

WÜRTTEMBERG

(STUTTGART)

STUTTGART

FO 82/149: Evan Montague Baillie to Earl Granville, No 59, Karlsruhe, 1 July 1871

[Received 5 July by post. For: The Queen / Gladstone; G[ranville]]

Decline of invitation to attend triumphal return of Württemberg troops; remarks on reactions of court and government

Having been invited to attend officially on the occasion of the Triumphal entry of the Wurtemberg Troops into Stuttgart on Thursday last, it appeared to me evident that under the general Instructions, that had preceded from Your Lordship's Office on former occasions, I was not authorised to accept the invitation without special order from Your Lordship to do so.

I accordingly took an opportunity to explain to Baron Wächter what our general Instructions were, namely to abstain from taking part officially in public demonstrations in celebration of military successes, instructions which had already formed the subject of a Correspondence between Her Majesty's Legation and the Wurtemberg Foreign Department at the time when Baron Hügel was Minister for Foreign Affairs[.]¹

Baron Wächter said that he perfectly understood the position I was in, and that he would not fail to explain the matter to The King and whomever else it might be advisable.

As M^r Cope and myself were the only Members of the Corps Diplomatique who were not officially present at the ceremony it is possible that our absence may give rise to disagreeable remarks being made in the Court Circle of Stuttgart, but I am sure that Baron Wächter will make it plain that there is no reasonable ground for any offence being taken.

¹Hügel was minister for foreign affairs from 1855 to 1864.

**FO 82/150: Robert B. D. Morier to Earl Granville,
No 40, Stuttgart, 27 December 1871**

[Received 2 January 1872 by Messenger Biehl. For: The Queen / Gladstone; G[ranville]]

Views on expansion of imperial legislature at expense of local legislature; reluctance of smaller states to adopt imperial legislature

The question of the legislative competence of the Empire as compared with that of the Local Legislatures, to which I called Your Lordship's attention in my despatch N^o 30 of the 5th instant, has since that date assumed important proportions and whilst almost exclusively occupying the attention of politicians in South Germany has roused the passions of the National Press north of the Main.

Motions intended to elicit an expression of opinion on the merits of the Question have been submitted both to the Württemberg and Bavarian Chambers and have, according to the tedious forms in force in the Local Legislature of Germany, been confined to Committees whose Reports will not be ready for some weeks to come.

The motion submitted to the Württemberg Chamber was forwarded to Your Lordship in the postscript to the despatch above adverted to.²

The Bavarian Motion, as Your Lordship will have been informed from Munich, goes much further and if carried into law would provide a very effectual barrier against the extension of the competence of the Empire otherwise than with the previous consent of the Bavarian Chambers.³

The loss of temper which is plainly discernible on the hand of both parties to the conflict is to be in part accounted for by the fact that besides the abstract question of the interpretation of Section 78 of the Constitution⁴ there is a practical Question, concerned with the extension of the Competence of the Empire to the whole domain of the Civil Code awaiting its solution, which to all appearance will be solved in the sense of not extending the Imperial Competence in

²Motion of 7 December 1871. It demanded that any alteration of the Treaty of Union between the North German Confederation, Baden, and Hesse, on the one hand, and Württemberg, on the other (25 November 1870), required the consent of the Württemberg *Landtag*; Morier's postscript to No 30 is dated 6 December 1871.

³The motion of 13 December 1871 stipulated that in all constitutional matters the decisions of the Bavarian plenipotentiaries to the Federal Council were to be subjected to prior approval – by both chambers of the Bavarian *Landtag*.

⁴According to Article 78 of the imperial constitution of 16 April 1871 amendments to the constitution – as enacted by the *Reichstag* – could be rejected by a minority of 14 (of a total of 58 votes) in the Federal Council. Furthermore, fixed rights of individual states could only be modified with the consent of the state in question.

this direction. This result which may be confidently expected from the votes, amounting to 14, already given by Bavaria, Wurttemberg and Saxony in the Committee of the Federal Council, (votes not likely to be altered when the question is submitted to the Plenum of that Assembly,) will for the first time leave Prussia and the North of Germany in a minority, and the mere prospect of such a contingency has already created much ill blood.⁵

Enclosed herewith for Your Lordship's information in original & translation is an interpellation addressed in the Wurttemberg chamber to the Minister of Justice by Deputy Mohl inquiring whether it is the intention of the Government to oppose the motion in question by all means in their power.⁶

Granted the patience necessary to master the almost unintelligible verbosity of this document it gives a fair idea of the kind of democratic conservatism which makes the Suabian recoil with horror from the thought of seeing himself divested of the Right of Legislating quâ Suabian matters which he conceives touch him in his character of Württemberg and not of German citizen.

The reply of M. de Mittnacht the Minister of Justice is also annexed.

FO 82/153: Robert B. D. Morier to Earl Granville, No 5, Stuttgart, 31 January 1872

[Received 6 January by Messenger Biehl. For: The Queen / Gladstone; G[ranville]]

Budget committee recommends suppression of Württemberg's mission at Vienna

The Budget Committee have resolved by a majority of eight votes against seven to recommend the suppression of the Württemberg Mission at Vienna, and by a like majority to recommend the maintenance of the Württemberg Mission at Munich.

I am also informed that the question was mooted in the Committee as to whether it would not be more advisable at once to strike out the post of Foreign Minister.

These rapid steps in the direction of the international extinction of the Kingdom of Württemberg are hailed with much joy by the more advanced national or unitarian party.

⁵On 15 November 1871 the majority of the *Reichstag* voted to extend imperial competence to civil law; on 8 December the constitutional and judicial committees of the Federal Council presented their report, which negated the motion by 6 to 4 votes.

⁶Enclosure: original (undated newspaper clipping entitled 'Kammerbericht, 31. Sitzung, 9 Dezember 1871' from *Staatsanzeiger für Württemberg*) and translation.

It remains however to be seen how the report of the Committee will be received by the Chamber.

**FO 82/153: Robert B. D. Morier to Earl Granville,
No 17, Stuttgart, 27 February 1872**

[Received 4 March by messenger to Darmstadt. For: The Queen / Gladstone; G[ranville]]

Debate in Württemberg chamber on competence of imperial versus local legislatures

In my despatch, N^o 30 of the 5th of December, I called your Lordship's attention to a point incidentally touched upon in the debates of the German parliament,⁷ to which I was inclined to attach much importance in connection with the constitutional development of the Empire. It had reference to the interpretation to be given to Section 78 of the Imperial Constitution, which determines, first, that alterations in the Constitution are to be effected in the way of legislation, but are to be considered as thrown out if fourteen votes are given against them in the Federal Council. – Secondly, – that the so-called Reserved Rights of Individual States cannot be altered without the consent of the State possessed of those rights.

I should mention that these Reserved rights consist of certain exceptional privileges which have been retained by individual States, such as the produce of the excise taxes on Spirits and Beer, which in the Confederation at large are Imperial taxes, the local management of Railways, Post Office, Telegraph &^{ca}.

It is only the Southern States which have reserved these rights.⁸

The points upon which a difference of opinion arose were first, whether the expression "Alterations of the Constitution" embraced indiscriminately every extension of the Competence of the Empire.

Secondly, whether the word 'State' in the second paragraph of Section 78 meant the Representative of the Government of the State in the Federal Council, or the concrete individual State itself, including under that term the legislative factors of the State.

The result of the mootings of the question in the German Parliament was to elicit motions in the local legislatures of Württemberg

⁷In No 30 Morier referred to the *Reichstag* debates of 25 November 1871 (1st and 2nd readings of the imperial law concerning the introduction of the Military Law of 1867 (North German Confederation) in Bavaria).

