

CHAPTER ONE

OUR MOVEMENT¹

*The antirevolutionary or Christian-historical movement represents, insofar as it pertains to our country, the keynote of our national character as this received its stamp around 1572 under the leadership of Orange and the influence of the Reformation, and wishes to develop this in accordance with the altered circumstances of our nation in a form that satisfies the needs of our time.*²

ARTICLE 1

I. OUR NAME

ANTIREVOLUTIONARY³

§ 5

Our movement has two names: either antirevolutionary or Christian-historical, depending on whether you focus on what we oppose or on what we wish to promote.

1. “Our Movement” here translates the original *Onze richting*, that is, our school or persuasion (in this case, regarding political thought).

2. William I, Prince of Orange, also known as William the Silent (1533–84), was the leader of the Dutch Revolt against the Spanish Habsburgs. See also below, § 10.

3. The first four sections (§§ 1–4) were the author’s introduction. As summarized in the editor’s introduction above, they spelled out at some length the difference between four possible types of political “programs,” the fourth being a “program of principles” on which this book is a commentary.

Our movement's *first* name, given its origin, is "antirevolutionary." It took its rise from opposing something offensive, something that clashed with what is just and sacred.

We are therefore at heart a *militant* party, unhappy with the status quo and ready to critique it, fight it, and change it.

What we oppose is "the Revolution," by which we mean the political and social system embodied in the French Revolution. Contrary to what is imputed to us, we do not oppose each and every popular uprising. We recognize that national leaders are sometimes called upon to put an end to destructive tyrannies, and so we honor, for example, the Dutch Revolt against Spain, the Glorious Revolution under William III, the American war of independence from Britain, and our overthrow of the Napoleonic regime in 1813.

Those events, after all, do not represent destruction but restoration, not the overthrow of a nation's laws but their reaffirmation, and thus not a forsaking of God but a return to him.

What we combat, on principle and without compromise, is the attempt to totally change how a person thinks and how he lives, to change his head and his heart, his home and his country—to create a state of affairs the very opposite of what has always been believed, cherished, and confessed, and so to lead us to a complete emancipation from the sovereign claims of Almighty God.

The French Revolution was the first and most brazen attempt of this kind. Thus, like Edmund Burke, we do not hesitate to focus our attack on this monstrous Revolution. To forestall any misunderstanding, I ask only of my readers, be they adherents or opponents, to bear in mind that the enduring power of an *idea* is different from its fleeting *expression* in that one event.

As an idea, the Revolution turns everything topsy-turvy, such that what was at the bottom rises to the top and what was at the very top now moves to the bottom. In this way it severs the ties that bind us to God and his Word, in order to subject both to human criticism. Once you undermine the family by replacing it with self-chosen (often sinful) relationships, once you embrace a whole new set of ideas, rearrange your notions of morality, allow your heart to follow a new direction—once you do this the Encyclopedists will be followed by the Jacobins, the theory by the practice, because "the new humanity" requires a new world. What the philosophers, whose guilt is greater, did to your minds and hearts with

pen and compass and scalpel (and would like even more boldly to do to your children) will be carried out by the heroes of the barricades with dagger, torch, and crowbar.

CHRISTIAN-HISTORICAL

§ 6

But it is not enough to know what you are against. To wage war with prospects of victory, our people needed to become aware of the sacred stronghold for the sake of which we entered the fray. To indicate that, we called ourselves *Christian-historical*. The ideology of the Revolution, after all, is anti-Christian in its starting point and therefore much worse than the worldview of paganism.

That is why the *Christian* banner had to be lifted high again. Not only did it announce an Evangelical program, but it also affirmed specifically that the battered condition in which the eighteenth century had handed Europe over to the age that followed, was not the fault of Christian principles having failed us but of our failure to live up to those principles.

We condemn outright the abuses that were customary in 1789, though there was exaggeration in the way revolutionaries depicted them. We fully agree that things could not go on that way. And even in the unholy and shameful upheaval that brought all the dregs of human passions to the surface, we revere God's guiding hand in delivering Europe from those abuses.

But when revolutionaries now tell us: "Everything used to be Christian, so your religion was responsible for those abuses, and abandoning the Christian religion and switching to our humanist beliefs is the only permanent remedy"—then everything in us protests against such calumny. On the contrary, after comparing the historical record with the demands of the gospel, we contend that this godless tyranny, this level of infamy to which men had sunk, this whole situation so unworthy of humanity, would never have come about if the nations of Europe had not time and again put the candle of the gospel under a bushel.

