CONTENTS

SYLLABUS

Paper –VII

HISTORY OF EUROPE FROM 1848 TO 1990 A.D.

Chapter-1

Unit – 1: ***The Second republic and the second Empire in France:***
Napoleon IIIrd (1848 to 1887) became emperor from the President. Works of the Provincial Govt. of the second republic. Home and foreign politics of Napoleon IIIrd. Downfall of Napoleon IIIrd. Fall of IInd Empire & the establishment of IIIrd republic. Napoleoncode.

Unit – 2: **Unifecation of Italy:**
Obstacles in the unification of Italy. Attempts to unifoy Italy & the failure of attempts, Growth of Italian unification under the leadership of Mazzini. Garibaldi & Cavour Victor Emanuel II.

Unit – 3: **Unification of Germany:**
Contribution of Bismareh to unify Germany.

Unit – 4: **Eastern problems: The main currents from 1815 to 1870**
Causes & results of Crimean War. Significance of the Eastern question in Europe & affairs upto 1870. Reforms of Tsar Alexander IInd.

Chapter -2

Unit – 5: **England (1815 to 1870):**
The Social & economical conditions of England from 1815 to 1870, Industrial revolution in Europe – its results and efforts on other countries.

Unit – 6: **Expansion of Europe: New Imperialism:**
Reasons for the expansion of European powers & control over the non European World during 19^{th} century – 19^{th} century has been the Europeanization of the world, Expansion of imperialism in Asia by Russia, France & Britain, Division of the continent of Africa by the European powers, France Prussia war (1806).

Unit – 7: ***Beginning and the New Era : New epoch begins after 1871 A.D.***
Characteristics of New epoch – Causes of International problems, Solution of international problems pacificism and cooperation, Second conference of Hague 1907. Working class movement Trade union. Beginning of Armed peace-effects another countries, Socialism and its effects on European countries, Concept of Karl Marx.

Unit -8: **Third Republic in France:**
Problem of 3^{rd} republic of France between (1871 to 1914), Political significance of Dreyfus case. Circumstances leading to the Dual alliance between France & Russia-its consequences.

Chapter -3:

Unit -9: **German Empire (1871-1890) :**
Kalturkampf & reasons of abandoning it by Bismarck aims of Bismarck Foreign policy after 1870 – its results Home policy of Bismark after 1871.

Unit -10: **German Empire (1891-1914):**
Anglo –German relations during 1891 to 1914, Kruger Telegram must stand as one of the greatest blunders in the history of the modern diplomacy, Foreign policy of Kaisar William 2nd of Germany its consequences.

Unit -11: **Russia (1870 to 1914):**
Causes of the Russo – Japanese war and the consequence of her defeat; Growth of nihilism in Russia.

Unit -12: **Italy after 1870:**
Internal and Foreign Policy of Italy between 1871 and 1914, Law of Papal Guarantees – Refusal of Pope for acceptance.

Unit -13: **Berlin Congress (1878): Italy before 1st world war :**
Rise of the party of Voung, Turk and their role cause and results of voung turk revolution the History of the first and second Balkan wars the results of these wars.

Unit -14: **German Empire (1891-1914) : Causes of friction between Austria and Hungry and Serbia after 1890:**
The sequence of events from the Turkish Revolution of July 1908 to the Austrian declaration of war upon Serbia in July 1914.

Unit -15: **Partition of Africa First World war causes & results main contents of peace conference at Paris in 1919**
Russian revolution, Europe between two world wars, League of Nations, Rise of Dictatorships 2nd world war and U.N.O. : Reconstruction of Europe cold war NATO Warsaw pact.

CHAPTER– 1

UNIFICATION OF STATES IN EUROPE

STRUCTURE

1.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After studying the chapter, students will be able to :

- state the history of Napoleon III, his policies and downfall;
- understand the unification of Italy;
- explain the unification of Germany;
- discuss the causes and consequences of Crimean War.

1.2 INTRODUCTION

With Napoleon safely removed from the scene, in distant St Helena, the Bourbon king Louis XVIII - restored to the throne now for the second time - attempts to establish the constitutional monarchy which has been the condition of his dynasty's return.

NOTES

The pattern is intended to echo the parliamentary system established in Britain, with one chamber made up of peers and another of elected deputies. As with the Cavalier parliament after the English restoration in 1660, the first elections result in an ultra-royalist majority. Vengeance for the recent sufferings of the landed classes is high on the agenda.

The king, personally inclined to moderation, contrives to steer a middle course for a few years after 1816, when new elections return a more centrist parliament. But his task is made more difficult after the assassination, in 1820, of his nephew the duc de Berry.

The event prompts an immediate swing to the right, accentuated because the young man's father - the future Charles X - is already the leader of the ultra-royalist faction in the country. The 1820s see a continuous drift towards reactionary policies, including the unscrupulous revision of the franchise to favour the rich. The process aecelerates after Charles X succeeds his brother in 1824.

At the very start of his reign Charles X makes a dramatic statement of his intended policy. He has himself crowned in the cathedral at Reims. The Holy Ampulla, believed to have been brought from heaven by the Holy Ghost, has been smashed by a republican in 1793. But Charles is relieved to discover that faithful royalists have rescued the few drops of the sacred liquid needed for his anointment. The ceremony can be carried out with full medieval pomp.

Appropriate political measures follow. Power is returned to the clergy. The Jesuits reappear. Large sums of money are allotted to recompense the aristocracy for lost lands.

Hostility mounts and is even expressed in parliament. Charles responds by selecting increasingly right-wing ministers. Eventually in desperation, on 26 July 1830, he dissolves the elected chamber, severely restricts the freedom of the press, and announces a new electorate limited to 25,000 grandees.

This is too much for the Parisians, always conscious of their revolutionary traditions. Barricades appear once again in the streets. Angry crowds brandish the tricolour, symbol of the revolution but replaced since 1815 by the Bourbon flag. The mood is captured in romantic form in Delacroix's inspirational painting of this same year, Liberty Guiding the People.

After three days of street-fighting (July 27-29), the people win. Charles X, king of pomp and ceremony, flees from the city. In his place there arrives a distant Bourbon cousin, Louis Philippe, the duc d'Orléans. He cuts a very different figure.

When he presents himself on July 31 at the Hôtel de Ville, Louis Philippe is wrapped in a tricolour. In an extraordinary echo of distant events, he is greeted on the steps by Lafayette - a leading player in a similarly dramatic scene in Paris forty-one years earlier, in 1789. On 9 August 1830, Louis Philippe is formally

proclaimed 'king of the French ... by the will of the people'. He becomes known, with good reason, as the Citizen King.

1.3 THE JULY MONARCHY : AD 1830-1848

NOTES

The Citizen King finds it hard to govern a nation in which the number of disaffected factions has increased with each change of regime. The extreme left wing, deriving from the Jacobins, has recently found new support in the increasingly industrialized cities. Meanwhile more moderate republicans, also with their roots in the revolution of 1789, hope for a system akin to that of the Directory.

The imperial years have also left a Bonapartist faction, dreaming of a new empire linked with Napoleon's family. Even the royalists, having achieved their main purpose with the Bourbon restoration, are now split into two incompatible groups.

The royalists faithful to the main Bourbon dynasty, describing themselves as the Legitimists, believe that Charles X's grandson (son of the assassinated duc de Berry) should be king as Henry V, with Louis Philippe merely regent. The other royalist faction, backing Louis Philippe, are known as the Orleanists.

Louis Philippe lacks a clear democratic mandate (the franchise in his reign extends only to some 200,000 wealthy citizens), yet he has little of his own to offer - except the first glimpse of a trend which becomes familiar only in the late 20th century. As the bourgeois monarch, he can be seen walking in the streets carrying his own umbrella. Fascinated at first, Parisians soon find this uninspiring.

The result is a reign both unsettled and violent. There are several attempts on Louis Philippe's life (eighteen people are killed and many wounded in 1836, when assassins contrive an 'infernal machine' which can fire twenty-five guns simultaneously at a royal procession). And there are frequent republican uprisings - in Lyons in 1831, in Paris in 1832, in both cities again in 1834.

The predictable response is a clampdown on political liberty. This provides some calmer years at a time of prosperity in the early 1840s. But from 1846 political dissatisfaction coincides with economic setback, with the wheat and potato crops failing in much of Europe.

In 1847 a campaign for constitutional reform is conducted in a series of high-profile banquets. Feeling threatened by this campaign, the government bans a banquet due to be held on 22 February 1848 in Paris. The result is a large demonstration and the reappearance of barricades in the streets (with a new element, the red flag of socialism, now seen in working-class districts).

The usual pattern of escalation occurs. On February 23 troops fire on the demonstrators. The following day Louis Philippe abdicates and withdraws to England. He intends his grandson to succeed him. But the Paris crowd, converging on the Hôtel de Ville, proclaims instead France's second republic.

NOTES

1.4 THE SECOND REPUBLIC : AD 1848-1852

In its first few days the provisional government of the new republic passes several radical measures. It proclaims the right of everyone to work, proposes state-run national workshops to ensure full employment, limits the length of the working week, and introduces universal male suffrage over the age of twenty-one - increasing the electorate at a stroke from 200,000 to some nine million.

Within weeks the national workshops are deemed impractical and are abandoned, being replaced with schemes such as the extension of military conscription. The result is an insurrection in the working-class districts of Paris, in June 1848. It is ruthlessly suppressed by the republican government.

In the light of these events, and of the rash of revolutions elsewhere in Europe this summer, the electorate inclines to an authoritarian figure when the moment is reached, in December 1848, for the choice of the republic's first president. The winner is Louis Napoleon, nephew of the emperor. He receives more than five million votes, nearly four times the score of his nearest rival.

This is a moment for which Louis Napoleon has been working tirelessly, often to tragicomic effect. At dawn one day in 1836 he has presented himself in Napoleonic uniform to an artillery regiment in Strasbourg, inviting them to join him in restoring his uncle's empire. When they fail to do so, he is inevitably arrested.

On that first occasion the French king, Louis Philippe, thinks it wise to underplay this feeble act of insurrection. Louis Napoleon is quietly deported to the United States. But he would be emperor, is not so easily discouraged. In 1840, he lands near Boulogne with fifty followers and invites the garrison to help him recover his rightful empire. Again he is arrested, but this time he is tried and imprisoned for life. In 1846 he escapes, disguised as a labourer, and makes his way to London.

