>235</sup>

May it not be that Italy has granted some Italian port for the Russian Fleet or Squadron to make use of when cruising in the Mediterranean in the summer?

<sup>228</sup> On 2 August 1893.

<sup>229</sup> On the Triple Alliance, see n. 174 in Berlin section.

<sup>230</sup> On 7 August 1893.

<sup>231</sup> Name not traceable.

<sup>232</sup> On 26 July 1893.

<sup>233</sup> On 8 August 1893.

<sup>234</sup> On 10 August 1893.

<sup>235</sup> Enclosures: translation of an article entitled 'Behind the scenes' [*Hinter den Coulissen*], *Bayerischer Kurier*, undated [7 August 1893]; translation of an untitled article from the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, undated [26 July 1893].

**FO 9/269: Victor Drummond to Earl of Kimberley,  
No 25, Munich, 27 July 1894**

[Received 30 July by messenger. X; K[imberley]]

*Ultramontane press incensed by Federal Council decision to allow Order of Redemptorists but not Jesuits; Ultramontane party tactics in religious and political matters*

The decision taken by the German Imperial Federal Council on the 9<sup>th</sup> instant permitting the return of the order of Redemptorists, or White Fathers, whilst retaining the Imperial Law of 1872 excluding the Jesuits, has been received very coldly by the Bavarian and Württemberg Ultramontane Press, for although it expresses itself thankful for a small instalment of what the Roman Catholic party have demanded for several years, it still declares that the agitation will continue until the Law of 1872 is entirely abolished, and hints that the party will know how to make itself disagreeable to the Imperial Government in the next session of the Imperial Parliament at a time convenient to itself to push forward its claims, in a renewed demand for the return of the Jesuits.<sup>236</sup>

The Bavarian Government is blamed for not voting in favour of the abrogation of the Law of 1872. This shows the spitefulness of the Ultramontane party, for, although the Bavarian Government promised to use its best endeavours to induce the federal Council to vote for the return of the White Fathers, they have never expressed their desire to see the return of the Jesuits; they carried out their promise honourably and successfully, and instead of showing their gratitude the Ultramontane party show their displeasure.

A short time ago, I enquired of my Colleague The Nuncio<sup>237</sup> what was the present position of the Ultramontane party in regard to its adherence to its Leaders, in religious and political matters. His Excellency replied, that it had been decided that the Members of the party would follow their Leaders' views and act together in all religious questions, but in political and social questions, they could act and give independent votes according to their own views.

The Catholic Congress to be held next month at Cologne<sup>238</sup> will show what policy will be pursued to obtain the abrogation of the

<sup>236</sup> The Anti-Jesuit Law of 4 July 1872 banned the Jesuit Order in the German Empire. It was extended by implementing the ordinance of 20 May 1873 to the missionary order of the Most Holy Redeemer (Redemptorists). The White Fathers (*Societas Missionariorum Africae*) were not affected by the Anti-Jesuit Law. In his dispatch Drummond refers to the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, the ban on which was likewise lifted by the Federal Council on 9 July 1894.

<sup>237</sup> Andrea Auiti.

<sup>238</sup> From 26 to 30 August 1894.

above-mentioned Law of 1872; the language made use of by Members of the Ultramontane party at Catholic meetings held this month, show[s] great irritation and angry feeling. If the same indignation is shown at the Congress, the Cultur Kampf may be revived.

**FO 9/269: Arthur George Vansittart to Earl of Kimberley,  
No 63, Munich, 22 November 1894**

[Received 24 November by post. X; K[imberley]]

*Split between Prussian and Bavarian factions of Social Democratic Party*

With reference to my despatch No. 48 of the 26<sup>th</sup> ultimo, I have the honour to report that the split, which has now evidently occurred between the Socialist deputy Bebel, on the one hand, and the Deputies Vollmar and Grillenberger on the other, is being watched with interest here.<sup>239</sup>

In answer to Bebel's accusations, recently made in Berlin,<sup>240</sup> the deputy Grillenberger has published in his *Organ* the "Fränkische tagespost",<sup>241</sup> an article defending his policy, and stating that the Social-Democratic party is not Russia, and its' members will simply not put up with an autocratic rule. The article though makes allowances for Bebel's temperament, and finishes up by saying that when he has exhausted his anger it is to be hoped he will acknowledge having brought accusations which, had they been made by any other member of the party, he would have been the first to condemn himself.

The principal points in Bebel's utterances against Vollmar are that he is in the first place an Aristocrat,<sup>242</sup> and that, as such his movements must be viewed with suspicion: that in the next place his policy of winning over the peasants at any price is a wrong one. The proper course would be to win over the rural artizans, workmen, etc ... who were much more disposed to adhere to a communistic programme.

The "Bayerischer Kurier",<sup>243</sup> in a recent review on the Socialistic situation, sums up as follows:

<sup>239</sup> The differences originated in Bebel's criticism of the SPD deputies of the Bavarian *Landtag* which, on 1 June 1894, had approved the state budget, containing ameliorations for lower-grade civil servants.

<sup>240</sup> At a Berlin party meeting, on 14 November 1894.

<sup>241</sup> On 17 November 1894.

<sup>242</sup> Georg von Vollmar's family was elevated to the nobility in 1790; his full name was Ritter von Vollmar auf Veltheim.

<sup>243</sup> On 20 November 1894.