We contend that to stray onto the slippery paths of the philosophy of humanity will not stop the flood of iniquity. Instead, that would make it wash over us even more frightfully and before long confront us with such calamities that the blood-red luster of 1789 and 1793 will pale by comparison.

We contend, after consulting our beliefs, examining our personal lives, and listening to the past, that there is no other cure to be found for Europe's malady than under the auspices of the Man of Sorrows.

If "Christian" therefore stands opposite "humanity," the addition "historical" indicates that our situation *cannot be created by us* at will. It is the product of a past that, independent of our will and apart from our input, is fashioned by him in whom we live and move and have our being.

Whoever respects the rights of history places himself under a law and acknowledges that his will is bound by the will of former generations and is tied to the interests of the generations to come. In short, with the hallmark of history on our labors, the crown that we took for ourselves is laid down again and, alongside our forefathers and surrounded by our present adherents, we go on our knees in order to give glory, not to the creature, who is nothing, but to him whose holy footsteps you hear rustling through the pages of history.

§ 7 THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO

From this short exposition it is clear that "antirevolutionary" and "Christian-historical" are words of almost identical meaning. It betrays a lack of familiarity with the meaning of these terms when people give out that they are willing to be called "Christian-historical" but not "antirevolutionary."

Granted, there is more durable content in a label that states positively what you are for, than in a term that merely indicates what you are against. Also, the terms *Christian*⁴ and *historical* sound more familiar and positive and speak more to your inner life than the cold foreign term *antirevolutionary*. In addition, the label "Christian-historical" would remain relevant even if the Revolution were vanquished and the term "antirevolutionary" had outlived itself.

The reason why we often prefer the name "antirevolutionary," as one can readily see, is that it is more energetic and more compelling. When someone tells you, "I am an antirevolutionary" you know at once where you are at with him, whereas "Christian-historical" still leaves you wondering.

Let's make no secret of it: it takes more courage to be an antirevolutionary.

4. *Note by the author:* Historically, in the Netherlands, the adjective *christelijk* [Christian] denotes whatever is based on the Reformed religion.

Oh yes, our day and age will let you have your label “Christian-historical,” provided nothing further is specified about it. You can be Christian-historical without any consequences to speak of. With nothing but that title you will even be admitted to the circle of full-blooded radicals as a person open to change.

But when you declare yourself an antirevolutionary—that is, when you consciously and stoutly oppose the prevailing ideas and trends in legal thought; when you carry forward your Christian and historical convictions onto the political and social domains and consider it an honor to belong to that group in society that is targeted for oppression if not destruction—then your opposition provokes resistance and you are in for a political fight to the death.

II. THE KEYNOTE OF OUR NATIONAL CHARACTER

THREE BASIC TYPES OF NATIONALITY

§ 8

Three national types vie for dominance in the bosom of our nation: the Roman Catholic type, whose image and ideal lie in the Middle Ages; the Revolutionary type, whose ideal and type are found in the model states of the French or German doctrinaires;⁵ and in between these two the Puritan type, which is represented by our movement and whose flowering coincides with the glory days of the Dutch Republic.

Each of these three types have always displayed the same national character, but each time with a different keynote, depending on the principle animating it and the aims pursued by it.

The old Netherlandic people stayed the same; the nation was never uprooted. Yet in the sixteenth century and again toward the end of the eighteenth century, this people underwent a remarkable transformation and renewal in its character and qualities, a change that, depending on your sympathies, you will either praise as having rejuvenated and ennobled the nation or else denounce as having perverted and degenerated it.

The weakest type to develop was the Catholic one. During the years that Rome flourished, any political and cultural unity in the Low Countries

5. Doctrinaires were those who wished to reconcile monarchical institutions and old-regime values with the new political realities brought on by the French Revolution.

burgeoned only briefly and proved incapable of inspiring a comprehensive national sense through a single national will.⁶

Of greater influence was the liberal keynote that was imposed upon our national character after the revolution of 1795, when national unity was consolidated as never before and the systematic breakup of our liberties and privileges began in earnest, following foreign examples. It had greater influence in part because already during the Dutch Republic a powerful group had wanted to enter upon a course that could now be taken unhindered under French auspices. The influence was greater above all since Roman Catholics, in a natural reaction to the anti-Catholic nature of our former republic, initially aided the revolutionaries.

But the type to develop most richly, to blossom most abundantly, to ripen to nationality most fully, was the Puritan Christian type that our people took on during the Republic. The Catholic type had been impressed only briefly on the newly formed nation. The Revolutionary type has been operative for only eighty years. The Puritan type, by contrast, has had two full centuries to unfold its splendor.