⁸The particular sovereign rights retained by Baden, Bavaria, and Württemberg were contained in the November (Versailles) Treaties of 1870. *Reservatrechte* for the management of railways and the postal system were restricted to Bavaria and Württemberg. For further rights of Bavaria, see n. 153 in Munich section.

and Bavaria with a view to an expression of local Parliamentary opinion in regard to the reading of the text of the Imperial Constitution, and there was in consequence a possibility of a conflict of opinion between the local and Imperial Legislatures, fraught with possible danger to the future constitutional development of the Empire.⁹

The resolution submitted to the Württemberg Chambers was given in the Postscript to my despatch of the 5th of December.

After spending more than two months in Committee, it came on for discussion in the House on the 7th instant, and after several days of animated debates, was lost by a majority of sixty votes against twenty-nine, – the local legislature of Württemberg thus ratifying the Imperial reading of the text of Section 78 by two thirds of its number.

I have the honor to transmit to Your Lordship herewith the report of these debates contained in the *Staats Anzeiger*, together with a careful and conscientious précis by M^r Scott.¹⁰

Having already in my despatch of the 5th of December anticipated the general considerations suggested by this proviso of the Imperial Constitution according to which the future relations of the members of the present Imperial Confederation 'inter se' are to be determined not by international treaties similar to those which called the present Constitution into life,¹¹ but by the legislative apparatus of Parliament and Federal Council, I need not repeat them here.

The interest of the debates lies mainly in the important disclosures made respecting the historical genesis of the Versailles treaties by M. Mittnacht, who negotiated those Treaties on the part of Württemberg, and in the admission of that Minister that it was no use closing one's eyes to the fact that anything which a majority headed by Prussia, and those States who were necessarily her Allies in the North, desired must sooner or later become law, and that consequently even the veto of fourteen votes in the Federal Council could only be looked upon as a useful engine for preventing over hasty legislation, and not as a barrier that could be effectively opposed to the will of the leading State.

⁹For the respective motions, see nn. 2 and 3 in this section.

¹⁰Enclosures: originals (*Staatsanzeiger für Württemberg*, No 34, 8 February 1872; *Beilage für den Staatsanzeiger für Württemberg*, No 35, 9 February 1872; *Beilage für den Staatsanzeiger für Württemberg*, No 39, 14 February 1872; *Staatsanzeiger für Württemberg*, No 36, 10 February 1872) and précis of proceedings in the Württemberg chamber of deputies of 7 and 8 February.

¹¹For the treaties of November 1870, see n. 15 in Darmstadt section.

That the interpretation given by the Württemberg Government of the first part of Section 78 is the only one tenable, lies, I think beyond a doubt. – Alterations of the Constitution must include all Alterations and therefore every conceivable extension of Imperial competence: – that is to say, such an extension of Imperial competence as would absorb all individual and separate life is not excluded. – That such a provision, which in reality destroys the federal character of the Constitution by placing a minority of the so called Sovereign units at the mercy of a majority, should have been passed by the local legislatures almost without discussion, can only be accounted for by the febrile excitement under which, owing to the war,¹² the nation was still suffering, and the artificial haste with which the treaties were hurried through the various chambers in order that the Imperial edifice should be completed by the time the war came to a close.

As regards the second point, that of the interpretation to be given to the term “State”, it appears to me that greater doubt exists, though it seems established that the sense given to the term by M. Mittnacht and the other negotiators of the Treaties of Versailles, namely as meaning the vote of the Plenipotentiary of the State in the Federal Council, is that which was originally intended. – It certainly seems an immense power to confide into the hands of a diplomatic Representative, – for it would render it possible for such an one, even against the instruction of his own Government, – irrevocably to bind the State which he represents to Imperial measures which might override every law guaranteed by the constitution of that State. – It is as if in the course of ordinary international relations a Government were to furnish a negotiator not only with full powers to negotiate and sign a treaty, but to ratify such treaty when signed, without first referring it home, and to engage themselves to abide by it, even if subversive of the fundamental laws of the state so bound.

That the readiness with which the various Governments concerned rallied to this interpretation, and the warmth with which they defended it, are partly to be traced to the independence it secures to them towards their own Chambers, is, I fear, not far from the truth.

If we are to bow our necks before the Imperial purple, it is at least something to be able to hold our heads more erect before our own subjects, and their constitutional representatives.

I do not think I slander in taking for granted some such reasoning as this.

¹²Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1871.

That the real 'portée'¹³ of these Treaties had not been realized until the present exhaustive debates, is certain, and these debates have therefore at least got the merit of having shewn to the Nation to what an extent it is unified, and it must be added to what extent the local legislatures have been mediatized.

How far this is an unmitigated good, and how far the cause of political and individual liberty, which was certainly more warmly contended for in the local Parliaments, than it has been as yet, or is likely to be for some time to come, in the National Parliament, is a question which I will not now enter upon, though I hope to advert to it before long.

FO 82/153: Robert B. D. Morier to Earl Granville, Most Confidential, No 19, Stuttgart, 27 February 1872

[Received 4 March by messenger to Darmstadt. For: The Queen / Gladstone; G[ranville]]

King of Württemberg believes state parliaments to be superfluous

In the course of the conversation which I had with the King this morning on the occasion of my audience of farewell, His Majesty, who touched on many political subjects, observed in reply to a remark which I casually made on the number and variety of parliaments now sitting in Germany, that it was high time the local Parliaments were abolished. One great Parliament for national purposes was quite sufficient. – “Dans nos propres territoires on devrait concéder le pouvoir à Nous [*sic*] autres Rois – Nous ferions les affaires beaucoup mieux – Les Chambres ne causent que des embarras, et ne font qu'entraver la marche des affaires.”¹⁴

This is the Royal conclusion drawn from the existing Imperial Constitution. – I advert to it in my despatch N^o 17 of to-day's date.¹⁵

The democratic conclusion drawn from the same premises is that one great national Crown is sufficient for all national purposes and that the local Sovereigns might well be suppressed, if the local legislatures were left standing with bonâ fide power to transact Provincial business.

¹³French: 'importance' or 'impact'.

¹⁴French: 'In our own territories one should concede power to our other kings. We would do things much better. The chambers cause only embarrassment and do nothing but hamper the course of things.'

¹⁵See preceding dispatch.

**FO 82/154: George Petre to Earl Granville,
Confidential, No 14, Stuttgart, 3 October 1872**

[Received 7 November. For: The Queen / Gladstone; G[ranville]]

Reasons for appointment of new Prussian envoy at Stuttgart

Baron von Rosenberg, who has been Prussian Representative at this Court since 1867, has been recently recalled by His Government, and will be succeeded by Baron Magnus, the Prussian Minister at Hamburg; who is to be succeeded in his turn, by Baron von Rosenberg. The latter diplomatist, during his five years residence at Stuttgart, has certainly displayed no lack of zeal or activity in furthering the aims and consolidating the influence of Prussia in this portion of Southern Germany, and therefore, although he is generally believed not to be a favourite of Prince Bismarck, his sudden removal to what may be considered an inferior post, can hardly be attributed to any dissatisfaction with him on these grounds.

The position of the Prussian Representative in Wurtemberg, who, stripped of all disguise, is neither more nor less than the pioneer of mediatization, is, under any circumstances, in some degree, an invidious one; and great tact and discretion are undoubtedly requisite, if Prussian influence is to be effectually promoted, without making itself felt, and without incurring odium or distrust. Whether Baron von Rosenberg has sufficiently displayed these qualities or not, it cannot be disputed that he has drawn upon himself very great unpopularity, amounting latterly to a positive personal dislike, which the Court and those opposed to any further curtailment of the independence of Wurtemberg take no pains to conceal. He is reproached with having carried on an open and active propagandism both in and out of Parliament, and with being in constant communication with all the leaders of the Party¹⁶ in this country which desires its further absorption in the Empire.

I have no good authority for stating that the King, however much he may have desired it, actually asked for Baron von Rosenberg's recall, but I believe that during the recent visit of the Crown Prince of Germany, who was received most cordially both by the King and the population of Wurtemberg, it was made apparent to His Imperial Highness that such a step would be agreeable to His Majesty and was desirable.¹⁷

¹⁶*Deutsche Partei* (established in 1866); its programme corresponded largely with that of the National Liberals in other German states.