The election of a president in 1848 at last offers him a legitimate route to power. Even with his somewhat preposterous track record, Louis Napoleon sweeps to victory on the popular vote. Such is the magic of the family name.

The presidency is for a fixed term of four years. Louis Napoleon skilfully builds up support around the country, but he fails to persuade the national assembly to vote a change of law enabling him to continue in office after 1852.

He resolves this dilemma with a brilliantly organized coup d'état. During the night of 1 December 1851 troops enter the assembly in Paris while large numbers of Louis Napoleon's political enemies around the country are arrested. He then uses the Napoleonic device of a plebiscite to seek the nation's approval for a new constitution.

Louis Napoleon is helped by the fact that the assembly, inclining again to royalist sympathies, has in 1850 disenfranchised some three million of France's

poorest voters. He restores universal male suffrage in time for the plebiscite on December 20, in which he asks for dictatorial powers as president for a span of ten years. Seven and a half million voters approve of his plans, with less than a tenth of that number registering dissent.

A year later he again follows his uncle's example, enquiring whether the French people would like him to be their emperor. Once more an overwhelming majority say yes. Louis Napoleon takes the title Napoleon III, being supposedly the third ruler in his line. France's Second Empire begins.

1.5 THE SECOND EMPIRE AT HOME : AD 1852-1870

The constitution established by Napoleon III, with the mandate of the plebiscites of 1851 and 1852, enables him to rule with virtually unrestricted personal authority. The members of the upper chamber are appointed. The lower house is elected for six years but sits for only three months in the year; its debates are published in censored form, and the press is under similar restrictions.

After years of weak rule and public disorder, France at first welcomes firm government. The economic cycle is on the upturn. Industrialization is proceeding apace. The network of railways is greatly extended, radiating out from Paris. Financial services are developed. Reduction of tariffs leads to a marked increase in levels of trade.

These signs of prosperity and national energy are reflected in a glittering court life very different form the drab example set by the Citizen King. In 1853 the emperor marries a beautiful Spanish countess, Eugénie de Montijo. The empress becomes the central figure in the glamorous festivities which are the public face of the Second Empire.

Nevertheless by the end of the decade there is mounting dissatisfaction at the moribund political scene masked by this glitter. Napoleon III responds to the challenge with sound political sense. Rulers have traditionally clamped down at the first sign of unrest, but he takes the opposite course. He defuses the situation by becoming more liberal.

An amnesty announced in August 1859 allows the return of many political exiles. In 1860 the elected assembly is given greater powers and the restraints on the press are somewhat eased. The new atmosphere encourages political dissent (in the election of 1863 there are two million opposition votes, and republican candidates do well in the larger cities), yet the emperor does not reverse the direction of his policy.

Further relaxations are decreed in 1867. By the 1869 election the opposition vote has increased to three million. Again the emperor is undeterred. The public's message prompts him to restore genuine parliamentary government.

NOTES

The leader of the liberal group in the lower chamber, Émile Ollivier, is invited to form a ministry. He and his colleagues devise with the emperor a constitution which is put to the people in 1870 in yet another Napoleonic plebiscite. Once again it passes handsomely, with more than seven million voters expressing their approval.

An imperial dictatorship has been transformed, almost seamlessly, into a constitutional monarchy. The new arrangement is hailed as the 'liberal empire'. But it is destined to have only two months of life. Napoleon III's relative failure in foreign policy has undoubtedly made him more inclined to grant concessions at home. But a final and costly disaster, at the hands of Prussia, proves the last straw.

1.6 THE SECOND EMPIRE ABROAD : AD 1852-1870

Fascinated by every detail of his illustrious uncle's career, Napoleon III is eager to play a similarly impressive role on the international stage. His first major undertaking achieves all he might wish. By standing up to Russia in 1852 on the issue of the Holy Places in Palestine, he pleases Roman Catholic opinion in France. In the resulting Crimean War, France is on the winning side. And the holding of the peace talks in Paris in 1856 gives the new empire a visibly central role in European affairs.

But this is the last of Napoleon III's foreign policies to turn out exactly as he would wish.

In 1859, he undertakes an adventure in north Italy, the arena which saw many of Napoleon I's greatest successes. His intention is to repeat the earlier Napoleonic achievement of sweeping the Austrians from Italy. To some extent he succeeds in his aim.

After a narrow victory at Magenta in June he enters Milan as a liberator (and by agreement brings Savoy and Nice back within French borders). But his sudden treaty with Austria, after the horrors of Solferino, leaves almost everyone dissatisfied.

During much of the 1860s France's main foreign involvement is in Mexico, where the ill-conceived attempt to set up an empire under French patronage ends in utter disaster in 1867.

But Napoleon's downfall comes at the hands of Prussia, the nation so profoundly humiliated by his uncle in 1807.

In 1866, the emperor is wrong-footed by the rapid victory of Prussia over Austria in the Seven Weeks' War. This leaves France with an unexpectedly powerful and uncompromising neighbour on her eastern frontier. War between the two is now perhaps inevitable - though when it does occur, in 1870, the immediate cause is a succession of diplomatic bungles and deceptions.

NOTES

1.7 FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR : AD 1870-71

Ever since Prussia's rapid success in the Seven Weeks' War of 1866, and the resulting consolidation of Prussian territory on the Rhine, there has been alarm and resentment in France at the growth of this ambitious neighbour. It is dramatically increased in 1870 when news leaks on July 3 that a prince of the Prussian Hohenzollern family has been offered, and has accepted, the vacant throne of Spain.

Having fought so often in the past against being surrounded to south and east by the Habsburg dynasty, there is public outcry in France at the prospect of the same trick now being pulled off by the Hohenzollern. In an escalating crisis, the Prussian king William I withdraws his relation's candidacy on July 12.

The matter might have rested there, but for a diplomatic blunder on the French side. The French ambassador, in an audience with William I at Ems on July 13, demands an assurance (amounting to a slur on the king's good faith) that the candidacy will never be renewed. William refuses to give this assurance. He then sends a telegram to Bismarck describing, in neutral terms, the audience and its outcome.

Bismarck, irritated at the collapse of his Spanish policy, shortens the telegram before publication in such a way as to imply that the Prussian king has treated the French ambassador with disdain. Public opinion in France, already inflamed, now explodes. The French government declares war on Prussia on July 19.

France suffers as rapidly and as conclusively at Prussia's hands as Austria did four years previously. Again the significant period of warfare lasts less than seven weeks. In early encounters near Metz the French almost hold their own against the Prussians, but by August 31 a large French army is surrounded near Sedan.

During September 1 the French cavalry, charging desperately to break out of the encirclement, suffer heavy casualties from the Prussian artillery. On the following day the French surrender. After losses in the battle of 38,000 men (killed, wounded or missing), another 83,000 now lay down their arms and become prisoners of the Germans. Among them is the French emperor himself, Napoleon III.

The events at Sedan bring to an end one empire, in France, and hasten the creation of another, in Germany. But they do not immediately end the war.

When the news of Sedan reaches Paris, a government of national defence is rapidly formed. Its first action, on September 4, is to depose Napoleon III and declare a republic. But there is nothing now to stop the German army on its march towards Paris. The siege begins on September 19. The only chance of relieving the city is to raise new armies in the provinces. And here aeronautics play their first significant role in warfare.

NOTES

On October 7, a balloon rises from Paris (historic city of the balloon). It floats above the Germany army and lands far beyond their lines. It carries Léon Gambetta, minister of the interior in the new republican government. Two days later he reaches Tours and begins to orchestrate a campaign of guerrilla warfare which severely disrupts the smooth Prussian military operation.

But it can only delay the eventual capitulation. Early in 1871, on January 23, delegates from Paris pass through the German lines to Versailles to agree an armistice. They find the Prussians in an excited mood. Just five days previously, in Louis XIV's famous hall of mirrors in the palace of Versailles, the Prussian king has been proclaimed emperor of a united Germany.

1.8 THE PARIS COMMUNE : AD 1871

The Paris delegates to Versailles win peace at a humiliating cost. France is to cede Alsace and much of Lorraine to Germany, to pay a massive indemnity of 5000 million francs, and to support a German army of occupation until the money is provided. Moreover Bismarck insists on immediate elections to provide a national assembly with the authority to sign a treaty.

Elections are held on February 8 and the assembly meets at Bordeaux on February 13. On March 1, the German terms are formally accepted. On that same day the Prussian army marches in a victory parade through the streets of Paris. The crowd watches in sullen silence. Trouble is in store.

There are many causes of Parisian resentment other than the parade itself. The government's capitulation has made meaningless the suffering endured in the four-month siege. Even worse, the composition of the recently elected assembly suggests that the new republic, acclaimed only six months previously, is already in danger. Republican delegates are in a minority, easily outnumbered by royalists (elected in rural areas) whose political aim is the return of the Bourbon dynasty. Ominously, the assembly decides to sit in Versailles rather than Paris.

In these circumstances Parisians rediscover the heady mood of the first French revolution. As then, radical unrest finds strength in alliance with the National Guard.

On March 18 the government tries to disarm the Paris National Guard. The result is an insurrection. Two generals are captured and shot by the insurgents. The government forces withdraw from the city. By March 26 municipal elections have provided a central committee which calls itself the Commune of Paris.

The committee is a radical body in the now well established revolutionary tradition (some of the delegates are also members of the International). It passes a few left-wing measures - in particular the immediate cancellation of past debts to landlords. But the circumstances leave little time for politics. Paris is again under siege, this time from French forces.

NOTES

On May 21 government troops re-enter Paris through an undefended suburb. A week of bloody street fighting ensues, with the communards defending a succession of barricades, until a final battle is fought and lost in the Père Lachaise cemetery. But the deaths in this week of violence are nothing to the revenge which follows the fall of the commune. Thousands are dragged into the streets and killed by soldiers of the national army. The Figaro emphasizes the need to 'Purge Paris' of an evil which stretches back through 1848 to 1793.

The third French republic has a violent birth and it proves extremely unstable, with thirty governments in the first twenty years. But it lasts.