The age in which that keynote came to dominate was the heroic age of our nation, or if you will, that mysterious moment when all the hidden treasures of our nationality suddenly burst to life and everything seemed to have become great, causing the nation to outdo itself, even as mutual trust and confidence redoubled the effect of the nation's strength.

It is a matter of record that at that time the Netherlands was at its peak, was most itself in every field and every domain of human endeavor, of learning, and of life. All Europe acknowledges that we were then the most refined and the most richly organized region of the whole continent.

And the memory of that former greatness is still so overpowering that our "revolutionaries," rather embarrassed by the traditions of their own forefathers (the terrorists of the French Revolution), preferably parade in garb stolen from the wardrobe of our history and act as if a Marnix of old and a Kappeyne of today resemble each other like two drops of water.⁷

6. Kuyper refers here to the years ca. 1430–1530 when the Low Countries collectively were ruled by the Burgundians and the Habsburgs.

7. Philip of Marnix, lord of St. Aldegonde (1540–98), was a Calvinist theologian, scholar, Bible translator, poet, political activist during the Dutch Revolt, and diplomat in the service of William the Silent. Johannes Kappeyne van de Coppello (1822–95)

Toward the end of the eighteenth century the Puritan type was removed from our emblem. At first, admittedly, the attack on this national type seemed to have succeeded all too well, especially after the annexation of the southern provinces of North Brabant and Limburg.⁸ There were those who believed that the vibrant life of earlier days was totally choked and crushed and could never again become a national movement. But events soon proved that they had cried victory too soon.

On the contrary, no sooner did the faith of our fathers surface again in the *Réveil*,⁹ the *Scheiding*,¹⁰ and the reaction to theological modernism, than it became evident that the old sympathies were back and people longed for the social and political ideas from days of yore.

Indeed, our party is not a “school party,” destined to disappear again once the education question is off the table. Nor are we a group of the “orthodox” party whose political sympathies are yet to be born and who exist only as a *church party*.

On the contrary, our party’s strength lies precisely in the fact that we know ourselves to be heirs of a political program that once aroused the admiration of Europe, made the Netherlands a world power, and if developed in accordance with our times still has promise for the future.

Groen¹¹ therefore understood very well that his strength lay as much in our national history as in our school system, and that the [Christian day] schools, which he provisionally named “Christian-national” schools,¹² could flourish only if they were grafted onto the root of this Puritan history.

was a talented parliamentary leader of the Dutch liberals and notorious sponsor of the Primary Education Act of 1878 against which Kuyper organized the People’s Petition (*Volkspetitionnement*).

8. These provinces, whose populations were and still are predominantly Roman Catholic, were incorporated in 1815 into the United Kingdom of the Netherlands.

9. *Réveil* refers to the Reformed-evangelical revival of the early 1800s.

10. *Scheiding* refers to the Secession of 1834 from the national church.

11. Guillaume (Willem) Groen van Prinsterer (1801-76) was the leading member of the “confessional” party in the Dutch Reformed Church and founding father of the anti-revolutionary movement in Dutch politics, essentially Kuyper’s political godfather.

12. In 1861 Groen van Prinsterer helped establish the Association for Christian-National Education in support of financially struggling “Christian-national” primary schools, while in 1868 a second federation, the Association for Reformed Education, was founded to support “schools with the Bible.” The schools of both organizations competed with the publicly funded schools that were mandated by law to inculcate “Christian and civic virtues” yet without use of the Bible or reference

§ 10 THE CONSTITUTIONAL CHARACTER OF THE REFORMED TYPE

The Puritan type of our national character was formed during the revolt against Spain, after being prepared by the ferment of the Protestant Reformation. Thus it came into being as early as 1520, became self-conscious in 1568, and was the first in 1572 to scuttle the ships and burn the bridges behind it, marking the irrevocable changeover of the nation to a new direction in life. It traveled the moral high road by putting the entire life of the nation in the service of one sacred, lofty cause. It has rightly been said that in our country the church was not established within a state, but inversely, that the Republic of the United Netherlands was set up as a protective wall around an already existing church and therefore as part and parcel of that church.

Consequently, the mission of our republic was to use its armies and fleets and its commercial influence to protect the free course of the gospel throughout Europe and other continents and to safeguard the free course of the gospel at home in accordance with freedom of conscience for everyone.