“One thing is certain, that there is a split between the North and South of the Social-democratic party. The aristocrat Vollmar with his partisans on the one hand, and Bebel at the head of the Prussian Socialists on the other hand. In one word the Prussian understands how to impose himself with his love of command, and to make himself the most cordially detested German everywhere.”

The Social-democratic Organ of Munich,<sup>244</sup> in an article just published, entitled “Bebel’s raising of the Colours” accuses him of having thrown down the torch of dissension in the ranks of the party, and states that his recent appearance can only be called a Pronunciamiento<sup>245</sup> directed against the results of the “Frankfurter Parteitag”.<sup>246</sup>

It is needless to quote any further, for the split is now in active progress, and mutual vituperations between the different leaders of the Social-democratic party are likely to be the order of the day for some considerable time to come.

**FO 9/269: Victor Drummond to Earl of Kimberley,  
No 65, Munich, 29 November 1894**

[Received 3 December by post. X; K[imberley]]

*Anti-Bebel speech made by Deputy Vollmar at Social Democrat meeting*

With reference to M<sup>r</sup> Vansittart’s despatch No. 63 of the 22<sup>nd</sup> instant, I have the honour to report that a Social-democratic meeting, which was very numerous attended, was held in Munich on the 26<sup>th</sup> instant.<sup>247</sup>

The Deputy Vollmar in his speech, which lasted two hours, and which was warmly applauded, attacked Bebel’s recent attitude and utterances: Vollmar, in qualifying Bebel by the name of “The Dictator” called out “it is not with myself here one has to reckon with, but with the whole Bavarian Social-democratic party. I shall do my duty as long as the Party requires me, but as long as I enjoy its’ confidence I shall not allow myself to be intimidated, and least of all through such menaces.”

At the close of the meeting two Resolutions were passed, one protesting against Bebel’s attitude and utterances with respect to the Bavarian Social-democrats; and the other containing a vote of Confidence in Vollmar.

<sup>244</sup> *Münchener Post*, 22 November 1894.

<sup>245</sup> Spanish: ‘public declaration’.

<sup>246</sup> Bebel’s initiative to compel *Landtag* deputies to vote against state budgets was dismissed at the Frankfurt party congress (21 to 27 October 1894).

<sup>247</sup> See previous dispatch.



## FO 9/270: Victor Drummond to Earl of Kimberley, No 3, Munich, 10 January 1895

[Received 14 January by messenger. For: The Queen / Lord Rosebery / Copy to Berlin for perusal; 'Ask Mr Drummond to send originals of newspaper articles', K[imberley]]

*South German and Prussian particularism; Bavarian parties condemn imperial subversion bill; petition to Reichstag; socialist meeting and contempt for the same*

Much irritation has been lately shown by the German Press against Prussia, chiefly owing to Prussia's reactionary policy; the new Project of Law, the "Umsturz Vorlage", now under discussion in the Imperial Diet being received in the South German States with marked disfavour.<sup>248</sup>

With respect to Particularism in the South German States, it has hitherto been forgotten that there is also Prussian Particularism, the two are antagonistic to one another, but this Particularist feeling concerns the ideas and requirements of each particular State; it is in no way inimical to the Empire.

The German people are as strong in their fidelity to the Unity of the Empire as hitherto, there is nothing to prevent them, however, from showing discontent with their own internal affairs; the idea, therefore, as given in the French Press, that the present dissatisfaction of the South Germans with Prussia may loosen the strings which hold the German Empire together, is erroneous.

With respect to the "Umsturz Vorlage", or project of law to combat Socialism, Bavaria and Würtemberg raise their voices against it, for there are measures proposed in the Project of Law which affect others besides the Socialists.

At a meeting held by the Democratic party in Munich on the 5<sup>th</sup> instant, but at which all political parties were represented, the "Umsturz" proposal was unanimously condemned. Professor D<sup>f</sup> Quidde said article 130<sup>249</sup> punishes attacks on Religion, the Monarchy, family life, and property severely, but does not punish attacks on the rights of the People, and the Constitution.

The project of Law was specially directed against Social Democracy, but not against The Chief of the Press Bureau<sup>250</sup> viz; – M<sup>f</sup> Rössler.

In alluding to article 131,<sup>251</sup> D<sup>f</sup> Quidde said, as it stands, not only would those persons be punished who purposely misrepresented

<sup>248</sup> For the 'subversion bill' (*Umsturzvorlage*), see n. 381 in Berlin section.

<sup>249</sup> Article 130 of the Imperial Criminal Code of 1871 concerned incitement of the people (altered on 20 March 1876).

<sup>250</sup> The Prussian *Literarisches Büro*; see also n. 67 in Dresden section.

<sup>251</sup> Article 131 of the Imperial Criminal Code of 1871 concerned contempt of government.

facts, but likewise those would be punished who know, or who must take for granted, that facts have been misrepresented. Besides the Press, every one reproducing an article, facts, etc ... would be punished. In his opinion the whole paragraph should be removed. Under the new law, half the population of Munich would come under accusation for all that was said in the recent "Fuchsmühl" affair.<sup>252</sup> [Note in margin: 'See Mr Vansittart's despatch No. 56 of the 8<sup>th</sup> November [18]94]

D<sup>r</sup> Quidde further stigmatized article III.<sup>253</sup> Under its' provisions, plays from the great national Poet Schiller, such as "Tell" and the "Robbers", would be condemned, because Schiller glorified in these pieces certain crimes.