1.9 POLICIES OF NAPOLEON III

On the surface, France under Napoleon III glittered; in terms of specifics, France was the symbol of success in many areas. During Napoleon III's reign, the French economy flourished due to high demand for French goods, a new banking system put France's financial house in order, and a massive program of public works turned Paris into the envy of the entire world. The city was completely redesigned and improved by Baron Georges Haussmann. Haussmann ripped into poor neighborhoods, replacing them with museums, apartments for the bourgeoisie, brownstones, architectural wonders, wide and straight boulevards, etcetera. Paris, previously the most radical and most volatile of European capitals, took a decidedly more conservative bend—policing was easier, the bourgeoisie pushed the workers into the surrounding suburbs, and the rich came in droves to the center.

In foreign policy, Napoleon III had some success and some horrible failures. As a victor in the Crimean War and a key supporter of Italian unification, Napoleon III made French foreign policy dominant (for a time) on the Continent. With Savoy and Nice back under the French fold, Napoleon III could boast an end to the encirclement imposed upon France after the defeat of his uncle. However, his involvement in Mexico was a fiasco. In 1861, Napoleon III sent a military force to that nation to pacify the Mexican countryside, setting up Austrian archduke Maximilian as emperor of Mexico. France, as Mexico's largest creditor, had the support of Mexico's conservative elite who opposed the liberal policies of the previous president in Mexico City. However, Maximilian suffered from a serious lack of popular support in Mexico; once Napoleon III withdrew his troops to fight in Europe, Maximilian fell to popular uprising and was executed in the summer of 1867. French prestige was damaged and public criticism threatened to bring down Napoleon III's regime.

The proximate cause of the demise of the Second Empire was France's defeat at the hands of Prussia in the Franco-Prussian War. After Prussia occupied Paris, Napoleon III fled, and Prussia set up an unstable republican government based on universal manhood suffrage and multiparty parliamentarianism.

NOTES

COMMENTARY

To explain the success of the Second Empire, we must see Napoleon III as one of the first modern politicians, keenly aware of the role of public opinion and skillful in the management of information and outward appearances. Napoleon III began his public works project not simply to make Paris a livable place (a reasonable goal, considering how dirty and crime-ridden Paris had been beforehand), but also to show his public and the world how successful and wealthy France had become. He wanted Paris to be the center of world culture and politics not only because he was fiercely patriotic, but also because the effect such international prestige would have on his voting public would be necessary to the maintenance of his regime. Napoleon III mastered the art of the public appearance and the modern-day "photo-op" before such modern politics actually took hold in other places (such as the United States).

The rest of France's success, based primarily on the economic boom in Europe at the time, was not Napoleon III's doing, but we can attribute some credit to him for maintaining it in France. Years of stable, dictatorial rule in Paris brought international investment back into France, resulting in a period of sustained economic growth and a stable period of wages increasing faster than prices. The rich did get richer, but abject poverty in the cities diminished, as well. Granted, poverty remained (despite Napoleon III's original promise in the presidential election of 1848; however, no one could argue against the fact that the economy was improving and France was doing pretty well.

So, why did France fall so easily? It is too easy to point to the cause usually cited in textbooks—that Napoleon III's France was a hollow shell. That might have been true, but so was Austria, so was Russia, so was the Ottoman Empire, and they took much longer to fall from grace. It is possible that France fell first because of Prussia's absolute advantage in strength on the Continent; it was in the wrong place at the wrong time in the face of such a strong enemy.

FOREIGN POLICY

In a speech at Bordeaux in 1852, Napoleon III famously proclaimed that "The Empire means peace", reassuring foreign governments that the new Emperor Napoleon would not attack other European powers in order to extend the French Empire. He was, however, thoroughly determined to follow a strong foreign policy to extend France's power and glory, and warned that he would not stand by and allow another European power to threaten its neighbour. He was also a partisan of a "policy of nationalities" (principe des nationalités) re-casting the map of Europe, sweeping away small principalities to create unified nation-states, even when this seemed to have little relevance to France's material interests. In this he remained influenced by the themes of his uncle's policy, as related in the Mémorial de Sainte-

Hélène, such as Italian unification and a united Europe. These two factors led Napoleon to a certain adventurism in foreign policy, in the opinion of some contemporaries, although this was tempered by pragmatism.

NOTES

The Crimean War

Napoleon's challenge to Russia's claims to influence in the Ottoman Empire led to France's successful participation in the Crimean War (March 1854 – March 1856). During this war, Napoleon established a French alliance with Britain, which continued after the war's close. The defeat of Russia and the alliance with Britain gave France increased authority in Europe. This was the first war between European powers since the close of the Napoleonic Wars and the Congress of Vienna, marking a breakdown of the alliance system that had maintained peace for nearly half a century. The war also effectively ended the Concert of Europe and the Quadruple Alliance, or "Waterloo Coalition" that the other four powers had established. The Paris Peace Conference of 1856 represented a high-water mark for the regime in foreign affairs, when Napoleon had followed through with his ideas.

Asia

In 1857, Napoleon III provided his assistance in negotiations to end the Anglo-Persian War, leading to the March 1857 Treaty of Paris.

In East Asia, Napoleon took the first steps to establishing a French colonial influence in Indochina. He approved the launching of a naval expedition under Charles Rigault de Genouilly in 1858 to punish the Vietnamese for their mistreatment of French Catholic missionaries and force the court to accept a French presence in the country. An important factor in his decision was the belief that France risked becoming a second-rate power by not expanding its influence in East Asia. Also, the idea that France had a civilizing mission was spreading.

This eventually led to a full-out invasion in 1861. By 1862, the war was over and Vietnam conceded three provinces in the south, called by the French Cochin-China, opened three ports to French trade, allowed free passage of French warships to Cambodia (which led to a French protectorate over Cambodia in 1863), allowed freedom of action for French missionaries and gave France a large indemnity for the cost of the war. France did not intervene, however, in the Christian-supported Vietnamese rebellion in Bac Bo, despite the urging of missionaries, or in the subsequent slaughter of thousands of Christians after the rebellion.

In China, France took part in the Second Opium War along with the United Kingdom, and in 1860 French troops entered Beijing. China was forced to concede more trading rights, allow freedom of navigation of the Yangtze, give full civil rights and freedom of religion to Christians, and give France and Britain a huge indemnity. This combined with the intervention in Vietnam set the stage for further French influence in China leading up to a sphere of influence over parts of southern China.

NOTES

In 1866, French naval troops attacked Korea in response to the execution of French missionaries there. Though the campaign against Korea was primarily the work of the ranking French diplomat in China and not formally authorized by the French government, its failure nevertheless resulted in the decline of French influence in the region. In 1867, a military mission to Japan played a key role in modernizing the troops of the Shogun Tokugawa Yoshinobu, and even participated on his side against Imperial troops during the Boshin war.

Italy

As President of the Republic, Louis-Napoléon sent French troops to help restore Pope Pius IX as ruler of the Papal States in 1849 after his rule had been overthrown by the revolutionaries led by Giuseppe Mazzini and Giuseppe Garibaldi who had proclaimed the Roman Republic (although as a Carbonaro he had been involved in plotting a similar revolt in the Papal States during his youth in Italy). This won him support in France from Catholics (although many remained supporters of the Bourbon monarchy at heart). Yet at the same time he had sent an emissary to negotiate with the revolutionary Italian nationalist Mazzini. The Catholic Encyclopedia observes: "In this way the difficulties of the future emperor reveal themselves from the beginning; he wished to spare the religious susceptibilities of French Catholics" and yet to support "the national susceptibilities of the Italian revolutionists—a double aim which explains many an inconsistency" in his policy.

Napoleon remained attached to the ideal of Italian nationalism which he had embraced in his youth, and wished particularly to end Austrian rule in Lombardy and Venice (he always nursed a dislike for Austria as the incarnation of reactionary, legitimist monarchy, and the great barrier to the reconstruction of Europe on nationalist lines. As Emperor, Napoleon dreamed of doing this, and thus satisfying his own inclinations and winning over liberal and left-wing opinion in France (which was passionately in favour of Italian unification) while at the same time supporting the Pope in Rome and thus maintaining conservative and Catholic support in France. These contradictory desires were evident in his policy in Italy.

In April–July 1859 Napoleon made a secret deal at Plombières-les-Bains with Cavour, Prime Minister of Piedmont, for France to assist in expelling Austria from the Italian peninsula and bringing about a united Italy, or at least a united northern Italy, in exchange for Piedmont ceding to France Savoy and the Nice region (which was destined to become the so-called French Riviera). He went to war with Austria in 1859 and won victories at Magenta and Solferino, which resulted in the ceding of Lombardy to Piedmont by Austria (and in return received Savoy and Nice from Piedmont as promised in 1860). After this had been done, however, Napoleon decided to end French involvement in the war. This early

withdrawal, however, failed to prevent central Italy, including most of the Papal states, being incorporated into the new Italian state. This led Catholics in France to turn against Napoleon. Napoleon tried to redress the damage by maintaining French troops in the city of Rome itself, which prevented the Italian government seizing it from the Pope, a policy which Napoleon's devoutly Catholic wife Eugenie fervently supported. However, Napoleon on the whole failed to win back Catholic support at home (and made moves to appeal instead to the anti-Catholic left in his domestic policy in the 1860s, most notably by appointing the anti-clerical Victor Duruy Minister for Education, who further secularized the schooling system). Nonetheless, French troops remained in Rome to protect the Pope until the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870.

NOTES

Grand Scheme for the Americas

Napoleon III envisioned a "Grand Scheme for the Americas", which would consist of three general points. The first involved recognition of the Confederate States of America and a military alliance with them. The second involved reintroducing monarchical rule to Latin America, in the form of Maximillian I in Mexico, and increasing French trade throughout Latin America. The third point involved control over Mexico with the creation of a large buffer state from the Rio Grande to the Baja California peninsula.

Mexico

Another example of Napoleon's adventurism in foreign policy was the French intervention in Mexico (January 1862 – March 1867). Napoleon, using as a pretext the Mexican Republic's refusal to pay its foreign debts, planned to establish a French sphere of influence in North America by creating a French-backed monarchy in Mexico, a project that was supported by Mexican conservatives who resented the Mexican Republic's laicism. The United States was unable to prevent this contravention of the Monroe Doctrine because of the American Civil War; Napoleon hoped that the Confederates would be victorious in that conflict, believing they would accept the new regime in Mexico.