¹⁷Friedrich Wilhelm visited Stuttgart from 15 to 17 August 1872.

In making these observations, I need not assure Your Lordship that I have no wish whatever to pass any criticism of my own on the conduct of my Prussian Colleague, but merely to report, without overstating, the circumstances which are believed to have led to his recall.

**FO 82/156: George Petre to Earl Granville, No 17,
Stuttgart, 28 March 1873**

[Received 31 March by messenger. For: The Queen / Gladstone / Circulate; G[ranville]]

Serious anti-Semitic riots in Stuttgart; Social Democrats blamed

Rather serious riots, originating in a most trivial cause, occurred here the day before yesterday and were not quelled without the intervention of the military. A Soldier had an altercation with a Jewish clothesman¹⁸ as to the price of some article of wearing apparel which he wished to purchase; from words they came to blows, and the Jew called in the Police, who appear to have assisted him not only in ejecting but in maltreating the soldier, although it turned out afterwards that the latter was not seriously hurt.

A report spread like wildfire through the town that a Jew and the Police had murdered a Soldier, and towards evening excited crowds assembled in the quarter of the Town where the occurrence took place, smashed the shop windows of several Jewish dealers in clothes, and pelted and assaulted the Police[.]

The same scenes took place on the following evening, when the Police were even more seriously attacked and used their drawn swords freely against their assailants. The Authorities were alarmed, and no less than a battalion of infantry and two squadrons of Cavalry were called out in aid of the Police.

To an ordinary observer this seemed to be rather an unnecessary display of military force, but at all events it succeeded in restoring tranquility, which has not since been disturbed or is likely to be.

It is thought that social-democrats, who have very numerous adherents here amongst the working classes, have had something to do with fomenting these riots.

¹⁸The dispute was between the soldier (name unknown) and Helene Baruch, owner of a draper's shop.

**FO 82/156: George Petre to Earl Granville, No 24,
Stuttgart, 28 May 1873**

[Received 2 June by messenger (under F.S. [flying seal] to Darmstadt). For: The Queen / Gladstone / Circulate / Berlin; G[ranville]]

Controversies regarding imperial railway bill; Württemberg government opposed to proposals for a central board and equal tariffs

The Bill which was lately introduced by Herr Elben, a Wurtemberg deputy in the Imperial Parliament, for creating a supreme Board of supervision or control, for the whole of the German railways, and which elicited an approving speech from Prince Bismarck, is not viewed in the same favorable light by the Wurtemberg Government.¹⁹ The ostensible objects of the Bill are to assimilate the railway tariffs throughout Germany, and to compel the various Railway administrations to subordinate their traffic arrangements to a uniform plan, framed solely with a view to the general interest of the public and of commerce, to the exclusion of purely local interests and rivalities. The Wurtemberg Government, as Baron Waechter told me, are fully alive to the advantage and even to the necessity of accomplishing the latter of these two objects, but they are opposed, on financial grounds, to the assimilation of the tariffs. The Railways in Wurtemberg are the exclusive property of the State and are exceedingly well managed; but owing to the geographical features of the country, the cost of construction has been considerable, and the tariff is in consequence somewhat higher than it is on many German lines. Taken altogether, they do not pay more than 3 ½ per cent, which the new lines in course of construction, will rather diminish than add to. Assimilation in the case of Wurtemberg, therefore, means reduction of the rates, involving a loss of revenue. Baron Waechter, when speaking to me on this subject, observed that the large increase of expenditure, present and prospective, entailed by the army reorganization upon Wurtemberg,²⁰ which would render increased taxation unavoidable, made it more than ever undesirable that the present sources of revenue should be diminished.

¹⁹The *Gesetz betreffend die Errichtung eines Reichs-Eisenbahn-Amtes* was discussed in the *Reichstag* at the 1st reading on 17 May 1873; Bismarck approved the bill that same day. It was passed by the *Reichstag* on 16 June and – against the votes of Württemberg and both Mecklenburgs – in the Federal Council on 20 June 1873.

²⁰The reorganization of the Württemberg army and its integration into the federal army, as the XIII Army Corps, was based on the military convention between the North German Confederation and Württemberg of 21–25 November 1870.

In addition to the economic objection above mentioned, it is obvious that there is an extreme dislike here to any farther extension of the principle of centralization.

It is feared that the establishment of a Central Railway Board sitting at Berlin, may lead to continued influence and hamper the independence of the Government in the management of its railways. These, together with the Post Office, were left to Wurtemberg by the German Constitution;²¹ but there is a powerful political party to which Herr Elben (who is editor of the National Liberal paper, the "Suabian Mercury"²²) belongs, which considers that in the interest of German unity centralization must be carried farther, and that the Wurtemberg Railways and Post Office should be brought under Imperial Administration.

Count Uxkull, of the Foreign Office, has been sent to Berlin, to suggest the views of the Wurtemberg Government in the Federal Council, and it is hoped that they will have the support of Baden.

FO 82/156: George Petre to Earl Granville, No 30, Stuttgart, 3 July 1873

[Received 7 July by messenger. For: The Queen / Gladstone / Circulate; G[ranville]]

General anger at imperial press bill; liberty of press in Württemberg

The strong and almost unanimous disapprobation with which the text of the abortive Imperial Press Bill, of which so much has been spoken and written of late, was received by the Prussian newspapers, has been reechoed to the full in this portion of Southern Germany.²³ The National-Liberal Papers followed, as they invariably do, in the wake of the Berlin "National Zeitung", but to the democratic Press this unfortunate attempt at legislation has furnished for weeks past a fruitful theme of derision and scorn.

As regards liberty of the Press Prussia has much to envy Wurtemberg, for in no Country in Europe, not excepting England, is the Press more free than it is here. There is no special Law regulating or restricting it, no Police interference of any kind, and not even a stamp duty on newspapers.

Under these circumstances an Imperial Press Law which might be hailed with satisfaction in Prussia as a considerable measure of relief,

²¹For the reserved sovereign rights, see n. 8 in this section.

²²*Schwäbischer Merkur*.

²³For the Imperial Press Law, see n. 35 in Dresden section.

would by no means be viewed with similar satisfaction in Wurtemberg; whereas such a Law as that which was recently submitted to the Federal Council would simply be looked upon as an intolerable piece of tyranny causing people to remember with regret the more lenient legislation on Press matters even of the Diet of the old German Confederation.

**FO 82/158: George Petre to Earl of Derby, No 6,
Stuttgart, 13 March 1874**

[Received 16 March by post. For: The Queen / Disraeli / Circulate / Berlin / Mr March / D[erby]]

Remarks on Reichstag proposition to abolish separate diplomacy for southern German states and deprive diplomatic corps at smaller courts the rights of 'exterritoriality'

I took an opportunity a few days ago, of asking M. de Mittnacht whether he knew anything of a rumoured intention attributed to the National-Liberal party in the Reichstag, of bringing forward a motion for the forced abolition of the separate diplomatic representation of the German States, and, assuming the rumour to be true, what importance he attached to a motion of the kind. M. de Mittnacht said that he had heard nothing of any intention to bring forward the question in the Reichstag; but he related to me a circumstance which fully accounts for the existence of such a rumour, and which throws a curious light upon the confused manner in which the business of the Empire is occasionally transacted at Berlin.

A short time ago, M. Leonhardt, the Prussian Minister of Justice, submitted to the Federal Council a project of Law, printed and bearing the signature of the Chancellor of the Empire, the purport of which was to deprive all Foreign representatives accredited to the separate Courts of Germany, and not at the same time accredited to the Empire, of the privileges and immunities which "exterritoriality" confers upon diplomatic agents.²⁴ The object of the measure was obviously, as M. de Mittnacht truly observed, to get rid by a side-wind of the Foreign Representatives accredited to the German Courts; but, ostensibly at least, it left untouched the right professed by the German Sovereigns of accrediting diplomatic Agents abroad.²⁵

²⁴The bill in question was subsequently withdrawn and is not documented in the minutes of the *Verhandlungen des Bundesrats des Deutschen Reiches* of 1874.