Other speakers also gave their views strongly condemning the project of law.

D<sup>r</sup> Conrad (a professor of literary note) said German Culture should not become the plaything of an absolute Ruler, or of his chamber servants.

D<sup>r</sup> Sigle [*sic*], editor of an anti-Prussian newspaper,<sup>254</sup> said that he wished it to be known that the Ultramontane Party would reject the Project of Law, which was directed against every party, which did not run as a slave after the all Powerful one at Berlin.

After various other speakers of all kinds of politics had spoken, the following Resolution was unanimously voted: –

That the 1000 Citizens (or more) present declare the "Umsturz Vorlage" to be a most dangerous menace to civil Freedom and culture. They expect the Reichstag to reject the Project of Law with an overwhelming majority, and that, on their part, they will take into consideration the necessity for ameliorating the present penal code in a more liberal and national spirit.

After the above Resolution was passed, the meeting addressed the following petition to the Imperial Diet (Reichstag) –

1. That the Reichstag be pleased to reject the proposal submitted by the Federal Council, for altering the Penal, Military, and Press Codes, as being a most dangerous menace to civil Freedom and German Civilization.

<sup>252</sup> On 30 October 1896 a legal dispute between inhabitants of Fuchsmühl (Upper Palatinate) and the local lord of the manor escalated when a detachment of 50 soldiers forcibly intervened against a crowd of 180 people who were insisting on their long-honoured right to cut wood in a forest. Two peasants were killed, some thirty people were wounded.

<sup>253</sup> Article 3 of the bill adjusted to Article 23 of the Imperial Press Law, of 7 May 1874, to the proposed amendments to the Imperial Criminal Code. It concerned confiscation of publications without court order.

<sup>254</sup> *Das Bayerisches Vaterland*.

2. That the Reichstag be pleased to take into consideration the necessity of a Reform in the present Penal Code in a Liberal, and national Sense of the Word.

Again a great Socialist meeting was held in Munich yesterday, when Herr Volmar [*sic*], Socialist member of Munich, spoke against the reactionary policy at Berlin, and against the “Umsturz Vorlage”.

He said “the project of Law has been presented, and is the production of a non responsible Government which sees the mountain high increasing discontent without knowing how to stop it. It must be thrown out. The German people who have been sleeping now begin to move, and the leader to Victory in this fight is Socialism. The meeting unanimously passed a Resolution condemning the Project of Law, which is for the purpose of destroying the small rights of the people remaining to them.”

I have the honour to inclose herewith translation of an Extract from the “Munich Bavarian Courier”,<sup>255</sup> [Note in margin: ‘Précis translation’] taken from a letter of the Correspondent<sup>256</sup> of the “Frankfurter Zeitung”,<sup>257</sup> giving his opinion on the present discontent in South Germany. In it he mentioned that there is a disposition to blame the Bavarian Government for not having withstood in the Federal Council, the Prussian Reactionary policy.

### **FO 9/270: Victor Drummond to Earl of Kimberley, No 9, Munich, 21 February 1895**

[Received 27 February by messenger. For: The Queen / Lord Rosebery; K [imberley]]

*Cautionary press comments on German Emperor's personal will transcending the will of the people*

The extraordinary activity of mind of His Imperial Majesty The German Emperor as well as the activity of His Majesty's movements and his strong will have made a great impression upon the German people. The words written by His Majesty in the Golden Book in the Munich Guildhall “Suprema lex regis voluntas”<sup>258</sup>

<sup>255</sup> Enclosures: original (cutting) from *Bayerische Kurier*, 5 January 1895 and précis translation.

<sup>256</sup> Name not traceable.

<sup>257</sup> The correspondent's report, dated Munich 1 January, was published on 3 January 1895.

<sup>258</sup> ‘The king's will is the highest law’. Wilhelm signed the Golden Book on 8 September 1891 upon his visit to Munich.

have been interpreted as signifying the Emperor's own personal will which is considered shown, by His dispensing with the services of the two Chancellors of the Empire without consulting the Federal Council.<sup>259</sup>

Upon the relations between the Emperor and the German Nation, I have the honour to inclose herewith Précis translations of two remarkable Articles<sup>260</sup> which have lately appeared in the "Munich latest news"<sup>261</sup> of the 8<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> ultimo. The first is headed "the highest law" and comments upon the phrase "Suprema lex regis voluntas", and says that the Emperor should remember that the Empire was made with the blood of the People, and points out that the will of the Prince concerns the Imperial legislature which can only be executed by the help of the Federal Council and Imperial Parliament.

The Emperor is praised for wishing to do only that which is good in the service of the German Nation, but a hint is given to His Majestys' Counsellors that they should have the courage to say to His Majesty that when he acts upon the "Suprema lex regis voluntas" He should be told that this is not the highest Law, but that of the Welfare of the People.

The second Article headed the "German people and their Emperor" shows the German Empire is an eternal Confederation, in regard to which, The Emperor is only a Chief with His equals, their relations of the Emperor and the people being founded on mutual esteem and love: the people do not wish to be ruled by Him but loved. Is this the case? let this question remain unanswered says the writer,<sup>262</sup> who then presupposes a rupture between the Emperor and the people and supplies its probable results, giving three ways, adhering to the second, consisting in a return to the old traditions of the Imperial Constitution. The Emperor and His people must mutually respect each other, and His Majesty should be thus counselled.