But his imperial dreams would not be so easy to achieve. In Mexico, the French army suffered its first military defeat in 50 years, on the Fifth of May, 1862 in Puebla when the Mexican army under the leadership of General Ignacio Zaragoza defeated a much better-equipped French army. The defeat not only surprised the world, but served to revitalize the national spirit of Mexicans, helping to sustain a guerrilla warfare that lasted 5 years. In the end, it remained the Second Mexican Empire.

With the support of Mexican conservatives and French troops, in 1863 Napoleon installed Maximilian I of Mexico, a Habsburg prince, as emperor. Ruling President Benito Juárez and his Republican forces retreated to the countryside and fought against the French troops and the Mexican monarchists.

NOTES

The combined Mexican monarchist and French forces won victories up until 1865, but then the tide began to turn against them, in part because the American Civil War had ended. The U.S. government was now able to give practical support to the Republicans, supplying them with arms and establishing a naval blockade to prevent French reinforcements arriving from Europe. Due to continued losses inflicted by the Mexican guerrillas loyal to the Republic and the threat of an American military intervention, Napoleon withdrew French troops from Mexico in 1866, which left Maximilian and the Mexican monarchists doomed to defeat in 1867. Despite Napoleon's pleas that he abdicate and leave Mexico, Maximilian refused to abandon the Mexican conservatives who had supported him, and remained alongside them until the bitter end, when he was captured by the Republicans and then shot on 19 June 1867.

The complete failure of the Mexican intervention was a humiliation for Napoleon, and he was widely blamed across Europe for Maximilian's death. However, letters have since shown that Napoleon III and Leopold of Belgium both warned Maximilian not to depend on European support. Empress Eugénie has also been largely blamed for the fiasco, the implication being that she tried to meddle in affairs of state in order to get over her husband's affairs of the heart.

Empress Carlota of Mexico visited Napoleon III and Empress Eugénie at Les Tuileries to request financial and military aid to rescue the agonizing empire, but her petitions were rejected. Carlota in turn insulted the Emperor and his wife by mocking their humble origins. She subsequently declined into mental illness.

United States of America

In the beginning of the 1860s, the objectives of the Emperor in foreign policy had been met: France scored several military victories in Europe and abroad, the defeat at Waterloo had been exorcised, and France was once again a significant continental military power.

During 1861 to 1862, Napoleon III positioned France to intervene in the American Civil War on the side of the Confederacy. The United States repeatedly warned that this meant war but the emperor inched steadily toward officially recognizing the Confederacy, especially after the crash of France's cotton textile industry and his successes in Mexico. Through 1862, Napoleon III met unofficially with Confederate diplomats, raising their hopes that he would unilaterally recognize the Confederacy. The emperor, however, could do little without the support of Britain, which refused to recognize the Confederacy. In 1863 the Confederacy realized there was no longer any chance of intervention, and expelled the French and British consuls, who were advising their citizens not to enlist in the Confederate Army.

NOTES

Prussia

A far more dangerous threat to Napoleon III, however, was looming. France saw its dominance on the continent of Europe eroded by Prussia's crushing victory over Austria in the Austro-Prussian War in June–August 1866. Due in part to his Carbonaro past, Napoleon was unable to ally himself with Austria, despite the obvious threat that a victorious Prussia would pose to France. Napoleon felt secure in the presumption that the war with Austria would be drawn out, or would result in Austrian victory, when he agreed not to intervene in 1864. Yet, having decided not to prevent the Prussian rise to power by allying against her, Napoleon also failed to take the opportunity to demand Prussian consent to French territorial expansion in return for France's neutrality. Napoleon only requested that Prussia agree to French annexation of Belgium and Luxembourg after Prussia had already defeated Austria, by which time France's neutrality was no longer needed by Prussia. This extraordinary foreign policy failure saw France gain nothing while allowing Prussia's strength to increase greatly. In part the reason for the Emperor's blunder must be laid on his deteriorating health during this period—he had begun to suffer from a bladder stone that caused him great pain, even preventing him from riding a horse.

Napoleon's later attempt in 1867 to re-balance the scales by purchasing Luxembourg from its ruler, William III of the Netherlands, was thwarted by a Prussian threat of war. The Luxembourg Crisis ended with France renouncing any claim to Luxembourg in the Treaty of London (1867).

1.10 DOWNFALL OF NAPOLEON III

Napoleon III paid the price for his failure to help defend Austria from Prussia. In 1870, when goaded by the diplomacy of the Prussian Prime Minister (and chancellor of the North German Confederation, and soon of the new German Empire) Otto von Bismarck, he began the Franco-Prussian War. This war proved disastrous for France, and was instrumental in giving birth to the German Empire, which would take France's place as the major land power in continental Western Europe until the end of World War I. In battle against Prussia in July 1870, the Emperor was captured at the Battle of Sedan (2 September) and was deposed by the forces of the Third Republic in Paris two days later.

Napoleon spent the last few years of his life in exile in England, with Eugenie and their only son. The family lived at Camden Place Chislehurst, where he died on 9 January 1873. He was haunted to the end by bitter regrets and by painful memories of the battle at which he lost everything; Napoleon's last words, addressed to Dr. Henri Conneau standing by his deathbed, reportedly were, "Were you at Sedan?"

NOTES

The Emperor died during a multistage process to break up a bladder stone. The surgeon Sir Henry Thompson, sounded the emperor and detected a bladder stone. Surgery was performed on 2 January and 6 under chloroform anaesthesia delivered by Joseph Thomas Clover. The cause of death was reportedly kidney failure and septicaemia. Clover and Thompson signed the post-mortem report with four other physicians; however, it has long been suspected that the operation was botched due to the arrogance of Thompson, resulting in the Emperor's untimely death.

1.11 UNIFICATION OF ITALY

The Italian Unification or Italian Risorgimento is known as the chain of political and military events that produced a united Italian peninsula under the Kingdom of Italy in 1861. These events can be broken down in five stages: Pre-Revolutionary, Revolutionary, Cavour's Policy and the Role of Piedmont, Garibaldi's Campaign in Southern Italy, and the creation of the Italian Kingdom.

Pre-Revolutionary Phase

After the Napoleonic Wars and Napoleon Bonaparte's second defeat, the major powers that has resisted met at a conference called the Congress of Vienna in 1815. The topic of discussion was to limit France's power, set limits on nations so no one nation become too strong, and divide up the territory conquered up by Napoleon. In its negotiations, the congress returned domination of the Italian Peninsula to Austria. Austria now occupied Lombardy and Venice and had considerable influence on other Italian states. One of the few places of independence was the Kingdom of Sardinia, which now controlled Piedmont, Nice, Savoy and Genoa.

Some of the things that conflicted and interfered with the unification process were: Austrian control of Lombardy and Venice, several independent Italian states, the autonomy of the Papal States, and the limited power and influence of Italian leaders.

Revolutionary Phase

During the first half of the 19th century, only aristocrats, intellectual, and upper middle class took the cause for unification. The masses showed no concern. However, the people with a passion for unification started to form secret societies, namely the Carbonari. Although at first, they only demanded more rights from their respective government, the cause began to grow. By 1820, the Carbonari were involved in numerous failed revolutions against the Kingdom of Two Sicilies, the Kingdom of Sardinia, Bolonga, and other Italian states. However, the Austrian Empire crushed all of these revolutions; thus leading to more resentment from the Italians.

NOTES

The soul and spirit of the Carbonari and the revolutions was a man named Giuseppe Mazzini. Mazzini was an idealized who wanted not only wanted a united Italy, but an Italy with a republican form of government. Mazzini brought the campaign for unification into the mainstream when in 1831 he created Young Italy, a group created for the sole purpose to spread the ideas unification, revolutions, and republicanism. In 1846, a liberal pope, Pius IX, was elected who enacted numerous reforms. Soon, other states followed but these reform movements were not enough. A series of uprising known as the Revolution of 1848 occurred throughout Europe including France, Germany, the Austrian Empire, and northern Italy.

The revolution also occurred in the Kingdom of Two Sicilies were the king signed a constitution. In the Papal States, radical took over Rome, causing the Pope to flee. In the absence of the pope, Garibaldi and Mazzini created a republic called the Roman Republic. In Piedmont, after the insistence of nationals, the King Charles Albert sent to Lombardy in their fight for freedom from Austrian rule.

Although some of the revolutions were successful in the beginning, they were quickly crushed. In 1849, France sent troops to Rome and destroyed the short-lived Roman Republic. Piedmont lost to Austria and the king was forced to abdicate, causing his son, Victor Emanuel II to become king in 1849.

After the unsuccessful events of the last few years, unification would seem as a distant dream. However, things were about to change with the appointment of Count Camillo di Cavour as prime minister of Piedmont in 852. With the use of all the political and military tricks in the book, Cavour tackled and succeeded in making this dream into a reality. Italy and Europe would never be the same again.

CAVOUR'S POLICY AND THE ROLE OF PIEDMONT

After the numerous failed uprisings throughout Italy, Camillo di Cavour became the prime minister of the Piedmont (Kingdom of Sardinia) in 1852. By the use of bargaining, putting great powers against each other, war, and political cunning, Cavour was able to unite Italy in a short time.

Although Piedmont was a small state, it had considerable influence due to its military strength, conservative philosophy, and admirable political leader. In addition, Victor Emmanuel II ruled in conjunction with a parliament, thus establishing a legitimate stable form of government and not giving cause to an internal revolution. Although Piedmont exercised a conservative policy, it was loose and constructive in many areas, especially commerce and industry. With the use of commercial treaties, Piedmont began to play an increasing role in commerce in the region as it started to win trade away from Austria. These actions

NOTES

served very popular with the public and were received further progress with Cavour's appointment in 1852. Cavour had a strong belief in scientific and economic progress, and was a firm supporter of unification. However, he did not share the same republic views as Mazzini and Garibaldi. In Cavour's view, unification needed a strong state to lead, namely Piedmont. And Piedmont can only become strong with railroads, economic freedom, stable finances, and a higher standard of living.

Cavour immediately began by implementing some liberal (but necessary) ideas. He encouraged people to participate in government, started to change public opinion by skillfully using the press and the government, and economic freedom, and most importantly spread the propaganda of Italian unity under Victor Emanuel II.

In order to achieve his goals, Cavour needed the help of a strong ally, the leader of France, Napoleon III. France proved to be a good partner because it was a traditional enemy of Austria and any loss of Austrian influence would be beneficial. Also, Napoleon III showed favor to a liberated and united Italian peninsula. To seal the deal of this partnership, both leaders met secretly at Plombieres, a French spa. Piedmont would stir up trouble in one of the territories controlled by Austria, thus forcing Austria to go to war against Piedmont. France would help Piedmont in exchange for Nice and Savoy.