The inspiring ideal of our nation at that time was *civil liberty*, not as a goal in itself but as the vehicle and consequence of that much higher liberty that is owed to men's conscience.

And so people knew what they lived for; they knew the purpose of their existence. They believed, they prayed, they gave thanks. And blessings were plentiful: the country enjoyed prosperity, happiness, and peace.

William of Orange was the spiritual father from whom this type grew and who preserved it from those excesses of the left and of the right that led similar efforts in Westminster and New England to such totally different outcomes.

Orange represented more than the small number of heroes who lived up to the reputation of that noble house. In the nation's eyes, a Prince of Orange represented a mystery, a star of hope that was safe to follow, a precious treasure because he was so evidently provided by the Lord.

to Christian doctrine. Kuyper agreed with Groen that the teaching of such values deprived children of the motive to honor them and the strength to persevere in them. See also below, § 156.

The motto *Hac nitimur, hanc tuemur*¹³—leaning on the power of God in his holy Word and deeming liberty a priceless good—was a marvelous and meaningful expression. When struck on coins it was a cautionary reminder for a trading nation that this treasure of Orange was to be deemed of greater value than all the spices from the Orient.

THE UNFOLDING OF THIS TYPE IN THE ANTIREVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT § 11

The antirevolutionary party indeed adopts an exalted standpoint when it declares that it represents “the keynote of our national character as this received its stamp around 1572 under the leadership of Orange and the influence of the Reformation.” Yet this stance becomes practical only when it adds at once that it “wishes to develop this in accordance with the altered circumstances of our nation in a form that satisfies the needs of our time.”

We refuse to join the revolutionaries in sliding toward their godlike *power state*. We refuse no less to join Rome in returning to the Middle Ages. And against their united or separate attempt to eradicate the Puritan type from our national character, we shall continue to defend the latter tooth and nail.

Yet not by repristination.

We wish to recover nothing from the past that has proved unusable, nothing that we have outgrown or that no longer fits our circumstances. None of us dreams of visiting the museum of antiquities to bring back the old, clumsy, rusty state machine that had begun to creak on all sides.¹⁴

We also accept the fact, without mental reservations, that North Brabant and Limburg are now parts of our country and will be constitutive elements of our future nationality.

And, to put to rest once for all: we ourselves react more strongly than anyone to the idea of re-establishing a Reformed state church. On the contrary, we demand the strictest application of the principle that the state shall not itself promote “the saving faith.”

But the chief goal that is nonnegotiable for us is this: (1) Our country as a state shall not be placed in a hostile position over against the living God.

13. “On this we rest, this we defend,” translates this Latin motto that appeared on early-sixteenth-century coins depicting the maid of Holland leaning on a Bible and holding a spear topped by a liberty cap.

14. Kuyper makes reference here to the highly decentralized, oligarchic government of the Dutch Republic.

(2) Our country shall not go back and exchange the Puritan political principles for the Catholic ones. (3) Our country shall not surrender its native institutions in favor of models from abroad.

That was the threefold goal for which our fathers, under the leadership of Orange, fought against Rome and Spain and equally against the Arminians and the States.¹⁵ That same threefold goal we are committed to pursue for our time. To forestall any misunderstanding, we hasten to add that the manner in which our fathers tried to realize that goal can no longer be fully ours.

What we must pursue today is to gain acceptance for those political ideas that will enable our citizens, endowed with equal duties and equal rights, be they Catholic, Puritan, or Revolutionary, to contribute, each in their own way and for their part and in their measure, to the formation of a higher national type that will restore the unity of our national consciousness.

III. OUR MOVEMENT IN OTHER COUNTRIES

§ 12 IN CATHOLIC COUNTRIES

Our Program states correctly that the antirevolutionary party represents the Puritanism of the sixteenth and seventeenth century “insofar as it pertains to our country” and that it cannot be tied to such a narrow definition beyond our borders.

In other countries the antirevolutionary party determines its relations on the one hand according to the position taken with respect to the Revolution, and on the other according to the felicitous or less felicitous manner in which the confession of the gospel was brought into agreement with the defense of freedom of conscience.

This last point needs to be added in this last quarter of the nineteenth century, lest by steering clear of the Revolution we should fall into the hands of Rome.

As is well known, after 1815 it indeed seemed for a long time that all Christian elements in Europe, whether they still remained in the Catholic

15. “Against Rome and Spain” means against the Inquisition introduced by Charles V and intensified by Philip II; “against the Arminians and the States” means against the government that used its political power around 1610–18 to privilege free-will Calvinists over sovereign-grace Calvinists, a bias that was reversed by Prince Maurice, son and successor of William of Orange.

church or flourished in the churches of the Reformation, could make common cause against the godless drive of the Revolution.