These Articles have probably been instigated on account of the late reactionary policy at Berlin,<sup>263</sup> and on account of the general belief

<sup>259</sup> For Bismarck's and Caprivi's dismissals, see nn. 252 and 298 in Berlin section.

<sup>260</sup> Enclosures: original (cutting) 'Das höchste Gesetz', *Münchener Neueste Nachrichten*, 8 January 1895 and précis translation ('The Highest Law'); original (cutting) 'Das deutsche Volk und sein Kaiser', *Münchener Neueste Nachrichten*, 11 January 1895 and précis translation ('The German People and their Emperor').

<sup>261</sup> *Münchener Neueste Nachrichten*.

<sup>262</sup> Name not traceable.

<sup>263</sup> Drummond is referring, amongst other things, to the 'subversion bill' (see n. 381 in Berlin section).

that the entourage of the Emperor never have the courage to offer advice to His Majesty, and it is feared therefore that there is a possibility that His Majesty may some day carry out some measure, or do something antagonistic to the feelings of the people.

**FO 9/270: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury,  
Confidential, No 38, Munich, 24 August 1895**

[Received 26 August by messenger. S[alisbury]]

*British press articles have stirred up German animosity towards England; other causes of resentment*

Certain articles which have lately appeared in the English newspapers, the "Standard" and the "Globe", have again stirred up German irritation against England, their publication is declared to be a great want of tact and have increased England's unpopularity in Germany, which is to be regretted.

The cause of Germany's displeasure, with England has been, I consider, brought about in the first instance, by the German Colonial party, jealous of our great success in Africa and by the Bismarck party who were annoyed, at the time of the death of the late Emperor of Russia<sup>264</sup> to see signs of a friendly "rapprochement" between Russia and England which would be inimical to their own policy, which is, to further a policy of discord between the two nations as also between England and France, in order to distract attention from Germany; then, there is always, outside of Government quarters, a soreness that England will not join the Triple Alliance<sup>265</sup> and, not so long ago, annoyance at New Zealand's proposal in regard to Samoa,<sup>266</sup> again the Congo agreement and the idea that we wished Germany to protest against French proceedings in Siam.<sup>267</sup>

German jealousy and selfishness are the actual causes of Germany's irritation. England is always the "perfidious Albion" if she does not conform to Germany's wishes. England it is declared is always trying to make a catspaw of Germany.

<sup>264</sup> Alexander III died on 1 November 1894.

<sup>265</sup> For the Triple Alliance, see n. 174 in Berlin section.

<sup>266</sup> Drummond is referring to New Zealand's proposal to annex Samoa under a British protectorate, which was put forward in April 1894.

<sup>267</sup> For the Anglo-Congolese (Anglo-Belgian) agreement, see n. 365 in Berlin section; for the French proceedings in Siam, see n. 227 in this section.

I may be permitted to refer, with reference to my above remarks, to my Despatches N<sup>o</sup> 80 confidential of the 29<sup>th</sup> October 1887 and N<sup>o</sup> 61 of August 15<sup>th</sup> 1893.<sup>268</sup>

**FO 9/270: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury,  
No 39, Munich, 30 August 1895**

[Received 9 September by messenger. X; S[alisbury]]

*Forty-second Roman Catholic Convention in Munich; little change in political agenda except willingness to work with state and Protestants to combat socialism; measures in this regard*

The forty second annual Congress of the German Roman Catholics assembled at Munich on the 26<sup>th</sup> instant, it was formally opened on the 27<sup>th</sup> instant<sup>269</sup> by the President, Count von Preysing, who commenced proceedings by reading a letter from The Pope<sup>270</sup> laudatory of the objects the Congress had in view.

Telegrams of loyalty were sent to the Pope, His Imperial Majesty The German Emperor and His Royal Highness The Prince Regent of Bavaria,<sup>271</sup> and gracious replies were received.

There is little of real novelty to be reported on from the results of the Congress, it was chiefly, a yearly repetition of old annual phrases; but, a remarkable change in one point must be noticed, which is, that the Roman Catholic Party appear disposed no longer to look upon the State or The Protestants as enemies, but declare their readiness to act with them to combat atheism and revolutionary principles.

Count von Preysing referred in his speech to the growing indifference of the people towards Religion which, he said, must be combated by religious school teaching, by Confessional schools, and by particular attention to religious education in the middle and high schools; other speakers insisted on every means being taken to combat Socialism, (on this point I may remark that it is reported that four thousand people attended the Roman Catholic Congress and that 20,000 [*sic*] Socialists attended a Socialist meeting held in Munich a few weeks ago,)<sup>272</sup> they declared Christian workmen's associations were essential to assist religious feeling among the working classes, that Christianity is combined in Christ, The Church and The

<sup>268</sup> See pp. 500–503 and 532–533.

<sup>269</sup> On 26 August; the 42<sup>nd</sup> *Katholikentag* took place from 25 to 29 August.

<sup>270</sup> Leo XIII to Count von Preysing, president of the organizing committee, dated Rome, 30 July 1895.

<sup>271</sup> Luitpold.

<sup>272</sup> Drummond is referring to the workers' summer fete at Holzapfelkreuth on 18 August 1895.

Pope, and that all Christian sects should be drawn into one fold, (of course the Roman Catholic.)