In April 1859, war broke out between Piedmont and Austria. The plan worked very well the joined forces of Piedmont and France won at Magenta and Solferino. Pretty soon, Prussia started to mobilize an army in Austria defense and more Italian provinces wanted to join Piedmont under one nation. Both of these events alarmed Napoleon III because Prussia was starting to have a strong presence in European affairs and more Italian states wanting unification greatly exceeded what he had envisioned for Italy. So he signed an armistice with Austria and ended the war but angered Cavour.

Piedmont received Lombardy from Austria as a result of the war. After the war and the political maneuvering, Piedmont had greatly increased its size. However, Garibaldi's campaign in southern Italy would more than double the size of the kingdom.

Garibaldi's Campaign in Southern Italy

If Mazzini was the soul of the unification process, then Garibaldi was the hero. In early 1860, he started to gather volunteers in Genoa for an expedition to Sicily. As Cavour neither opposed nor helped, thousands of soldiers from Romagna, Lombardy, and Venetia set sail for Sicily in May 1860.

The Expedition of Soldiers, as it was called, was an instant hit with the public. The Kingdom of Two Sicilies had long been a corrupt government and

NOTES

now it was seeing its last days. Although the Garibaldi Red Shirts were less skilled and ill equipped, they were a tremendous success. They occupied Sicily within two months and already Garibaldi was setting his eyes on mainland Italy. However, after his declaration to advance to Rome, instead of stopping in Naples, Cavour became increasingly worried. If Rome was attacked, France and Austria would immediately help the Pope and crush the opposing army, thereby discrediting and destroying the unification agenda.

In yet another brilliant move, Cavour encouraged riots and uprisings in the Papal States thus giving the Piedmontese troops a reason to come under the pretext of maintaining order. In 1860, two thirds of the Papal States joined Piedmont and Rome was left alone. As the Piedmontese army bypassed Rome and the remaining Papal States and marched south, Garibaldi would surprise everyone with one of the most memorable gestures in history. On September 18, Garibaldi gave up command of his army and shook hands with Victor Emanuel II, signifying the unity and formation of the Kingdom of Italy in 1861.

Creation of the Italian Kingdom

Although a Kingdom of Italy had been formed, it did not include all of Italy. The missing parts were Rome and Venetia. Neither could be gained easily because Rome was under the protection of Napoleon III and French troops while Venetia was controlled by Austria and its troops. But an opportunity arrived and Venetia was annexed in 1866. That opportunity was the Seven Weeks' War between Austria and Prussia. Austria promised Venetia if Italy stayed neutral and Prussia promised Venetia if Italy joined them in the war. Italy decided to join Prussia due to a previous agreement. Although the Italian army did poorly, Prussia won the war and it held up its part of the bargain.

In 1870, the Franco-Prussian War occurred between France and Germany and Napoleon III was forced to pull the French troops from Rome to aid the war effort. While Rome and the remaining Papal States remained unprotected, Italian troops marched in unopposed. In October 1870, Rome voted to join the union and in July 1871, it became the capital.

The unification was a long and arduous process. But all the problems that remained before the unification were not solved after the unification. As the last quarter of the century unfolded, this was evident. But, Italy stayed united and focused on solving its new problems. In the end, Cavour, Garibaldi, and Mazzini became the founding fathers of a nation and were immortalized.

1.12 UNIFICATION OF GERMANY

Whereas Camillo di Cavour directed Italian unification, a Junker (the Prussian name for an aristocratic landowner from old Prussia in the east) named

NOTES

Otto von Bismarck pushed German unification through "blood and iron" and skillful understanding of realpolitik. As the map of central Europe stood in 1850, Prussia competed with Austria for dominance over a series of small principalities fiercely keen on maintaining their independence and distinctive characteristics. Prussia proper stretched from modern-day Lithuania to central Germany. Prussia also controlled the German lands around the Rhine River in the west. In between, from Denmark to Switzerland, lay small provinces that Bismarck needed to incorporate under the Prussian crown to create a viable German Empire.

In 1862, Bismarck reorganized the Prussian army and improved training in preparation for war. In 1864, he constructed an alliance with Austria to fight Denmark over Denmark's southern provinces of Schleiswig and Holstein. Prussia received Schleiswig while Austria administered Holstein. That situation, however, could not stand for long, as Austrian Holstein was now surrounded by Prussian lands. Bismarck provoked a conflict with Austria over an unrelated border dispute and in the subsequent Seven Weeks' War—named for its brevity—Prussia crushed the collapsing Austrian army. The peace settlement transferred Holstein to Prussia and forced Austria to officially remove itself from all German affairs.

With Austria out of Bismarck's way, his next obstacle was the skepticism of the southern provinces. Overwhelmingly Catholic and anti-militaristic, the southern provinces doubted Prussia's commitment to a united Germany of all provinces. Prussia's Protestantism and historic militarism made the gulf between north and south quite serious. Therefore, Bismarck turned to realpolitik to unite the Germanic provinces by constructing a war against a common enemy. In 1870, Bismarck forged a note from the French ambassador, implying that the ambassador had insulted the Prussian king. After he leaked this letter to both populations, the people of France and Prussia, roused by nationalist sentiment, rose up in favor of war. As Bismarck hoped, the southern provinces rallied to Prussia's side without any hesitation. In July 1870, France declared war on Prussia. Within a matter of weeks of fighting in Alsace-Lorraine, France lost this Franco-Prussian War. Alsace-Lorraine was transferred to Germany in the peace settlement, allowing Prussia to declare the German Empire, or Second Reich, on January 21, 1871.

COMMENTARY

Like Italy, Germany had quite a few serious issues to resolve once unification took place. Regional differences, developing since the first settlement of the Germanic tribes during the Roman Empire, were distinct, and local princes refused to give up substantial power to the central government. The Berlin assembly, therefore, was kept weak. Germany, like the United States under the Articles of the Confederation, seemed merely a loose of confederation of autonomous states. In Germany's case, one state, Prussia, was absolutely dominant due to its size,

power, and military strength. This, combined with Bismarck's skillful conduct in international and national affairs as chancellor, kept the empire together until 1914.

NOTES

However, the creation of a unified Germany in central Europe marked one of the greatest revolutions in the history of international relations. Since the establishment of nation-states in Europe, France, under the Valois-Bourbon royal line, dedicated its foreign policy to the weakening of Habsburg (Austrian and Spanish royal families) and the continued disunity of the Germanic provinces. Now that central Europe was united into two major powers—Germany and Italy—Europe was quite a different place. What would now become of the traditional balance of power in place since the defeat of Napoleon? The whole point had been that no one nation should gain excessive power and strength on the Continent. With the unification of Germany in central Europe—an essential economic and strategic region—was the balance of power doomed?

1.13 THE CRIMEAN WAR (1854-1855)

For centuries, one central goal of Russian foreign policy was to obtain a warm water port in the south—namely, at the Bosporus Straits and the Strait of the Dardanelles, the small waterways connecting the Black Sea to the Aegean and Mediterranean Seas. In 1854, the decaying Ottoman Empire controlled that essential waterway and Russia sought increased power in this region.

In 1853, St. Petersburg demanded that the Ottoman Empire recognize Russia's right to protect Eastern Orthodox believers in Turkey. When Turkey refused, Russia sent troops into Ottoman territory. Fearing increased Russian power and an upset to the balance of power on the Continent, Great Britain and France declared war on Russia on March 28, 1854. Russia fared well against its weaker neighbor to the south, destroying the Turkish fleet off the coast of Sinope, a port city in north-central Asia Minor. However, in September 1854, the British and French laid siege to Sevastopol, Russia's heavily fortified chief naval base in the Black Sea, lying on the Crimean peninsula. After just under one year of constant battle, the Russian abandoned the fortress, blowing up their fortifications and sinking their own ships. Meanwhile, at nearby Balaklava, British troops charged down a narrow valley that was flanked by Russian guns on both sides. Nearly every British soldier fell dead in what came to be called the Valley of Death. The name of the British group was the Light Brigade, giving rise to the famous Alfred, Lord Tennyson poem, "The Charge of the Light Brigade."

Russia's new tsar, Alexander II, sued for peace in 1856. In the resulting Peace of Paris, Russia relinquished its claim as Christian protector in Turkey, the Black Sea was neutralized, and the balance of power was maintained.

NOTES

COMMENTARY

The Crimean War had the highest casualty rate of any conflict in Europe between 1815 and 1914, the century-long peace maintained by the balance of power. Disease killed many, but poor leadership killed thousands more. It was the final war in which the Ottoman Empire had any victorious role, though even in the Crimea, Russia fared quite well against the Turks. The greater importance of the Crimean War is embodied in one international and one national element.

In terms of European international relations, the Crimean War marked the end of the veritable charade of Russian military dominance on the Continent. Granted, the Russian army was the largest force due to its sheer numbers; however, it was soundly defeated by smaller British and French forces, and its navy proved utterly useless and backward by the middle of the nineteenth century. It was Russia who guaranteed to maintain order and balance after the defeat of the Napoleon—it did so with Austria, Prussia, and France since then. Now, that power was effectively eliminated; therefore, the demise of the balance of power could not be far behind.

On the national scale, the Crimean War, some historians have argued, marked the beginning of the road to the Russian Revolution of 1917.

1.14 CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF CRIMEAN WAR

Although the long term causes of the Crimean War probably were more crucial, the immediate causes of the war—ostensibly, at least—were over religion, particularly over the protectorship of the Holy Places in Jerusalem. The Holy Land was part of the Muslim Ottoman Empire but also was the home of Judaism and Christianity. In the Middle Ages, Christian Europe and the Muslim east had fought the Crusades over control of this land. However, the Christian Church was divided into numerous small denominations. The Eastern Orthodox Church and Roman Catholic Church were the two major branches of Christianity. Unfortunately, these main denominations could not work together. Both of them wanted to control the Holy Places.