²⁵The rights of individual German states to send and receive diplomatic representatives were not explicitly stipulated in the imperial constitution of 1871. In part, they were derived

M. de Mittnacht expressed to me the astonishment which the presentation of such a Law to the Federal Council had caused him and his Bavarian and Saxon Colleagues.²⁶ It was referred in the usual way to the Judicial Committee of the Council, of which M. de Mittnacht and M. Fäustle, the Bavarian Minister of Justice, are members, but it does not appear to have been discussed at all by that Committee. The two Ministers above-named went to Prince Bismarck and asked him for some explanation as to the motive for introducing such a radical constitutional change without warning or consultation with the other Governments. The Chancellor not only expressed his disapproval of the measure, but disclaimed all previous knowledge of it whatever, although it had been signed by him. It had emanated, he said, from the Prussian Ministry of Justice, and he desired that it should be withdrawn and that the presentation should be considered as “non avenue”.²⁷

In so far, therefore, as Foreign Diplomatic Agents in Germany are concerned, M. de Mittnacht observed that the question was at rest, and that, even if it were revived, the opposition of Bavaria, Saxony and Wurtemberg, who command the fourteen votes necessary for vetoing any constitutional change, in the Federal Council, could successfully resist any legislation of the kind.²⁸

There is another question, however, connected with the foregoing which is still pending, and which M. de Mittnacht seems to think may be solved in a different manner.

It is proposed that German diplomatic Agents accredited to German Courts, shall not, as hitherto, be entitled to claim the rights and immunities of “extritoriality”. A Prussian Minister at Stuttgart and a Wurtemberg Minister at Berlin would thus cease to be diplomatic Agents in the ordinary acceptation of the term, and would become – whatever their titles might be – mere Commissioners. M. de Mittnacht did not express any opinion of his own as to whether such a measure was a logical consequence of the German Constitution, or was expedient.

from Articles 7 and 8 of the final protocol of the Treaty of Union between the North German Confederation and Bavaria of 23 November 1870.

²⁶Johann Nepomuk von Fäustle and Christian von Abeken.

²⁷The French expression *nulle et non avenue* means ‘null and void’.

²⁸For the blocking minority in the Federal Council, as stipulated in Article 78 of the imperial constitution of 1871, see n. 4 in this section.

**FO 82/158: George Petre to Earl of Derby, No 20,
Stuttgart, 1 July 1874**

[Received 6 July by messenger. For: The Queen / Disraeli / Circulate; D[erby]]

Political equanimity regarding religious matters in Württemberg

A debate which took place recently in the Second Chamber of the Wurtemberg Parliament²⁹ on the subject of a vote which was proposed by the Government in aid of the erection of a new Roman Catholic Church at Tübingen furnished a proof, if such were wanting, of the entire absence in Wurtemberg of that bitterness of feeling which has been elicited by the struggle between the Catholic Church and the State in Prussia, and which has washed the debates in the German and Prussian Parliaments.

Though the matter itself may be insignificant, the fact is worth recording.

The expense of providing for the requirements of Public Worship in Wurtemberg falls upon the respective Communes, and no legal obligation rests with the Government to supplement the funds necessary for the purpose. It is usual however in certain cases to do so, and Tübingen being the seat of the national University and about to become a garrison town, the grounds for State assistance were fully recognized by the Chamber, and the vote was passed.

A dignitary³⁰ of the Evangelical Church made a speech on the occasion in support of the proposed grant, and concluded by expressing a hope that his Catholic fellow subjects would consider it as an earnest [*sic*] of that Community of feeling by which all Christian Sects should be united.

**FO 82/158: George Petre to Earl of Derby, No 41,
Stuttgart, 31 December 1874**

[Received 2 January 1875 by messenger. For: The Queen / Disraeli / Circulate in turn / Berlin; D[erby]]

Discussion with Mittnacht on recent ministerial crisis in Berlin

In the course of a conversation which I had with M. de Mittnacht the day before yesterday, His Excellency alluded to the late ministerial

²⁹The debate took place on 28 May 1874.

³⁰Name not traceable.

crisis at Berlin.³¹ He said that in his opinion the retirement of Prince Bismarck, setting aside all other consequences, would have been a very serious blow to the Governments of the minor States of Germany. That whatever the Chancellor's faults might be (M. de Mittnacht is by no means one of his personal admirers), his policy and his objects were essentially German in the broad sense of the word, and free from any taint of Prussian particularism, and that he looked upon him as a bulwark against the Prussianization of the smaller States. If for example, he said, a man like Count Arnim were to become Chancellor of the Empire, the German Governments would soon have cause to rue the change. The uncertainty of the future was a misfortune for Germany, for it was impossible to name a single Statesmen [*sic*] upon whom the responsibilities and duties of the Chancellor could devolve without a serious derangement of the machinery of the Empire. And for this state of things he thought that Prince Bismarck himself was in some measure responsible, in consequence of his having so completely monopolized power and identified the Empire with his own personality.

M de Mittnacht spoke in depreciating and rather bitter terms of the Prussian Minister of Justice, D^r Leonhardt, with whom as member of the Judicial Committee of the Federal Council he is of course thrown much in contact, and with whom it is evident he has had some sharp passages at arms during the elaboration of the Civil and Criminal Procedure Bills.³² He considered him, he said, to be a most inefficient Minister of Justice, notwithstanding the reputation which he enjoys as a jurist, and he smiled at the notion, encouraged recently by the Press, that D^r Leonhardt was disposed to act somewhat independently of the Chancellor.

"He is as much under the thumb of Prince Bismarck" said M de Mittnacht, "as Falck, and that is saying a good deal."

In speaking of the religious question M de Mittnacht expressed to me his conviction that the present strife (from which Wurtemberg is happily exempt) would never cease in Germany during the lifetime of Pope Pius IX, and as long as Prince Bismarck was at the head of affairs.

³¹Following a protest motion by the *Reichstag* against the violation of parliamentary immunity and the arrest of one of its deputies, Paul Majunke, Bismarck tendered his resignation in an audience with Wilhelm I on 17 December 1874. This was declined by the emperor.

³²For the respective bills and laws, see n. 88 in Munich section and n. 158 in Darmstadt section.

**FO 82/159: George Petre to Earl of Derby, No 13,
Stuttgart, 29 April 1875**

[Received 3 May by messenger. For: The Queen / Disraeli / Circulate; D[erby]]

Reactions to war scare; general relief at cessation of rumours

The deep feeling of uneasiness amounting at times to alarm, which has been produced of late by sensational articles in certain Prussian newspapers, and which the recent remonstrances addressed by the German Government to Belgium have not been calculated to diminish, has more or less subsided here, and the conviction, which was so general a short time ago that another war with France was inevitable at no distant date, appears to have yielded to a juster and less somber view of the probabilities of the immediate future.³³ It is impossible to doubt that peace is ardently desired here, not only by the Commercial and industrial classes, but, as far as my observation extends, equally by the Army.

The losses which the recent disquieting rumours have occasioned to the financial and trading communities in Germany are to be counted, so commercial people say, by many millions of florins, and the general and serious depression of trade and industry, which has now lasted for considerably more than a year, has caused these losses, which need not have been incurred at all, to have been more sensibly felt.

Even amongst the warmest supporters of the Government at Berlin, who, if somewhat less numerous in the South than in the North of Germany, are not the less thorough, there are many, I am convinced, who would be much relieved, if the German Chancellor, or the Press under his control, would allow the German nation for a time to rest and be thankful.