The spokesmen for Rome took up a very moderate position. They mostly emphasized the Christian faith and pushed the specifically Romish element to the background. In a very engaging manner they approached you with open arms, inviting you to do battle together for Throne and Altar. Their political writers did what was necessary to achieve success in this reconciliation. Their sincere and winning ways persuaded the old Protestant leaders to see benefit in closing ranks and recommending a new approach to politics.

Dedicated to pushing back the Revolution and granting equal status to both confessions, this approach—called “antirevolutionary” in Germany and “legitimism” in France—seemed to offer a basis for a modern reconstruction of the Christian state. Stahl, and even more Gerlach, were the talented advocates of this splendid illusion.¹⁶

Following the reaction of 1813, a number of confessors of Christ also in our country were infected by this naïve theory, and in some backward regions of the country one can still point to traces of the political paralysis inflicted on its blind followers. Precisely for this reason it cannot be praised enough in Groen that he never just imitated Edmund Burke or Gentz, Haller or Leo,¹⁷ or even Stahl and Von Gerlach, but increasingly pressed toward the more Puritan standpoint, the standpoint on which one extends the hand to the Catholic Christian yet opposes the ultramontane element in his politics.¹⁸

In other countries, however, men did not sober up until Rome dropped her mask and everyone could see how the Jesuits, even as Catholics and Protestants were beginning to form a united front, quietly and

16. Friedrich Julius Stahl (1798–1861), professor of jurisprudence in Berlin and member of the Prussian diet, defended “the monarchical principle against the Revolution” and famously stated that if the Revolution should ever triumph, Catholics and Protestants “would mount the scaffold together.” Ernst Ludwig von Gerlach (1795–1877), another member of the Prussian diet, crossed over from the Evangelical conservative party to the Catholic center party in the 1860s in protest over Bismarck’s power politics.

17. Kuyper lists off leading conservatives: Edmund Burke in Britain, Friedrich von Gentz in Austria, Karl Ludwig von Haller in Switzerland, and Heinrich Leo in Prussia.

18. Ultramontanism was Catholic political action that recognized the supreme authority of the pope in Rome.

imperceptibly, behind our backs, were aiming at our destruction and using us to have Rome brazenly triumph in the end.

§ 13 AGAINST THE MAY LAWS

Accordingly, almost nowhere do orthodox Protestants and Catholics travel together anymore. Everyone knows this about France. In Germany one leading paper has written off the Evangelical party as a “lemon sucked dry” and another paper never even considered a merger with Rome. Since the death of Von Gerlach we can safely say that as a result of Rome’s untrustworthiness there are no proponents left of a political prospect that, however appealing, brought nothing but cruel disappointment for our German friends.

That said, the rise of ultramontanism may have caused us to stop believing in one big worldwide Antirevolutionary Party composed of Catholics and Protestants, yet one should not infer from this that we are indifferent to every effort undertaken by Rome. On the contrary, in her struggle against the terribly unjust May Laws, the Center Party in Germany has our fullest sympathy.¹⁹ Rome’s exertions, both in Germany and in France, against secular public education and secular socialism remind us of our own long-standing efforts. The introduction of free universities in France, though initiated by Rome, has our warm approval. And even when a somewhat rigid and too virile ultramontanism in the republics of South America tries to bring healing in a situation of chronic civil war, the endeavor probably has ulterior motives yet we applaud what is commendable in it.

But nowhere do we recognize *kindred spirits* in the ultramontane party. We were never one, we are not one, and we shall never be one. And should there be instances, such as those mentioned above, when we choose for Rome against the Revolution, there are other cases, no less important, when we would favor liberalism over Rome. In both cases, meanwhile, we would be navigating our own vessel between a rock and a hard place rather than acting from affinity and principle.

19. The May Laws were enactments by the Bismarck government during the 1870s by which religious orders were abolished, and Catholic clergy were excluded from the education system and trained and appointed subject to state supervision.

We recognize only two types of political parties as like-minded with ours: (1) those that flourish in countries where the French Revolution never infiltrated; (2) those that oppose this Revolution within their borders on the basis of the Word of God.