In 1690, the Ottoman Sultan granted to the Roman Catholic Church the dominant authority in all the churches in Nazareth, Bethlehem and Jerusalem; then in 1740 a Franco-Turkish treaty stated that Roman Catholic monks should protect the Holy Places. This was intended to ensure the safety of Christians and to enable pilgrimages to Jerusalem; furthermore, the French had asserted their right to rebuild the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem as a Catholic church. However, between 1740 and 1820 the influence of the Roman Catholic Church had been allowed to lapse by natural erosion: there were not many Roman Catholics in that part of the world and Christians tended to belong to the Eastern

NOTES

Orthodox Church. Consequently, protection of the Holy Places had gradually devolved to Orthodox monks. Russia represented the Orthodox Church as its protector and Czar Nicholas I seems to have thought that he had been ordained by God as the leader of the Orthodox Church and the protector of Orthodox Christians. By the 1840s, Russian pilgrims were flocking to the Holy Land, which gave the Czar the excuse to demand that the Russians should be able to provide some form of protection for his subjects there.

In 1850, Louis Napoleon of France decided to champion the cause of Roman Catholics to control the Holy Places; technically he was within his rights but his demands on behalf of the Church allowed him to divert attention from problems in France and also helped him to advocate the idea of a second French Empire. In order to win the support of the majority of the French, Louis Napoleon needed to be seen as a 'good Catholic'; he also wanted to wreak his revenge on Czar Nicholas I for the insult of "mon ami" rather than the traditional "mon frère".

Traditionally, the Pope nominated the Catholic Patriarch of Jerusalem but over many years the office had become a meaningless title; the Patriarch did nothing and lived in Rome. However, in 1847, Pope Pius IX – who had been elected the previous year – sent the Patriarch to live in Jerusalem because in 1845 the Orthodox Patriarch Cyril had chosen to go to live in the city. In 1847 and 1848, there were unseemly scuffles between Catholic and Orthodox Christian monks and priests in Jerusalem; the representatives of the Orthodox Church emerged truimphant: for example, at the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem, Catholics had placed a silver star to commemorate the place of Jesus' birth. It was prised out and stolen, allegedly by Orthodox monks.

The Turks disliked the Russo-French conflict that was taking place on Turkish territory and the Sultan established a commission to examine the claims of the French. France suggested that the Catholic and Orthodox Churches should have joint control over the Holy Places: this led to an uproar in Russia and then deadlock. In February 1850, the Turks sent a diplomatic note to the French, giving two keys to the great door of the Church of the Nativity to the representatives of the Catholic Church. At the same time, the Porte sent a firman [decree] giving secret assurances to the Orthodox Church that the French keys would not fit the lock. However, by the end of 1852 the French had seized control of the Holy Places. This was seen by the Russians as a challenge to their prestige and policy; the Czar also saw Turkey falling under 'foreign' control. Nicholas I wanted Russia to have control over the Near East with the agreement of the western powers, especially Britain, so that Russian expansion could take place peacefully. Nicholas thought that this would be easy to achieve since the Earl of Aberdeen was the British Prime Minister.

In 1844, Czar Nicholas I had paid a royal visit to Britain. Whilst there he talked to staff at the Foreign Office and also to Aberdeen. Informal discussions

NOTES

took place about the Eastern Question but Aberdeen's approach was very different from the traditional scheme of Britain's foreign policy. During the discussions, Aberdeen expressed a very understated policy and consequently was conciliatory to the Czar who went away with misconceptions about Britain's attitude to the Eastern Question as a result. Aberdeen gave the impression of despair and disgust at the corruption of Turkey. The Czar therefore suggested that perhaps a way forward could be to partition Turkey. Aberdeen was not firm in denouncing these ideas or in stating British policy unequivocally, therefore the Czar felt that the partition of Turkey was viable and also that Britain was tired of defending Turkey and would not go to war over the Turkish Empire. Not only did Aberdeen give 'wrong messages' to the Czar, he also decided that the Czar would not go to war over Turkey.

In 1853, the Menschikov Mission arrived in Constantinople from Russia. Menschikov was a Russian soldier and diplomat who was told to coerce the Sultan into giving concessions to Russia within the Turkish empire. The Sultan faced a number of domestic problems at this time: the crisis over the Holy Places; an insurrection in Montenegro; a threatened coup in Serbia. Menschikov told the Ottoman officials that he was unhappy about the Sultan's treatment of Orthodox Christians in the empire and that in order for Russia and Turkey to remain on good terms, the two nations should approve a 'solemn agreement' so that the Russians could redress the grievances of Christian subjects in Turkey. Menschikov demanded the establishment of a Russian protectorate over all Orthodox subjects in the Ottoman Empire — laity as well as clergy: the total number of people who fell into this category was about twelve million. Russian demands led to fears in the Porte that Turkish independence was being threatened; as ever, the Sultan appealed to the Great Powers of Europe for protection against Russian encroachments.

Whilst he was in Constantinople, Menschikov met the British ambassador for discussions about the future of the Ottoman Empire: the British Ambassador was Stratford Canning, a cousin of George Canning. Stratford Canning — who had been created Viscount de Redcliff in 1852 (hereafter, Stratford) — had to make his own decisions because he was not getting a positive lead from the Foreign Office in Britain: the Foreign Secretary in Aberdeen's government was the Earl of Clarendon. Stratford had warned the Foreign Office of potential problems in Turkey and had explained the build-up of tension; he advised a high-profile approach by Britain but got little reaction. It was felt by the government that Stratford was alarmist and was exaggerating. No-one took him really seriously, except Palmerston who advised strong, prompt and effective action. It did not help his position that Stratford disliked the Russians on general and personal grounds. In 1832 he had been recommended as the Ambassador to Russia, but

had been flatly and rudely rejected by the Czar because of his relationship to George Canning. Stratford had never forgotten the snub.

NOTES

Because of Britain's long-standing policy of maintaining the integrity of the Turkish Empire, Stratford had access to the Sultan and encouraged him to refuse the Czar's demands. Stratford almost promised British protection for the Sultan: this was very much over-stepping his brief. Stratford followed a strong line of his own which was in accord with earlier British foreign policy and since he was receiving little guidance from London on how to deal with the problem, he felt that his approach was appropriate to the circumstances. The Sultan resisted Menschikov's demands; by the summer of 1853 Menschikov realised that he was making no progress in Turkey and returned to St. Petersburg to inform the Czar of the situation which in Russian policy appeared to be a failure while France apparently gained. The Czar felt shamed by the lack of success, therefore he decided to find out firstly, how strong the Sultan was and then how strong was Britain's intention to resist Russian encroachment. He thought - after his discussions in 1844 - that Aberdeen would recall Stratford and not fight.

In 1853, Russia invaded Turkish Moldavia and Wallachia which were autonomous areas within the Ottoman Empire. Nicholas' aim was not territorial conquest or to provoke a war but rather to bully and test Turkey, to see what the response would be and to force the Sultan to give guarantees to the Orthodox Church that Christians would be protected from harm. Czar Nicholas I did not expect either a hostile response from Britain or Anglo-French co-operation, given that the two countries were seen as 'natural' enemies. The result of Nicholas' actions were far from what he expected and his gamble did not pay off because he actually put pressure on the European peace.

- France — as personified by Louis Napoleon, now the Emperor Napoleon III — became aggressive and noisy.
- Britain was alarmed because of the threat to Turkey from the perceived Russian expansionist activity. There was therefore much activity with Britain's Mediterranean fleet.
- Austria-Hungary feared invasion because Russia had crossed the Danube, which was Austria's outlet to the Black Sea. Austria therefore began to mobilise.
- When Austria-Hungary began to mobilize, so Prussia started a partial mobilisation, fearing a threat to the Germanic Confederation.

This was very much like the Mehemmet Ali crisis of 1839 which led to the first London Conference so a similar situation had already been dealt with successfully by using international co-operation. The Powers realised this, and did not want a war over a misunderstanding; therefore they called a Conference

NOTES

of Vienna in 1853. It was attended by Russia, Austria-Hungary, Prussia, Turkey, Britain and France, to hammer out a compromise to defuse the situation. They produced the Vienna Note, an official diplomatic document of mediation proposing a compromise which Russia was prepared to accept because she did not want war. It said that the Czar should evacuate Moldavia and Wallachia but that Russia, as the protector of the Orthodox Church, should have nominal protection of Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire and of the Holy Places. The Note confirmed the status quo: neither Russia nor France got anything, but face was saved. Up to now, things were similar to the 1839 crisis: potential problems had been neutralised and a compromise had been arranged. However, previously the Powers had backed up their decisions with joint military support. This was the watershed of the crisis which could have ended at this point, but things went wrong and resulted in the Crimean War. There was no joint military force set up to follow the Note and there was no emphatic diplomacy to make the Sultan accept the Note — unlike the 1839 London Conference after which troops were put in the field to enforce the decisions of the Powers.

There was a positive response to the Vienna Note from the Russians who agreed to it and began to evacuate Moldavia and Wallachia. This proves that Russia was just probing into the Ottoman Empire and did not want war. She had been given nominal protection of the Holy Places and was appeased, if not satisfied. Russia would always make a diplomatic retreat if faced with strong opposition. Unfortunately, in October 1853 the Sultan rejected the Note and declared war on Russia because Stratford had assured the Sultan of British backing and also because Turkish territory had been invaded. The Sultan wanted revenge and he thought that he was assured of British backing. In the past, the Powers had used conjoint force to enforce their views on the Sultan but this time there was no military back-up for their decision. The Powers thought that the Note was enough and they were unable to co-operate among themselves for a variety of reasons :

- Austria-Hungary did not want to get involved in disputes with any of the major Powers and so chose to remain neutral in this instance. She was more concerned with Prussian expansion and the Italian revolts. She feared losing her Italian lands.
- Austria-Hungary and Prussia were mutually suspicious, and Prussia was expanding.
- Russia was opposed by Britain and France.
- Britain (under Aberdeen) was indecisive.
- Russia was disappointed with Austria-Hungary's attitude, after Russian help in suppressing the Hungarian revolt in 1848.

The Sultan was allowed to pursue his own policies because of the diplomatic breakdown; at the same time Stratford was assuring him of British support. By

NOTES

sheer coincidence, a small Anglo-French fleet entered the Straits a few days after the Sultan declared war on Russia (in contravention of the Straits Convention), to protect the Sultan from an internal rebellion. This seemed to endorse Stratford's promise of British help. Turkey's declaration of war and the Anglo-French presence in the Straits gave Russia a reason to retaliate.