**FO 82/159: George Petre to Earl of Derby, No 15,
Stuttgart, 30 April 1875**

[Received 3 May by messenger. For: The Queen / Disraeli / Circulate; D[erby]]

Religious harmony disturbed by Pope's dissatisfaction with Bishop of Rottenburg's refusal to nominate an ultramontane candidate for a vacant deanery

I have on more than one occasion adverted in my despatches to the harmony which exists in the relations between the Roman Catholic

³³For the 'War-in-Sight' crisis and the German remonstrances to Belgium, see nn. 195 and 203 in Berlin section.

Church and the State in Wurtemberg, in contrast to the bitter strife which is raging in other parts of Germany. The Government and the Catholic Hierarchy, as well as the great majority of the public here, both Protestant and Catholic, are equally desirous that this state of things should continue to the great benefit of all concerned. There are not wanting, however, certain indications of a desire on the part of some members of the Roman Catholic Church, both lay and clerical, in Wurtemberg, holding extreme opinions, as well as on the part of National Liberals, to disturb the prevailing harmony, or at least to increase the difficulty of maintaining it.

Some time ago a Catholic Priest of Ellwangen, named Schwartz, who is considered to be the head of that section of the clergy here which is least disposed to moderation, was elected to a vacant Deanery, an office which involves cooperation in various matters with the Administrative Authorities.³⁴

D^r Hefele, the Bishop of Rottenburg, declined to ratify the nomination,³⁵ and as the Bishop's determination to discountenance extreme opinions amongst the clergy of his diocese is well known, the refusal was naturally attributed to this motive.

M de Mittnacht however himself, told me that the Government has previously intimated to D^r Hefele that it was their intention to use their right of vetoing the appointment, and that the Bishop had wisely refrained in consequence from sanctioning it. It appears that Herr Schwartz has since been named by the Pope to be one of His Holiness's Domestic Prelates, which is of course a purely honorary and not very rare distinction, but under the circumstances it has been construed into a manifestation on the part of the Holy See of dissatisfaction with the conduct of the Bishop. The act has certainly not created a good impression here, whatever its real significance may be.³⁶

On the other hand M de Mittnacht, who is the leading Minister of Wurtemberg, and who happens to be a Catholic, has been attacked of late in certain National Liberal Papers in Prussia and Saxony, and accused of being an ultramontane, which is ridiculously untrue, as all who are acquainted with him and his antecedents must know.

The same Journals have also contained insinuations concerning the supposed undue favor shewn to Catholic interests at the Court of Wurtemberg, referring more particularly, I believe, to Queen Olga.

³⁴Schwarz was elected dean of the *Landkapitel* Ellwangen on 24 June 1874.

³⁵Decree of the Ordinariate of 8 July 1874.

³⁶Pope Pius IX appointed Schwarz as domestic prelate on 9 April 1875 without having consulted Bishop Hefele. On 1 May the Wurtemberg government denied Schwarz the right to hold the title.

There is no foundation whatever for these complaints or insinuations, and the source from which they emanate would lead one to think that the exemption from religious strife which Wurtemberg enjoys is not altogether agreeable to some who are hotly engaged in the conflict elsewhere.

FO 82/160: George Petre to Earl of Derby, No 8 [= No 7], Stuttgart, 11 February 1876

[15 February by post. For: The Queen / Disraeli / Circulate / Berlin; D[erby]]

Anxiety over Reich designs to acquire state railways; likelihood of strong opposition

The question, which may sooner or later, become a permanent one, of the acquisition by the Imperial Government of the whole of the railways throughout Germany, is, I think, causing some little anxiety here.³⁷ The Wurtemberg railways, with the exception of two insignificant branch lines, of a few miles in length, leading nowhere, are the property of, and under the exclusive management of, the State.³⁸ Both on political and economical grounds, such a stride towards centralization, as this scheme of wholesale purchase involves, is likely to meet with strong opposition both from the Government and the people of Wurtemberg; but the effect of the example of Prussia, and the force of circumstances must be duly considered in estimating the real strength and durability of such opposition.

M. de Mittnacht, whom I saw a few days ago, told me that he had no knowledge or information whatever as to what the Prussian Government was doing in this matter, or as to the ultimate intentions, real or supposed, of Prince Bismarck, except what he had derived in common with others from the Newspapers, and that, in his conversations with the Chancellor, when he was at Berlin this winter, no allusion even had been made, either to the expediency or possibility of the ultimate acquisition by the Empire of the German Railways.

The subject was evidently a disagreeable one to His Excellency, and, although he said that the resistance of Wurtemberg, even if she stood alone, which was improbable, would be an effectual bar to the realization of the scheme, I fancied I could detect a misgiving in his own mind on the subject.

³⁷For Bismarck's imperial railway scheme and the respective Prussian policy, see n. 234 in Berlin section.

³⁸In 1876 the two private lines were the Teckbahn and the Ermstalbahn.

**FO 82/160: George Petre to Earl of Derby, No 13,
Stuttgart, 26 April 1876**

[Received 1 May by messenger. For: The Queen / Disraeli / Circulate / Berlin / Munich; D[erby]]

Controversy over railway bill; Saxon and southern states opposed to German railway project; anticipation that bill will be adopted by Prussian parliament

Lord Odo Russell in his despatch N^o 146 of the 6th instant,³⁹ of which your Lordship has been good enough to send me a copy, expresses a confident opinion that the present opposition to Prince Bismarck's Railway policy in Saxony and in Southern German will dwindle down to a small minority during (and I presume as a result of) the approaching debates on the subject in the Prussian Parliament.⁴⁰ I am unable myself to detect any premonitory symptoms, in Wurtemberg at least, of a change in public opinion on this subject, and assuming, what may be fairly assumed, that there will be no attempt to intimidate, but merely to convince the opponents of the measure in the rest of Germany, I confess I shall be surprised at such a result of the Prussian debates. At all events the question will have to be presented in a novel and striking light, if the solid phalanx of opposition now arrayed against the project is to be suddenly disarmed or weakened. The real effective strength of this opposition is not political, though political parties hostile to Prince Bismarck may take advantage of it, but is derived from the economical and financial objections to the scheme. It is these objections which have divided the ranks of the habitual supporters of Prince Bismarck with the minor States of Germany.

Whatever may be the ultimate issue of the question in Germany, no one with whom I have conversed on the subject here has expressed any doubt as to the measure being successfully carried through the Prussian parliament. Putting aside the interests of the Empire, which is to be the purchaser, it is tolerably clear that Prussia, the vendor, would make a very good bargain in transferring her railways from her own shoulders to those of the Empire. The Prussian railways which are in course of construction or which will have to be constructed hereafter, at the cost of the State, to satisfy the economical wants of the Kingdom, are not likely to be profitable from a financial point of view, even if they pay their working expenses. In the South of Germany, on the

³⁹Not included in this volume.

⁴⁰For the imperial railway scheme and the Prussian law for the transfer of railways to the German Empire, see n. 234 in Berlin section; for the Saxon and Bavarian position, see pp. 308–309 and 485–487.

other hand, the network of railways is tolerably complete, and their receipts are more likely to increase than to diminish in the future.

Nor would the relinquishment of power, or the political sacrifice, involved in the alienation of the railways, be very perceptible or keenly felt in Prussia. A transfer of proprietorship and control from relinquishment from the Prussian to the Imperial Government at Berlin would not ostensibly differ from the process of transferring from the right hand to the left.

**FO 82/162: George Petre to Marquess of Salisbury,
No 7, Stuttgart, 29 May 1878**

[Received 3 June by messenger. For: The Queen / Lord Beaconsfield / Circulate; S[alisbury]]

Reactions to failed anti-socialist bill; social democracy in Württemberg

The almost contemptuous rejection by the German Reichstag of the Bill introduced by the Imperial Government for the repression of Socialism has not occasioned much regret or apprehension to the Government of this Country, although I am not aware that any opposition was offered to the measure by the Wurtemberg representative⁴¹ in the Federal Council.⁴² It was in fact a matter of difficulty and delicacy for any German Government, whatever its opinion might be as to the expediency or efficacy of the proposal itself, to reject a measure which was to a certain extent the result of the Emperor's own suggestion, and which owed its origin to the recent infamous attempt on His Majesty's life.⁴³ But there is a strong dislike felt by this Government to hasty and exceptional legislation of all kinds even when it is not open to the obvious objections which can be urged against the Bill in question. The spread and influence of Socialism will have to be encountered by other weapons than those which the Bill would have placed in the hands of the Police of every German town. The great feeders of Socialism in Germany are, undoubtedly, the heavy and increasing pressure of taxation, and the general paralysis of industry.