Referring to The Pope's position in Rome, one of the speakers, Baron von Hertling, said, that the 20<sup>th</sup> September 1870 had brought no solution, but only conflict, the Roman Catholics must fight on until it is closed, this can only be done by the return of the Italian people to The Pope, who is still a Prisoner, but who must sooner or later be set free, as it cannot be suffered that His Holiness should be the Subject of any Prince, the restoration of The territorial Sovereignty is necessary to put an end to the Conflict.<sup>273</sup>

Among other things advocated by the speakers were, liberty for all religious Orders, more Sunday recreation for Soldiers, abolition of Duelling, erection of cheap houses for workmen's homes, free Roman Catholic Universities; all these measures have, already, on other occasions been proposed.

Special mention was made of The Pope's exertion in favour of Peace between all classes and races, and of The German Emperor's desire for Peace, also The Prince Regent of Bavaria was mentioned as "a true Son of the Church, who showed His love for and His duty to His people."

The Congress was closed yesterday, when the archbishop of Munich<sup>274</sup> delivered His blessings.

I may add that the Roman Catholic party are undoubtedly very earnest in their work to combat Socialism and with this object they have several Societies, the most important is the People's Union,<sup>275</sup> this society held its annual meeting at Munich on the 27<sup>th</sup> instant, when it was shown that the Society had been formed to enable the people to assist the Bishops and Priests in their combative work, to uphold and show the advantages of religion as opposed to socialist doctrines. In 1893, there were one hundred and forty thousand members of the Union, in this year they number one hundred and eighty thousand. The Membership costs one shilling. The result of the Society's work, in its' attempt to attract the working classes into its' fold will be matched with much interest; there is no doubt of the extraordinary power being exercised by The Pope[,] His Bishops and Clergy to convert the world into the Roman Catholic haven, a civilizing but aggressive policy which cannot be too carefully taken into consideration by the leading Ecclesiastical Authorities of other Creeds.

<sup>273</sup> The 'Capture of Rome' of 20 September 1870 marked the incorporation of the Papal States into the Italian kingdom. The rights and prerogatives of the Pope and the Holy See and its relationship with Italy were regulated by the Law of Guarantees of 13 May 1871.

<sup>274</sup> Anton von Steichele.

<sup>275</sup> *Volksverein für das katholische Deutschland*, founded in 1890.

**FO 9/270: Brooke Boothby to Marquess of Salisbury,  
No 53, Munich, 10 November 1895**

[Received 18 November by bag. X; S[alisbury]]

*Landtag debates on imperial subversion bill and social democracy; complaints of emperor's growing power over smaller states*

I have the honour to report that the Social Democratic party in the Bavarian Diet have availed themselves of the Debates on the Estimates for the Ministry for Foreign Affairs to make a violent attack on the Government for their support of the anti Revolution Bills and for their generally subservient attitude towards Prussia in the Federal Council.<sup>276</sup>

Their leader, D<sup>r</sup> Grillenberger complained also that the German Emperor was assuming the position of an absolute ruler rather than that of President of the Federal Council;<sup>277</sup> that the state of affairs in the Empire was tending more and more to a military dictatorship; that the Governments of individual States were becoming daily more powerless; and that the Bavarian people were lapsing into slavery.

Baron Crailsheim, the Minister for Foreign Affairs replied. After justifying the attitude of the Bavarian Representatives in the Federal Council, – where their lack of Opposition was due to the unanimity which prevailed there – His Excellency declared that their support of the Anti-Revolution Bill was necessitated by “the Anarchist Movement, which had recently spread to Bavaria”, and the elements of which had shown themselves in Social Democratic Assemblies. He made an urgent appeal to the great ‘bourgeois’ parties to rouse themselves from their lethargy, and instead of exhausting their strength in combating each other, to combine against the common enemy, namely Social Democracy.

This appeal had unfortunately the very opposite effect, as each party in the effort to justify itself, was led to throw the blame on the other. Hence there ensued, contrary to a previous agreement, a prolonged general discussion on the causes of and remedies for social democracy, and the general state of political affairs in Bavaria. Although in this discussion the doctrines of the Socialists were strongly condemned, yet the complaints made against the growing predominance of Prussia and the Emperor's attitude towards the several

<sup>276</sup> The debates in the second chamber of the Bavarian *Landtag* took place on 28 and 29 October. On the ‘subversion bill’ (*Umsturzvorlage*), see n. 381 in Berlin section.

<sup>277</sup> The German Emperor, as King of Prussia, held the presidency of the confederation (*Bundespräsidium*); he was not president of the Federal Council, which, according to the imperial constitution of 1871, was chaired by the imperial chancellor.



States found an echo in other parts of the House – D<sup>f</sup> Daller, a leader of the Clerical Party, agreed with D<sup>f</sup> Grillenberger that “the King of Prussia is President of the Federal Council, and only as such bears the title of German Emperor; we must hold fast to that.” “It seems” he continued “that efforts are being made to stretch the power and influence of the President far beyond the limits of the Imperial Constitution.” – D<sup>f</sup> Orterer and other speakers also urged that Bavaria should more carefully maintain her independence.

As regards the general discussion on Social Democracy, the Clerical and the Liberal Party each made use of the old arguments, the former attributing its origin to the scientific instruction of the University Professors, which had undermined the religious convictions of the people, and taught them to regard the duties of brotherly help and support of their poorer neighbours as unnecessary; the latter retaliating that, in works of benevolence and philanthropy, the Liberals as a party were equally active, and that the real cause, that divided the two parties and prevented any combined action against Social Democracy, was to be found in the direct and indirect attacks of the Clericals for many years past on the Constitution of the German Empire.