In November 1853, the Russian Black Sea fleet based at Sevastopol and the Turkish fleet met at the Battle of Sinope. The Turkish fleet was sunk. It was a provocative action by Russia because she had no real reason to fear Turkey. The affair was reported in the British press as the 'Massacre of Sinope', and caused fever-pitch anti-Russian feeling among the public. It also strengthened the 'war faction' in the Cabinet, for unexplained and obscure reasons. Perhaps a combination of reasons were responsible: it has been argued that

- perhaps the long peace—since 1815—had created a desire for war. It provoked patriotism and expressed the British cock-sure attitude which resulted from her economic, territorial and free trade strength.
- Sinope was a naval victory: Russia clearly had a Black Sea fleet which needed to be defeated before it got into the Mediterranean. The British felt that the Russian naval threat could not be allowed to grow.
- Britain was becoming more and more dependent on trade, especially with India and the east: Sinope followed the Great Exhibition of 1851 that had demonstrated Britain's industrial pre-eminence in the world. The Mediterranean trade and the routes to India could not be jeopardised.
- In Britain, the 'war party' had been growing since the summer of 1853.

Even moderate papers like The Times demanded retribution before Russia over-ran Turkey: Russia could do this legitimately, since Turkey was the country that had declared war on Russia. Demands were made for a British fleet to be sent to the Straits, but the Cabinet was divided between 'war' and 'peace' factions, resulting in indecision. Clarendon, the British Foreign Secretary said that Britain was 'drifting towards war' — something that Aberdeen was trying to avoid. However, he was in an impossible position because not to help Turkey would lead to an expansion of Russian power and to help Turkey meant war. Aberdeen let events drift towards war by indecision in preventing it. By Christmas 1853, the British government was left with little choice.

In the winter of 1853, Lord John Russell proposed a Reform Bill in an attempt to strengthen the Coalition. It was rejected but Palmerston resigned to show his hostility to parliamentary reform. His resignation coincided with the government's indecision over Sinope, but was misinterpreted as a sign of Palmerston's disapproval of the government's foreign policy. That whipped up the war party's enthusiasm in Britain. The British government's dithering continued until March

1854, largely because of Cabinet divisions; then in March 1854 Britain and France jointly declared war on Russia ostensibly in defence of Turkey, but really to control Russia expansionism.

NOTES

From the Vienna Note onwards, it is difficult to see how war could have been avoided: this was even Gladstone's view. Palmerston may have been right: stronger action taken earlier might have stopped Russia. There was some element of Russia calling Britain's bluff, following the Czar's informal talks with Aberdeen in 1844, when Aberdeen's low-profile approach had intimated to the Czar that Britain would never go to war over Turkey. There is much evidence to suggest that Czar Nicholas I was under the illusion that British foreign policy towards Turkey had changed: even that Britain might consider the partition of Turkey, to end the problem; certainly he believed that Britain would not fight over the issue. The long gap of four months before Britain did declare war strengthened Russia's misapprehension. They had expected Britain to rush in, if she was going to do anything.

It was a shock for the Czar to discover that British policy towards the Ottoman Empire had not changed.

1.15 SUMMARY

- In 1847 a campaign for constitutional reform is conducted in a series of high-profile banquets. Feeling threatened by this campaign, the government bans a banquet due to be held on 22 February 1848 in Paris. The result is a large demonstration and the reappearance of barricades in the streets (with a new element, the red flag of socialism, now seen in working-class districts).
- The election of a president in 1848 at last offers him a legitimate route to power. Even with his somewhat preposterous track record, Louis Napoleon sweeps to victory on the popular vote. Such is the magic of the family name.
- The constitution established by Napoleon III, with the mandate of the plebiscites of 1851 and 1852, enables him to rule with virtually unrestricted personal authority. The members of the upper chamber are appointed. The lower house is elected for six years but sits for only three months in the year; its debates are published in censored form, and the press is under similar restrictions.
- Ever since Prussia's rapid success in the Seven Weeks' War of 1866, and the resulting consolidation of Prussian territory on the Rhine, there has been alarm and resentment in France at the growth of this ambitious neighbour. It is dramatically increased in 1870 when news leaks on July 3 that a prince of the Prussian Hohenzollern family has been offered, and has accepted, the vacant throne of Spain.

NOTES

1.16 REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Discuss the establishment of second republic.
2. State the history of Paris Commune.
3. What were the prime foreign policies of Napoleon III?
4. What were the causes of downfall of Napoleon III?
5. How did unification of Italy take place?
6. What were the causes of Crimean War?

1.17 FURTHER READINGS

- Beales, Derek. *The Risorgimento and the Unification of Italy*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1982.
- Craig, Gordon A. *Germany, 1866-1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Smith, Dennis Mack. *Cavour*. London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1985.
- Plessis, Alain. *The Rise and Fall of the Second Empire, 1852-1871*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Freeze, Gregory ed. *Russia: A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Kishlansky, Mark et al. *Civilization in the West*. Vol. II. New York: Longman, 1998.

NOTES

CHAPTER— 2

EUROPE IN 19TH CENTURY

STRUCTURE

2.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After studying the chapter, students will be able to :

- state the social and economic conditions of England from 1815 to 1870;
- understand the history of expansion of Europe in 19th century;
- explain the beginning of new phase in the history of Europe;
- discuss the evolution of third republic in France.

NOTES

2.2 INTRODUCTION

After Napoleon's domination of Europe from around 1800 to 1814, the rulers of Europe wanted to insure that no one would ever be able to come so close to taking over all of Europe again. To this end, the diplomats from all of the Great Powers met at the Congress of Vienna to negotiate from 1814 to 1815. There they reorganized European boundaries in hopes of creating a stable Europe where coalitions of nations could always ally to defeat one nation that got out of hand.

The rulers after Napoleon were dedicated to stopping revolution (like the French Revolution in their own countries. Louis XVIII, whose brother Louis XVI had been executed during the French Revolution, certainly didn't want another revolution in France. The Tory government in Great Britain was archconservative and greatly opposed social upheaval. Metternich, the foreign minister in Austria, was willing to do anything to stabilize Europe and preserve Hapsburg power.

In Great Britain, in 1815, the aristocrat-dominated Parliament passed the Corn Law, which raised tariffs on grain to make imports impossible. The high tariffs also raised prices beyond the reach of the working class. In December 1816, starving workers rioted in London. Meanwhile, in Manchester, the ascendant industrialists who dominated the city had been hoping to get Parliamentary representation for some time. Realizing how discontented the workers were, the industrialists helped organize 80,000 workers to demonstrate at St. Peters Field against the Corn Law and for universal male suffrage. The protest was peaceful, but British soldiers nonetheless fired into the crowd, killing several. The event became a national scandal, called the Peterloo Massacre. The Tory Parliament, frightened of the potential for worker revolts, passed acts in 1819 aimed at stopping mass political organization. Not appeased, a group of workers decided to try and assassinate the Tory cabinet. This group, known as the Cato Street Conspiracy, was discovered in 1820. Several members were executed.

2.3 SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF ENGLAND IN 19TH CENTURY

After the loss of the American colonies in 1783 Britain began to look for new colonies in order to find cheap sources of raw materials. The 19th century brought about the greatest prosperity in Britain. Its sources lay in colonial expansion, industrialization, improved transport, and social reforms.

At the beginning of the century Britain was at war with Napoleonic France. In 1806, Napoleon issued the Berlin Decree forbidding any country under his control from trading with Britain. In the following year, the British issued Orders in Council, granting the right to seize neutral shipping bound for French controlled ports. This decision led to a war with the USA (1812-1814). In 1815, the Duke of Wellington (1769-1852) defeated Napoleon at Waterloo near Brussels, and after

NOTES

the Congress of Vienna in 1815, Britain became the greatest and richest power in Europe. The British controlled world trade.

In the 19th century, the population of Britain increased rapidly. By 1815 it had reached 13 million and London was one of the largest cities in Europe (1 million inhabitants). By 1850 half the population lived in towns, and London had more than 2 million inhabitants. Between 1750 and 1850 the population of Britain increased threefold.

Victoria, daughter of the Duke of Kent, a younger son of King George III, succeeded her uncle, William IV, in 1837. Her reign lasted until her death in 1901, and it was marked by a steady growth of national wealth and expansion of the empire. Britain held the unchallenged position of world economic and political leadership. A popular saying of the time was that the sun never set on the British Empire, which was so vast.

In the 19th century, the empire included India, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, large parts of Africa, and many smaller territories. In the second half of the 19th century Britain was transformed from an agricultural to a modern industrial country. George Stephenson (1781-1848) invented the first locomotive which led to development of an efficient railway network enabling the quick transport of goods and passengers. Population shifted from the countryside to cities. In industry real wages doubled between 1860 and 1874.

In the 19th century, Britain changed from being a net exporter of agricultural produce to being a net importer. Industrialization and urbanisation continued at a great rate. However, the growth of towns was accompanied by the spread of epidemics. Cholera was one of the most frightening diseases of the 19th century. There were serious outbreaks in Britain in 1831-1832, 1838, 1848-1849 and 1854.

Industrial and urban centres grew in the Midlands and the North. Manufacturing wages were higher than in agriculture and many farm labourers migrated to towns. However, a lot of people lacked a steady income. The conditions of the poor were appalling. The 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act set up a new system of poor relief. Poor people had to enter workhouses if they wished to receive help. Life in the workhouse was made as harsh as possible to deter 'scroungers'.

In spite of the growing importance of the middle class, the British aristocracy and the landed elite dominated Parliament. The enactment of the so-called Corn Laws in 1815, which prohibited the import of cheap wheat from overseas, was an example of state protection of the landed interest.

The ideology that the state should not interfere in the affairs of society was called laissez-faire. As far as the Industrial Revolution was concerned, the state simply did not possess the means to direct the economy, and laissez-faire was the

NOTES

only viable policy. Economic development and the provision of an economic infrastructure were left entirely to the private sector. The state confined itself to the provision of national security and the maintenance of internal stability, largely through local justices in the early years of the century. The state first began to take responsibility for social welfare after the institutional reforms of the Whig administrations of the 1830s. Thereafter, state activity spread to include ever larger areas of life, though the British state was never as intrusive as its European counterparts.