In Wurtemberg, where the Democratic party was once so powerful, the Social-democrats, although not numerically insignificant in

⁴¹Karl Hugo von Spitzemberg.

⁴²For the anti-socialist bill which was rejected by the *Reichstag* on 24 May, see n. 250 in Dresden section.

⁴³For the assassination attempt of 11 May, see n. 242 in Dresden section.

the Capital and in the manufacturing town of Esslingen and its neighbourhood, attract but little attention, and they have no formidable organization as in the North of Germany.

As to political power, they have none; and although they contested Stuttgart at the last election, they have never succeeded in returning a single representative to the Wurtemberg Parliament.

FO 82/162: George Petre to Marquess of Salisbury, No 8, Stuttgart, 29 May 1878

[Received 3 June by messenger. For: The Queen / Lord Beaconsfield / Circulate; S[alisbury]]

Relations between Catholic Church and Würtemberg state; 50th anniversary ceremonies of bishopric of Rottenburg

As shewing the harmony and cordiality of the relations which exist between the Roman Catholic Church and the State in Wurtemberg, in pleasing contrast to the "Culturkampf" and its amenities, I may mention that on the occasion of the 50th Anniversary some days ago of the foundation of the Bishopric of Rottenburg, the King conferred the Grand Cross of the Order of Frederick on D^r von Hefe, the Bishop, and a lesser Order upon the Dean.⁴⁴

The control exercised by the State over the Catholic Church in Wurtemberg, and the rights and obligations of the latter, are regulated by the Law of 1862,⁴⁵ which was passed by the Chambers after their refusal to give legislative effect to the Concordat⁴⁶ which the late King had concluded independently of them with the Holy See a few years previously.

Although the Law modified many of the stipulations of the Concordat, its main provisions were left undisturbed, and the battle was fought by the Chambers more on constitutional than on any other grounds. The Church still considers, or professes to consider, the Concordat, which of course never had any legal validity in Wurtemberg, as governing its relations with the State, but the practical result is, that the law is implicitly and cheerfully obeyed by the clergy, and has never led to any conflict between the spiritual and temporal power. Much of the prevailing harmony is undoubtedly due to the moderation and judgment of Bishop Hefe, but it is also evident that

⁴⁴Anton von Oehler; he was awarded the *Komturkreuz des Württembergischen Kronenordens*.

⁴⁵Law of 30 January 1862.

⁴⁶The Concordat of 8 April 1857 was enacted by Wilhelm I on 21 December 1857 without consultation of the *Landtag*; it was rejected by the *Landtag* on 16 March 1861.

the regulations themselves were wisely and justly framed. It is perfectly true that many of them are not dissimilar from those contained in the Falk Laws,⁴⁷ especially the clauses which relate to the education of the Clergy &c, but the difference of origin, of animus, and above all of the manner in which the laws are applied, is difficult to account for the apparent inconsistency involved in the spectacle of peaceful acquiescence on the one hand, and determined resistance on the other.

**FO 82/163: Audley Gosling to Marquess of Salisbury,
No 11, Stuttgart, 21 February 1879**

[Received 24 February by post. For: St Petersburg under E.S. [flying seal] through Berlin; S[alisbury], 26 February]

Separation of ministries of foreign affairs and justice; appointment of Baron Maucler as Württemberg envoy extraordinary at St Petersburg; cordial Prusso-Württemberg relations

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Your Lordship's Despatch N^o 9, of the 17th Instant, which reached me this afternoon by the Messenger from Darmstadt, transmitting copy of a Despatch addressed to Your Lordship by Lord Augustus Loftus, dated the 28th Ultimo, respecting the appointment of Baron Maucler as Wurtemberg Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at S^t Petersburg.⁴⁸

I am quite unable to attach any political importance to this appointment or to the disconnection of the Wurtemberg Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Justice,⁴⁹ and I venture to trouble Your Lordship with my reasons for entertaining a contrary opinion.

Since the creation of the German Empire the Minor States composing it have confided the great central Power the manipulation of their political foreign affairs; but their Representatives while precluded from negotiating and finally signing treaties of Commerce and Navigation, have been, nevertheless, independently employed in the transaction of the commercial affairs of their respective Countries.

During the Debates which took place here in the Chamber of Deputies in 1873, which were fully reported to Earl Granville by Her Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires⁵⁰ and the late M^r Eden, it was clearly

⁴⁷For the May Laws (Falk Laws), see nn. 112 and 140 in Berlin section.

⁴⁸On 23 January 1879 Maucler was promoted from chargé d'affaires to envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary at St Petersburg.

⁴⁹On 21 December 1878 Eduard von Faber succeeded Hermann von Mittnacht – who remained minister president and foreign minister – as minister of justice.

⁵⁰George Glynn Petre.

shewn that both the Crown and the Parliament attached the highest importance to the maintenance of certain diplomatic Posts and those of St Petersburg and Berlin were voted almost unanimously by the Chambers.

Since that period Wurtemberg has jealously guarded her rights of Diplomatic representation in these Capitals as well as at Vienna.

The promotion of Baron Maucler, whose Letters of Credence as Chargé d'Affaires to the Russian Court date from 1873, arose from simple and very natural Causes. He passed some months here on Leave of Absence last Autumn and took an opportunity of urging his Government to invest him with the superior rank of Envoy, with, however, no increase of salary. His reason for this request was that he considered it derogatory to his national dignity to rank after the newly appointed diplomatic Agents of Servia, Montenegro, &ca, and I believe I am correct in stating that Baron Maucler's promotion was mainly due to considerations of a personal and family character.⁵¹

As regards the separation of the Portfolios of Foreign Affairs and Justice, which I had the honor to report to Your Lordship in my Despatches Nos 38 and 47, of the 12th and 22nd of December last, I venture further to disagree with the interpretation attaching to this measure.⁵²

In 1873 when the Budget was under consideration in the Chamber of Deputies, a Petition⁵³ was presented to the Government to reduce as far as possible the Civil Service Estimates, and to consider the propriety of amalgamating the Departments of Justice and Foreign Affairs, without, however, encroaching on the independent character of the latter. This proposition, as Your Lordship is aware, was carried into effect and the Portfolio of Foreign Affairs held by Baron Waechter was transferred to Herr von Mittnacht, then Minister of Justice, and practically leading Member of the Cabinet. Economical considerations were therefore the cause of this measure, and the recent separation of these offices was due solely to the inability of Herr von Mittnacht to perform the several duties of President of the Ministry, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Minister of Justice and Member of the Federal Council.

⁵¹Queen Olga of Wurtemberg was the daughter of the Russian emperor, Nicholas I.

⁵²In No 33 of 28 January 1879 (copy in FO 163/150) Loftus noted that when 'the German national feeling for German Unity was at its height' the existence of Wurtemberg's Ministry of Foreign Affairs was due only to its amalgamation with the Ministry of Justice. The reinstatement of a separate ministry could be seen as a symptom of change in Wurtemberg's attitude towards the German Empire.

⁵³Gosling is referring to the motion presented by the finance committee of the Wurtemberg *Landtag* on 8 August 1873 as part of its report on the budget for the years 1873–1875.

I believe I can confidently state that public opinion here has undergone no change whatever in regard to the attitude of the Kingdom of Wurtemberg towards the German Empire; that the relations between Herr von Mittnacht and Prince Bismarck were never more cordial; and that in a political, as well as in a Military sense, German Unity is as dear as ever to the subjects of this Country.