At the close of the discussion, the vote was declared to be agreed to on a show of hands without a division.

The Social Democratic movement does not appear to be making any serious advance in this part of Germany.

### **FO 9/271: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury, No 2, Munich, 9 January 1896**

[Received 17 January by bag. For: ~~The Queen~~ / Mr Balfour / Mr Chamberlain / African Department; S[alisbury]]

*Anti-British attitude manifested by Bavarian press following Transvaal incident*

I have the honour to inform Your Lordship that the Bavarian Press in its comments on recent events in the Transvaal has shown itself to be full as hostile to England and as violent and contemptuous in the language employed as the most extreme of the Prussian Organs.<sup>278</sup> While admitting the correctness of the attitude assumed by Her Majesty's Government at the actual moment of the inroad made by M<sup>r</sup> Jameson's followers, the Bavarian newspapers nevertheless maintain that this invasion had the moral support and sanction of the Colonial Office, and was carried out with the full knowledge of M<sup>r</sup>

<sup>278</sup> On the Transvaal crisis and the 'Jameson Raid', see pp. 188–195 and n. 450 in Prussian section.

Cecil Rhodes, and that it was only the failure of the attempt which forced Her Majesty's Government to disavow it. In every fresh Article on the subject the complaint is reiterated that England has the deliberate intention of establishing a Protectorate over the Transvaal, and of finally annexing it. This, it is urged would be the most flagrant and unheard of breach of the law of nations, but in accordance with Great Britain's course of action in every quarter of the world. The "Allgemeine Zeitung" in its issues of yesterday and today has somewhat moderated the offensiveness of its tone, but the "Neueste Nachrichten", which has a still larger circulation continues, to use the same expressions of hatred and contempt.

I quote in the Inclosure in this Despatch, a few extracts in translation from the leading Munich papers.<sup>279</sup>

**FO 9/271: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury,  
Confidential, No 15, Munich, 2 April 1896**

[Received 6 April by messenger. For: ~~The Queen / Duke of Devonshire / Mr Balfour~~ / Confidential to Berlin / Colonial Office; S[alisbury]; Copy, 2 April]

*Emperor's congratulatory telegram to President Kruger following 'Jameson Raid' attributed to royal sympathy with Boers and a diplomatic tactic to elicit Dutch friendship*

With respect to the raid made by D<sup>r</sup> Jameson and his followers into the Transvaal last December and the German Emperor's telegraphic message to President Krüger congratulating him on the Boers' victory, which caused general indignation throughout the whole English race, but which gained His Imperial Majesty great popularity with his people, who consider themselves the natural protectors of the Boers, the message was, according to information I have received from a confidential source, not only sent to President Krüger on account of His Majesty's sympathy with the Boers, but possibly with the view to assist Germany in obtaining Holland's friendship.<sup>280</sup>

Germany's sympathy is given to the Boers for the following reasons; – in the belief that the Transvaal and Orange Republic and even the Cape dominion are really Dutch possessions, and that the Dutch should be the Paramount Power in South Africa; also Germany desires to save the Boers from what they call British tyranny, and last not least to obtain great commercial advantages in opposition to us. This sympathy for the Boers was particularly

<sup>279</sup> Enclosures: translations of articles in *Münchener Neueste Nachrichten* of 4, 5 and 8 January 1896.

<sup>280</sup> On the 'Jameson Raid' and the ensuing Kruger telegram, see pp. 188–195.

noticeable at the time of the Jameson raid, when the “outlanders”<sup>281</sup> of German origin declared their willingness to act with the Transvaal Government against the English.

With relation to what I mention above of Germany’s desire to have Holland’s friendship, it must be remembered that until late years Holland had no friendly feelings towards Germany, fearing nothing more than amalgamation with the German Empire, as since it has been erected, hints had been expressed from time to time that Holland should form a part of it. This idea was not regarded with any favour by the Dutch, but since Germany has given its moral protection to the Boers, who have always preserved their attachment to the Mother Country, the Dutch have altered their sentiments, and the Germans are now much more liked, and recent events have added to this feeling.

The German Government is, I am told, aware that there is an influential party in Holland, not perhaps at present very numerous which upholds the maxim that where the Dutch element is in South Africa, the colonies there should belong to Holland; they are supported by certain German elements which covet a great German Colonial Empire, their influence is becoming daily stronger, their aim being to unite the Netherlands with Germany, and to acquire the Dutch Colonies.

German demonstrations of late years in favour of the Boers and Dutch in South Africa may therefore be looked upon as a Diplomatic means of drawing Holland in time into the folds of Germany with the prospective view above-mentioned, losing no opportunity to win the friendship of the Dutch.

D’ Jameson’s raid gave the German Emperor the ideal chance of accentuating this policy at our expense with the best possible results for furthering Germany’s views in regard to Holland.

**FO 9/271: Brooke Boothby to Marquess of Salisbury,  
No 29, Munich, 12 June 1896**

[Received 17 June. For: The Queen / Mr Balfour / Berlin, P.L. [printed letter]; S[alisbury]]

*Speech by Prince Ludwig at German dinner in Moscow; asserts independence of Bavarian state and loyalty to empire; reflects anti-Prussian sentiment in Bavarian public opinion*

I have the honour to report that the news which reached Munich on Tuesday last – through the channel of the Vienna “Neue Freie

<sup>281</sup> ‘Uitlanders’, foreign residents of the South African Republic.