To the first category belong the political parties in Britain and the United States. In neither country was society unhinged in order to replace it with a new one after the French model. In both countries government still stands on the foundation of God's Word and the historic rights that have roots in the nation's past. The only exception is the Radical group in England, especially the Birmingham club.²⁰

If asked whether our sympathies in British politics then lie with the Tories or the Whigs, one can already infer from our "leftist trend" (as it has been called) that we lean toward the Whigs. We admit that, to the degree that different countries can be compared, the domestic politics of Forster and Gladstone has virtually the same intentions as what antirevolutionaries aim at in the Netherlands. This explains why one of our conservative dailies could write recently that a liberal like Gladstone in no way resembles a Dutch liberal and that the real Puritans in Britain almost to a man support Forster.²¹

In America it stands to reason that we side with the Republicans against the Democrats. The Republicans are the spiritual offspring of the old Pilgrim Fathers, the heroes of the Anti-Slavery War, the adversaries of Catholicism, and the spokesmen of that true civic spirit that arose especially in New England.

As for the second category, with respect to Germany it should be kept in mind that not the *Kreuzzeitung* but the *Reichsbote* with its much purer tone is the paper of our sympathies. By this we do not at all deny that the *Kreuzzeitung* has stoutly revenged itself for its moral lapse brought on by Bismarck's reckless action of 1866. Still, we are sorry to say that this return to better paths was never resolute and energetic enough to enable it to compete with the *Reichsbote*. Germany's antirevolutionary party, particularly since the "Christian socialists" have taken the bull by the horns,

20. Kuyper refers here to a movement for "secularism" founded by George Holyoake (1817–1906), a British utopian socialist.

21. William Edward Forster (1818–86) was a member of British prime minister William Ewart Gladstone's first ministry, whose Education Act of 1870 protected denominational schools and permitted religious instruction in government schools.

has been moving on firmer ground and is gradually freeing itself from the bad repute of the Junker party.²²

As far as Catholic countries are concerned, they leave us almost cold—especially now that in France even a Broglie²³ has been chased from the scene as a “conspirator” and a Gambetta,²⁴ now master of the situation, looks like the calmest man in the world. Little can again be expected from the colorless constitutionalists, and the legitimists have forfeited their honor by allying with the republicans. He who loves France and fears God turns his eyes away from this sorry spectacle of human self-abasement and dreams nostalgically of what France might have been if only she had not listened to the Sorbonne but instead to the man from Geneva.

The same is true, *mutatis mutandis*, of Austria, Italy, Spain, and Belgium. We are keenly aware that the clerical parties in these countries would like to prevent free proclamation of the gospel, while the radicals on that score are favorably disposed towards us. But in these exclusively Catholic countries this is such a minor issue that it would be very superficial to let that determine our sympathies—all the more so after it became clear how badly we would compromise ourselves in the company of atheists from Antwerp who misuse the name “Beggar” and of radicals in Brussels who misuse the name of our Marnix of St. Aldegonde.²⁵

Finally, the fact that we often judge the actions of the Russian government more positively is easily explained from the circumstance that every attempt at converting Russia into a state after the revolutionary model has thus far been resolutely resisted. The conviction that “Russia must seek its own form of government along its own paths without allowing itself to be seduced by foreign utopias” is a thoroughly antirevolutionary idea (although this certainly does not stop us from severely condemning

22. The Junkers were the landowning aristocrats of Prussia who supported Bismarck’s aggressive foreign policy, which was also endorsed by the conservative newspaper *Die Kreuzzeitung*.

23. Albert de Broglie (1821–1901), a three-time conservative prime minister of the Third French Republic, was denounced as a “traitor” by the royalist party for supporting President Mac-Mahon (1808–93) in 1877 in his controversial dismissal of the Chamber of Deputies known as the “coup d’état of May 16.”

24. Leon Gambetta (1838–82), a radical leader in the Third French Republic, converted to “moderate opportunism” after 1877.

25. “Beggar” here translates the original *Geuzen* (from the French word *gueux*, “beggars”), a term of contempt, but later the honorific label for participants in the Dutch Revolt.

what happened, for example, in Poland).²⁶ Add to that the fact that the Russian Empire, as a patron of the Christian religion, has always opposed Islam both in Europe and in Asia. As well, the person of the czar offers a valuable counterweight to the pope of Rome. Understandably, a mighty empire with such desirable traits has always enjoyed a measure of sympathy on the part of antirevolutionaries. Thus in its present struggle Russia enjoys the moral support of Gladstone and Forster, of the Republicans in America and the antirevolutionary party in Germany. And all who were called "Christian-national" in our country have always, spontaneously and unanimously, sided with Russia.

26. In 1831, and again in 1863, the czarist regime squelched uprisings in Warsaw with a heavy hand.