**FO 82/164: George Petre to Earl Granville, No 9,
Stuttgart, 12 May 1880**

[Received 15 May by post. For: The Queen / Gladstone / Qy: Berlin; F.S.S. [Francis S. Stephens]; G[ranville]]

Mittnacht's reactions to political friction between Bismarck and smaller states over proposed stamp duties

I had an opportunity yesterday of conversing with Herr von Mittnacht for the first time since his return from Berlin, and although His Excellency was, as usual, somewhat reserved and reticent on the subject of the relations between Prince Bismarck and the Federal Council, it was apparent that the events of the last few weeks at Berlin, culminating in the remarkable speech of the Chancellor in the Reichstag on the 8th instant,⁵⁴ have produced in His Excellency's mind a feeling of weariness and discouragement, not to use a stronger term, tempered by a sense of relief that for some months at least there will be a cessation of these stormy episodes.

As regards the vote in the Federal Council some weeks ago on the subject of the proposed Stamp Duties on Post Office Order Receipts, which led the Chancellor, in a fit of anger, to send in his resignation to the Emperor, Herr von Mittnacht said that Wurtemberg objected to this duty on technical grounds, and had consequently opposed it, but that the whole conflict on so trivial a matter would have been avoided if the Prince had only allowed it to be known beforehand that he attached the slightest value to the tax in question.⁵⁵ Instead of which no one knew that he took any interest at all in the matter, whilst on the other hand the speech of the representative of the Imperial Post Office in the Council,⁵⁶ in strong opposition to the measure, certainly warranted the belief which was entertained by those who represented

⁵⁴For Bismarck's speech of 8 May 1880, see pp. 360–361.

⁵⁵The Federal Council rejected the clause in the stamp duty bill concerning post office order receipts on 3 April 1880. For Bismarck's subsequent request for release from office, see n. 370 in Berlin section.

⁵⁶Paul Fischer.

the Smaller States that in opposing the tax they were not voting against the Chancellor's wishes.

In respect to Prince Bismarck's recent speech in the Reichstag in which his elegiac reproaches and his censure are directed with tolerable impartiality against the Governments of Germany and the political parties in the Reichstag, I asked Herr von Mittnacht whether he considered that the Wurtemberg government was amongst those alluded to. His Excellency said he thought not. "But", he added, "what sting can there be in a charge of "Particularism", when such a man as Herr Delbruck is called a "particularist" by the Prince". "In one sense of the word", His Excellency added, ["every representative of a German Government in the Federal Council is a particularist, and must be so, for he is there to represent the special interests of his particular country in a Federal Empire.["]

FO 82/164: George Petre to Earl Granville, No 20, Stuttgart, 2 September 1880

[Received 4 September by post. Qy: 'Ask W.O. whether there are any regulations as to the enlistment of foreigners in the Proposition allowed by the Act 1 Vic. C 29'⁵⁷, J.P. [Julian Pauncefote]; 'What answer?'; P. Le P.T. [P. H. Le Poer Trench], 6 September; 'Copy to War Office left 8 September', F.S.S. [Francis S. Stephens]; 'Answered', 29 September]

Enlistment of foreigners in British army

The applications to me from German Soldiers, many of them non commissioned officers, who have served their time in the German Army, and are desirous of entering the Queen's Army Service, have become latterly so frequent that, although I give the same answer to all, viz that foreigners are not enlisted in the British Army, I think it my duty to refer the matter to Your Lordship for instructions as to whether I am right in absolutely rejecting every proposal of enlistment. One reason for my asking the question is, that articles have lately appeared in some of the German newspapers, amongst other the "Kreuz Zeitung", stating that foreigners, especially Germans, are being enlisted in considerable numbers in Her Majesty's Service. Whether this statement be correct or not, it is believed by those applying to Her Majesty's Legation for information as to enlistment, and therefore I should be glad to be able to confirm or contradict it.

⁵⁷Enlistment of Foreigners Act 1837.

**FO 82/165: Gerard F. Gould to Earl Granville, No 54,
Stuttgart, 15 November 1881**

[Received 5 December by messenger. For: The Queen / Gladstone; H.P.A. [Henry Percy Anderson]; G[ranville]]

Result of Reichstag elections in Württemberg

The results of the recent elections for the Imperial German Parliament, in which the Kingdom of Wurtemberg is represented by 17 Deputies, are now fully known.⁵⁸

In the late Imperial Parliament a majority of 11 of the 17 Deputies returned by Wurtemberg generally supported Prince Bismarck's views on all internal questions, whilst only 6 of the number (3 of the People's party ("Volkspartei"[]]) and 3 of the Centre or Catholic Party ("Centrum") were in opposition.

In the present Imperial Parliament the numbers are exactly reversed, a majority of 11 of the 17 Wurtemberg Deputies (7 of the People's Party and 4 of the Centre or Catholic party) having been elected as opponents, and only 6 (belonging to various parliamentary fractions) as supporters of the Imperial Chancellor's home Policy.

The most noteworthy feature in the recent elections in this Kingdom for the Imperial Parliament is the increase from 3 to 7 of the Deputies returned by the People's Party, a Party of which little had been heard of late years, though it is said to have at one time exerted considerable political influence.⁵⁹ As its name indicates it professes ultra Democratic doctrines with a strong bias in favor of Republicanism, some of its leaders having already gone so far as to proclaim on the hustings that the time is at hand when Monarchical Government will have become as much of an anomaly as many other feudal institutions which have long ceased to exist.

In this portion of the German Empire the discontent caused by the ever increasing pressure of the Military and fiscal burdens imposed on the population is so great, and the opposition to the projected legislative changes so general, that any fresh appeal to the constituencies would be extremely hazardous, and would almost certainly result in further developing the Democratic and subversive tenets held by the People's party ("Volkspartei").

⁵⁸The *Reichstag* elections were held on 27 October; the run-off ballot ended on 14 November 1881.

⁵⁹The left liberal German People's Party (*Deutsche Volkspartei*, established 1868) had its roots in the *Demokratische Volkspartei* (founded in the German smaller states in 1864 and most prominent in Württemberg).

**FO 82/166: William H. Haggard to Earl Granville,
Confidential, No 35, Stuttgart, 19 April 1882**

[Received 24 April by messenger. For: The Queen / Gladstone / Paris / St Petersburg; H.P.A. [Henry Percy Anderson]; G[ranville]]

Public opinion on prospects of war with Russia

Although the excitement caused in this part of Germany by General Skobelev's rash utterances has apparently calmed down,⁶⁰ and the papers speak in favorable terms of Monsieur de Giers' appointment,⁶¹ the opinion, or rather, I should say, the conviction of the Public that war between Germany and Russia is not far distant, has not been shaken.

Germans of all classes, soldiers and civilians, speak of this eventuality as a foregone conclusion and I have not yet heard anyone express a contrary opinion.

This conviction, is, I am told, exactly similar to that prevalent in Germany for some time previous to the Franco-German war, and, however little it may be justified by events, it is in itself so far dangerous, that it perhaps now, as then, may lead to, if it does not indicate, a certain eagerness on the part of the people to take up a quarrel which they have been long expecting to have forced on them.

General Schachtmayer, the Prussian Military Commandant in, or rather of Wurtemberg, who lately held the same important post at Strasburg, and who from his high position and reputation may possibly share to a certain extent the confidence of his chiefs, has expressed to me in the most emphatic terms his conviction of the certainty of eventual war. He added, significantly, that Russia would not find Germany unprepared. No officer, indeed, with whom I have conversed on the subject, has expressed any doubt as to the result, even if France should, as they expect she will, be unable to resist the temptation of throwing in her lot with Russia.

They base their confidence, partly on their Austrian alliance,⁶² but more on the extraordinary state of efficiency into which their own army has now been brought. Ever since the French war their system has been gradually perfected, and I have observed that during the last few months, the military authorities have redoubled their efforts to get their troops into the highest possible state of discipline, and their transport &c into the most accurate working.