Presse”<sup>282</sup> – of the speech of Prince Louis of Bavaria at Moscow, at the dinner given by the German colony on the 6<sup>th</sup> instant, has been the subject of general interest and discussion here during the past few days. – His Royal Highness is reported to have protested against the words “Prince Henry and all the Princes in his suite”, used by the President<sup>283</sup> in the toast which he proposed, declaring that they were “not vassals, but the allies of the German Emperor”; that as such – as the Emperor William I had always admitted – they had stood 25 years ago at the King of Prussia’s side; that as such they would again stand together, should the safety of Germany be in danger. The latest accounts received direct from Moscow state that Prince Louis concluded by exhorting all Germans to stand always together and to remain firm in their fidelity to the Empire.

The vast majority of the people of this county are in entire agreement with the views expressed by Prince Louis both as to the independence of Bavaria and as to the desirability of German unity. Many, however, regard the speech as unfortunately ill-timed and calculated to convey to foreigners the erroneous impression that there is internal disunion in the Empire. On the other hand there are many who, though staunch supporters of a “United Germany” and appreciating the advantages to be derived therefrom in case of war, are nevertheless not too well disposed to Prussia, and view with great uneasiness the growing tendency to centralisation; these latter rejoice in the accidental circumstance which called forth Prince Louis’s emphatic protest. This anti-Prussian sentiment has been specially evident during the past year in the Reports of [the] Chamber of Commerce, which complain that Bavarian interests are neglected in Commercial Treaties, and in the speeches of some influential deputies in the Diet: it is also very generally noticeable in the conversation of the people.

The “Allgemeine Zeitung”,<sup>284</sup> the most influential of the Munich daily newspapers, expresses its opinion of the Moscow incident as follows “Prince Louis has correctly stated the Constitutional position, and at the same time has so insisted on the advantages of German kinship and German unity, that all misconstruction, even for the most malevolent is rendered impossible. It is not the Prince’s words which can create a false impression abroad, but the commentaries which have been made on them in one part of the German Press.”

<sup>282</sup> Issue of 8 June 1896.

<sup>283</sup> Karl Camesa-Sasca.

<sup>284</sup> On 11 June 1896.

When a Berlin paper seeks to bring the Bavarian people as “thorough Germans”<sup>285</sup> into opposition with their Royal Family, this hopeless attempt can only result in producing the greatest indignation. The Wittelsbach dynasty is no less “thoroughly German” than our people, and well has the dynasty proved it – and not least Prince Louis.”

**FO 9/272: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury,  
No 23, Munich, 29 July 1897**

[Received 9 August by messenger. X; S[alisbury]]

*Speech by Johann Baptist Sigl at Peasants Union meeting critical of Catholic Centre Party and in favour of Bavarian national party; peasant movement gaining ground*

I have the honour to report an incident which has created some sensation in Bavaria.

At a meeting of a “Peasants Union” “Bauernbund”, D<sup>r</sup> Sigl a democratic Leader, formerly Representative in the Imperial Diet as Member for Kelheim and now elected Member for Regen in Franconia,<sup>286</sup> has lately<sup>287</sup> made a Speech at Pfaffenhofen denouncing the Centrum or Ultramontane party and Prussian particularism. He said, “we must now have a real Bavarian party which will know how to do its duty, the Centrum party must cease to exist as a Bavarian party for it follows slavishly the lead of the Prussian Centrum, if we succeed in crushing the Centrum[,] if we can form a Bavarian party whose Representatives will appear at Berlin then I am authorised to declare publicly that this event will be received with favour and with thanks in a high[,] very high place. This party, however, exists already[,] it is to be found in the Peasants party the real Bavarian the people’s party.”

D<sup>r</sup> Sigl’s observation that this would give gratification to a person in a very high place has mystified the Public, some believed it had reference to the Bavarian Minister<sup>288</sup> at Berlin others to Baron de Crailsheim who it is declared by the Centrum party lately mentioned to a leader of the Peasants party, D<sup>r</sup> Rassinger [*sic*],<sup>289</sup> that he foresaw that the future of Bavaria, the solving of Bavarian questions and the strengthening of Bavarian interests in Berlin could only be brought

<sup>285</sup> The original article used the expression ‘*kerndeutsch*’.

<sup>286</sup> Regen is located in Lower Bavaria.

<sup>287</sup> On 22 August 1897.

<sup>288</sup> Hugo Graf von Lerchenfeld.

<sup>289</sup> Georg Ratzinger.

about by the formation of a Bavarian party in the Reichstag, however, this has been officiously denied.

Baron Crailsheim told me only a short time ago that he viewed the advancing successful movement by the Peasants party with some concerns for it would have to be reckoned with at the Elections next year and that it would probably add another fraction to the Chambers which might cause difficulties to the Government on Government questions, this confirms me in my opinion that Baron de Crailsheim never could have made use of the words said to have been delivered by His Excellency in conversation with D<sup>r</sup> Rassinger.

This new Peasant movement, however, is gaining ground throughout Bavaria inimical to the Centrum party, the Roman Catholic Priests, the Nobles and Prussian Particularism.