⁶⁰For Skobelev's speeches, see n. 226 in Munich section.

⁶¹Nicholas de Giers was appointed Russian foreign minister in April 1882.

⁶²For the Dual Alliance of 1879, see n. 318 in Berlin section.

**FO 82/166: Gerard F. Gould to Earl Granville, No 72,
Stuttgart, 8 July 1882**

[Received 17 July by messenger. For: The Queen; H.P.A. [Henry Percy Anderson]; G[ranville]]

Prince Wilhelm of Württemberg's depression following the death of his wife; speculation on his withdrawal from the succession

Prince William of Wurtemberg, accompanied by his infant daughter, Princess Pauline, returned on the 5th instant to his favourite country seat of Marienwald near Ludwigsburg from Arolsen, where he has been staying since the death of his Consort.⁶³

The Prince, who is said to be quite broken-hearted has, it appears, expressed a decided wish to be at once relieved from his military duties as Commander of the Cavalry Brigade at Ludwigsburg, a position he has held for some considerable time.

It is feared that if His Royal Highness should continue in his present depressed frame of mind this step may prove but preliminary to his complete withdrawal from public life and possibly to his formal renunciation of his rights to the succession to the Crown of Wurtemberg. What has given rise to this apprehension is not so much any distinct avowal on his part as the well-known fact that His Royal Highness has been from his early youth upwards so extremely simple in his habits, so averse to taking a prominent part in all public displays and of such a nervously diffident and retiring a disposition that there is reason to believe that he would, even under the most favourable circumstances, have looked forward with dread to being called upon to occupy the exalted position he would eventually become entitled to in the ordinary course of events.

Although His Royal Highness must be aware that the loyal support readily granted to the new German Empire by the Wurtemberg people has in no way diminished their deep attachment to their Royal House, or their desire to maintain their national autonomy in it's present limited form, yet there are those who believe that, from patriotic motives as a German the Prince would not hesitate to do everything in his power still further to consolidate the union of the whole German race in one great and powerful Empire under the House of Hohenzollerns [*sic*].

The Prince's views are not shared by his Mother, Princess Catherine, and the other Members of the Royal family, who are therefore

⁶³Princess Marie died on 30 April 1882.

strenuously exerting themselves to dissuade His Royal Highness from taking the steps which he appears to contemplate.

[...]

P.S. I have this moment learnt that His Royal Highness has sent in his formal resignation of his military command

**FO 82/166: Gerard F. Gould to Earl Granville, No 97,
Stuttgart, 12 November 1882**

[Received 20 November by messenger. For: The Queen; H.P.A. [Henry Percy Anderson]; G[ranville]]

Remarks on impending general elections in Württemberg; Democratic Party agitating for revision of constitution

General elections for the renewal of the local Legislature (“Landtag”) are to be held throughout this Kingdom at the close of the year.⁶⁴ It is feared in some quarters, and apparently not without reason, that the opposition – the Democratic Party or “Volkspartei” – will succeed in wresting many seats from the Ministerial or National Liberal Party, which has long held undisputed sway in the country, the majority of its Representatives in the Lower Chamber being, place-holders[.]

The opposition are agitating for a revision of the present constitution which was granted by the late King.⁶⁵ This constitution practically leaves matters much in the same state as they were before it was promulgated, and abounds with startling anomalies.

The Ministers are selected by the Sovereign and only responsible to him. Nevertheless all measures of a financial or administrative character have to be discussed and approved by the Legislature before being submitted to the Royal Sanction.

The Legislature consists of two Chambers, which occasionally hold joint sittings.

The Upper or Hereditary Chamber (“Standeshaus”) is composed of the eldest lineal descendants (about 50 in number) of mediatised Princes and feudal Barons, who as such are accorded a number of privileges which to a certain extent place them on a footing of equality with the Sovereign himself. In the course of time the great majority of those “peers” (“Standesherren”) have virtually ceased to be Wurtemberg subjects, because they either possess estates in Austria or Bavaria, where they permanently reside, or have entered the service

⁶⁴Elections were held on 20 December 1882.

⁶⁵Wilhelm I; the constitution was promulgated in 1819.

of foreign Governments. They nevertheless continue to retain their seats in the Württemberg Upper Chamber, as they are allowed to vote by proxy, the result being that its deliberations are frequently carried on by some half dozen members who each dispose of the notes of a certain number of absentees.

The Lower Chamber (“Abgeordnetenhaus”) likewise offers a strange contrast with the Representative Assemblies of other constitutional countries. It numbers about a 100 members, of whom 13 are chosen from among the nobility – 8 Protestant and 3 Roman Catholic Churchmen, who are admitted as the Representatives of their respective Churches in virtues of their ecclesiastical offices – the Rector for the time being of the University of Tübingen. 7 Deputies, each elected by one of the 7 so-called “good” Towns⁶⁶ of Württemberg – and the remainder are returned by the various rural Districts, into which the Kingdom is subdivided for administrative purposes.

It thus happens that utter strangers to the country are admitted to a considerable share in the management of the national affairs, that the nobility, now shorn of most of its territorial possessions and its political influence, is largely represented both in the Upper and in the Lower Chamber and that Stuttgart, the Capital, with a population of over a 100,000 returns but one Deputy in common with other Towns and rural Districts containing less than a fifth of that number of inhabitants.

In these circumstances it is not astonishing that the agitation got up by the Democratic Party for the abolition of the Upper Chamber and the creation of a single Chamber freely and directly elected by the people should be gradually extending to all classes of the population.

FO 82/167: Gerard F. Gould to Earl Granville, No 9, Stuttgart, 18 January 1883

[Received 23 January by messenger. Qy: The Duke of Cambridge / Copy to War Office, 26 January; G[ranville]]

Activities of ‘soldiers’ clubs’; failure to amalgamate Württemberg, Saxon and Bavarian associations with Prussian parent association

Your Lordship is no doubt aware that shortly after the Franco-German war of 1870–71 a movement was started under the auspices of the Imperial Authorities at Berlin to form local associations composed of all the men who had served their time in the Imperial Army.

⁶⁶Stuttgart, Tübingen, Ludwigsburg, Ellwangen, Ulm, Heilbronn, and Reutlingen.

These Associations have the name of “Kriegervereine” (soldiers Clubs). They partake on the one hand of the character of mutual benefit societies, whilst retaining on the other hand a strictly military organization and being to some extent dependent on the protection and support of the Imperial Government.

The object principally aimed at is to keep up amongst old soldiers the traditions of their past services in the ranks of the Imperial Army and to encourage feelings of loyalty and devotion to the Emperor and the Empire. They are accordingly brought together as often as it is practicable either to discuss matters affecting them as a class or to take a prominent part in National Commemorations and other public displays.

By this means the work of hastening the unification of Germany into one compact body politic is effectively promoted, whilst a large, reliable and disciplined mass of men is always kept ready at hand to support the action of the Imperial Government in any emergency which may possibly arise. The number of Members of these “Kriegervereine” (soldiers clubs) has within the last 4 or 5 years enormously increased, in Wurtemberg alone for instance from 4000 to 30,000. It had therefore been thought by leaders of the movement that the time had come when a further step might be safely taken in the desired direction, and the local associations induced to amalgamate with the parent association at Berlin.⁶⁷ This proposal has, however, been rejected in Wurtemberg, Bavaria and Saxony without, as I have been informed on the best possible authority, meeting with any objection on the part of the Emperor of Germany Himself, when the matter was privately brought before him.

⁶⁷ Attempts to form a unified *Deutsche Kriegerverband* were made in May 1881 and March 1882 under the auspices of the *Deutsche Kriegerbund* (founded in 1873). However, provincial war veterans' associations in South Germany – including the *Württemberg Kriegerbund* in December 1882 – refused to join due to differences regarding the mode of their accession and their insistence on organisational independence.