**FO 9/272: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury,  
No 42, Munich, 13 October 1897**

[Received 18 October by messenger. For: War Office (Intelligence Division) / Berlin for perusal (P.L.) [printed letter]; S[alisbury]; Seen at Berlin [stamped]]

*Bavarian opposition towards proposed reforms of German imperial military judiciary procedures; upholds reserved rights*

Interpellations were made yesterday in the Bavarian Diet as to the attitude of the Bavarian Government on the question of the impending Reforms of the German Imperial Military Judicial Procedure, which is looked forward to with distrust by Bavaria who wishes to maintain her own Military Laws, carried out publicly, whereas Prussia's are secret.<sup>290</sup> The Minister of War, Baron von Asch, replied that the proceedings in the Federal Council were secret and, therefore, he could not give any information respecting them but that he would consult his Colleagues as to what further answer he could give; to day, His Excellency made a statement in the Chamber that he is authorised to say that the Imperial Federal Council has not yet come to an understanding, but that the Bavarian Government adheres to its' position already declared in 1891 and 1892 that they uphold the Bavarian Military Law of Publicity in its' proceedings and not less they are determined to uphold the Bavarian reserve rights; His Excellency, however, did not specially mention those as to Military Judicial Procedure, and with regard to this I have the honour to refer Your Lordship to

<sup>290</sup> For the German Military Penal Code, see n. 186 in this section.

my Despatch N<sup>o</sup> 54 of the 30<sup>th</sup> of October 1891, in which I mention a conversation I had with Baron de Crailsheim, when he stated that, in regard to Military Judicial Procedure, Bavaria had no reserved rights and that it was a matter that must be finally decided by the Imperial Federal Council.<sup>291</sup>

It is said, that The Prince Regent of Bavaria spoke very seriously to His Majesty The German Emperor during the Military Manoeuvres last month,<sup>292</sup> showing, that it would be impossible for Bavaria to change her Military Laws which she had maintained for so many years, and that The Emperor accepted the arguments set forth by The Prince Regent.

### **FO 9/272: Victor Drummond to Marquess of Salisbury, No 57, Munich, 31 December 1897**

[Received 10 January by messenger. For: Mr Balfour, A.J.B. [Arthur James Balfour] / Duke of Devonshire / Mr Goschen, G.J.G. [George Joachim Goschen] / Admiralty / Commercial Department; S[alisbury]]

*Views of Bavarian political parties regarding increase in size of German fleet; economic assessment of German shipping needs; statistical illustration of growth in merchant shipping*

With reference to my despatches N<sup>os</sup> 47 and 48 of the 5<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> ultimo, upon the proposed increase of the German Fleet, and to the Bill produced to the German Reichstag in this sense, I have the honour to report that meetings have been held in Bavaria and Wurtemberg which shew the views of the different parties.<sup>293</sup> The Colonial, National Liberal and Conservative party is entirely in favour of [the] Septennate arrangement; the Socialist and Democratic against it, although not opposed to a moderate increase of the fleet, and the Centrum party are in favour of a fleet sufficient to protect German citizens abroad and the German coasts but not for a fleet which would be a menace to others. The "Munich General News"<sup>294</sup> has obtained the views of the Wurtemberg National Economist, D<sup>r</sup> Schaffle, who in a very long and able report sums up with the expression that the present German fleet must be made more efficient in numbers of battle ships and cruisers to prevent a blockade of Germany's ports and to assist German merchant

<sup>291</sup> For the *Reservatrechte* (reserved rights), see n. 220 in this section.

<sup>292</sup> Wilhelm II met Luitpold at Würzburg and Nuremberg on 1 and 2 September 1897.

<sup>293</sup> For the imperial naval bill, see n. 536 in Berlin section.

<sup>294</sup> Schaffle's four-part article 'Ein Votum für die Marinevorlage' ('A vote for the navy bill') was published in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* on 23, 29, 30, and 31 December 1897.

ships from being captured in case of war and enable them to reach their own or neutral ports in safety.

D<sup>r</sup> Schaffle agrees with Admiral Tirpiz [*sic*] as to the composition of the German fleet necessary for German requirements even in time of peace, but that this must be the minimum.

D<sup>r</sup> Schaffle closes his remarks with the following observations on English and Commercial interests, “that the immense strides Germany has made in her commercial affairs since these last ten years has astonished her rivals, and England would if possible be too glad to take any opportunity to destroy this on account of her jealousy of our progress.”

For the first time in this century our ships’ tonnage last year surpassed that of England in the Port of Hamburg. Since 1873 our trade with England has only increased 88% (in the last ten years 35%) – whereas with Sweden it has increased 97%, Austria-Hungary 341%, United States of America 128%, Mexico and South America 317%, East India and Eastern Asia 488%, Australia 475%, the Cape 270%, the Levant 2261%. [”]

D<sup>r</sup> Schaffle shows that “whilst Germany’s trade has increased exceptionally by 55 millions sterling, [note in margin: ‘55,000,000’] that of Russia, France and England have diminished. The slur on Germany’s goods – “made in Germany” – has not damaged German industries but those of England.” “Yes!”, says, D<sup>r</sup> Schaffle, “we have emancipated ourselves from England which is the cause of her rancour and animosity – and we must be prepared to protect the trade we have gained by having a strong fleet.”

The National-Liberal, Colonial and Conservative Press use daily arguments not only to show that Admiral Tirpiz’ plan must be carried out, but also rightly or wrongly that no Power is opposed to this except Great Britain.