The growing prosperity of England was due primarily to her thriving industry, commerce and foreign trade. Prince Albert, the husband of Queen Victoria, said proudly: 'We are living at a period of most wonderful transition which tends rapidly to accomplish that great end to which all history points - the realisation of the unity of mankind' Modesty prevented him from adding 'under the rule of Britain' but he certainly meant it! In the 1870s Britain produced one-half of the world's iron.

The Victorian Age was marked by a great sense of confidence stemming from the country's supreme position in world affairs. The English way of life was thus seen as superior to that of other races. Cecil Rhodes once wrote to a young friend: 'Remember that you were born an Englishman, and as such, you have already won first prize in the lottery of life' This self-righteousness (despite Victorian hypocrisy), often quite sincere lay behind the paternalistic attitude adopted towards the peoples of the Empire. Carrying 'the white man's burden' was seen as a duty to bestow the benefits of English rule on 'uncivilised' nations. On the whole this confidence lasted right up until the devastation of the First World War.

The Victorians were much preoccupied by the issues of faith and doubt. By questioning the literal truth of the biblical account of Creation, Charles Darwin disturbed many believers. Science and Religion seemed to contradict each other.

In the period 1830-1850, which marked the second phase of the Industrial Revolution in England, there was a great deal of unrest among the working-classes. Its cause was mainly economic. Unemployment, long working hours and high prices were the most characteristic causes of popular discontent.

Radically-minded members of the upper classes and working-class leaders urged reform which would improve the economic conditions of a wide section of the population. In Parliament the aspirations of the working-classes received the support of a small party of Radicals who struggled for manhood suffrage, annual parliaments, and adequate representation of the industrial areas.

The Radical Reform Movement was also supported by newspapers such as the Manchester Register as well as by the Union Society, a local organisation which promoted self-education of the working-classes in order to prepare themselves

NOTES

for political leadership. Mass meetings and riots were organised as popular forms of protest. The most persuasive popular orator of the post-Napoleonic period was Henry Hunt whose speech in Manchester on 16 August 1819 attracted about 80,000 people. In response, the local yeomanry massacred the unarmed people. Over 400 were injured and eleven died. In consequence, restrictive laws were passed by Parliament and the radical reform movement was suppressed for some time. The working-classes were denied the right to participate in political life.

After the passing of the Factory Act of 1833, children under nine were forbidden to work in textile factories, and working hours for older children were limited to a maximum of 48 a week for those under 13, and 69 for 'young persons' of 13 to 18 years old. This was the first instance of state intervention in the laissez-faire economy. The Factory Act of 1844 reduced the work of children under 13 to 6.5 hours a day. Women's working hours were reduced to 12 a day. All dangerous machinery had to be fenced.

The Reform Act of 1832, which increased the franchise, did not satisfy the working-classes because it still excluded the vast majority of them from participation in both national and local government. It was beneficial to the middle-classes, *i.e.*, factory owners. In order to qualify for voting a man needed to earn at least £150 a year. An ordinary worker earned under £50.

In 1836, William Lovett and others founded the Working Men's Association which drew up a Charter containing six political demands :

- annual elections to Parliament;
- manhood suffrage;
- payment of members of Parliament;
- secret ballots;
- equal electoral districts;
- abolition of the property qualification for membership of the House of Commons.

The Chartists appealed to workers to found their own organisations and to agitate for the Charter by presenting petitions to Parliament (1839, 1842, 1848).

However, by 1848 the Chartist movement had lost its momentum. Some leaders turned towards revolutionary socialism. They attempted to create a mass organisation with a distinct working-class ideology. Others were attracted by the ideas of the Christian socialists led by Charles Kingsley and Frederick Maurice, or by the positivism propagated by a small group of intellectuals from London University. Although the Chartists did not achieve a direct political victory, they were successful in encouraging workers to organise themselves and to struggle for economic and political reforms. In 1867, a Conservative government gave

voting rights to a large number of urban working men. From that time the working classes steadily advanced to politic power.

NOTES

In 1844, twenty-eight Lancashire weavers each invested £1 in setting up a grocery store in Toad Lane, Rochdale. This was the beginning of the Cooperative Movement. Goods were sold at normal prices but profit (dividend) was shared among the customers in proportion to the amount of goods they had bought. Dividends could also be left in the business to accumulate. This encouraged members to build up savings.

Working-class activism in the 19th and the early 20th centuries was closely connected with the Trade Union movement, radicalism, and the lay activity of some churches. The London Trades Council established in 1860 soon became an important and influential body. In 1868, the Labour Representation League was formed. Its primary aim was to help elect working-men representatives to parliament. In 1871, a Trade Union Act was passed by Parliament giving the trade unions the status of legal social institutions. Although the number of labour representatives in Parliament grew steadily, they were still insignificant in a House which consisted of 600 members in 1906.

The political activism of the Labour militants in the years 1875-1914 was significantly inspired by socialist ideas. Karl Marx and other revolutionaries did not exert a direct influence on the Labour movement in Britain but their articles were translated into English and discussed. William Morris (1834-1896) promoted a non-revolutionary transformation to socialism. He gathered around himself a small group called the Hammersmith Socialist Society. Another organization which was not inspired by Marx but had socialist aims and made a considerable agitation among the working-classes was the Fabian Society. One of its major achievements was the Minority Report of the Poor Law Commission of 1905-1909. The Fabian Society was a political organisation founded in London in 1884 for the advancement of socialism by democratic means. Among its members were the writer George Bernard Shaw, the economists and historians Sidney and Beatrice Webb. All these organisations and movements contributed in different degrees to the formation of the Labour Party in 1900.

2.4 BRITAIN'S INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION (1780-1850)

Although Western Europe had long had the basic trappings of capitalism (private property, wealth accumulation, contracts), the Industrial Revolution fueled the creation of a truly modern capitalist system. Widespread credit, business corporations, investments and large-scale stock markets all become common. Britain led the way in this transformation.

By the 1780s, the British Industrial Revolution, which had been developing for several decades, began to further accelerate. Manufacturing, business, and the

number of wage laborers skyrocketed, starting a trend that would continue into the first half of the 19th century. Meanwhile, technology changed: hand tools were replaced by steam- or electricity-driven machines.

NOTES

The economic transformation brought about the British industrial revolution was accompanied by a social transformation as well. Population boomed, and demographics shifted. Because industrial resources like coal and iron were in Central and Northern England, a shift in population from Southern England northward took place. Northern cities like Manchester grew tremendously. These changes in social and demographic realities created vast pressure for political change as well. The first act to protect workers went into affect in 1802 (though in practice it did very little). Pressure to redress the lack of representation for the new industrial cities and the newly wealthy industrial manufacturers also began to build.

Meanwhile, industrialists developed an ideology called Laissez-faire based on Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations (1776) and continued by David Ricardo and Robert Malthus. Based on this, the discipline known as "economics" developed, largely to give the manufacturers a basis for arguing for little or no regulation of industry. Instead of government interference, these economists argued that a free market, in which everyone followed their own self- interest, would maximize the nation's utility.

Britain, with its head start in manufacturing, its many world markets, and its dominant navy, would dominate industry for most of the 19th century. Towards the end of that century, the United States and Germany would begin to challenge Britain's industrial power.

COMMENTARY

Among the Western European countries, Britain was the ideal incubator for the Industrial Revolution because an "Agricultural Revolution" preceded it. After the 1688 "Glorious Revolution", the British kings lost power and the aristocratic landholders gained power. The landholders tried to rationalize their landholdings and started the Enclosure Movement to bring more and more of their own land under tighter control, a process that went on throughout the 1700s. This policy had two main effects: it increased the productivity of the land, and transformed the people who used to work land into an unemployed, labor class of poor in need of work. Thus, the first factories had a ready labor-supply in Britain that was not available in other nations. Important inventions like the "Spinning Jenny" to produce yarn began to be made in 1760s, and soon the British textile industry was booming, aided by Eli Whitney's invention of the "Cotton Gin" in America, which provided a ready source of cotton.

NOTES

The Industrial Revolution represented a shift in influence away from the traditional power-holders in England. Aristocratic rule was no longer supreme, for "upstart" manufacturers were now often more wealthy and more important to the nation's overall well being than the landed gentry. They also employed a far greater percentage of the national economy. However, the aristocratic landholders did not entirely lose out: they maintained some power, and only grudgingly gave it up to business interests. Often, the aristocracy, trying to take power away from the manufacturers, would ally with the working class. As both sides, aristocrats and manufacturers, competed for the support of the workers, reforms in Britain gradually took place through Parliamentary deal- making without the need for a bloody revolution. In its impact on human societies, the industrial revolution was probably the most important change in its era, more important, perhaps, than any events in the last few thousand years. The Industrial Revolution allowed increasing urbanization and greatly increased the overall wealth and production power of humanity, although not everyone always shared in the benefits of industrialization equally.

Though industrialization was most prominent in Europe, its transformative powers must be seen as a theme through the period of 1815-1848. Capitalism and the Industrial Revolution went hand-in-hand with the Western European countries' liberal traditions. Many of the same principles underlying the French Revolution were being developed via the Industrial Revolution in Britain. Industrializing nations developed middle classes who began to wield political clout. Further, the Industrial Revolution would give Western Europe the economic system and technology to dominate much of the world in the colonial period towards the end of the 19th century. The countries that did not transition to industrial systems very quickly got left behind, and often ended up as satellites to the major powers.

It would be some time before workers developed a counter-ideology of their own. Yet as manufacturing brought hundreds of thousands of workers into the cities, they started thinking about organizing to protect their own political interests. By 1825, the workers in the industrializing nations would become a social and political force of their own.

2.5 INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN OTHER PARTS OF EUROPE

Most products people in the industrialized nations use today are turned out swiftly by the process of mass production, by people (and sometimes, robots) working on assembly lines using power-driven machines. People of ancient and medieval times had no such products. They had to spend long, tedious hours of hand labor even on simple objects. The energy, or power, they employed in work came almost wholly from their own and animals' muscles. The Industrial

NOTES

Revolution is the name given the movement in which machines changed people's way of life as well as their methods of manufacture.

About the time of the American Revolution, the people of England began to use machines to make cloth and steam engines to run the machines. A little later they invented locomotives. Productivity began a spectacular climb. By 1850 most Englishmen were laboring in industrial towns and Great Britain had become the workshop of the world. From Britain the Industrial Revolution spread gradually throughout Europe and to the United States.

Changes That Led to the Revolution

The most important of the changes that brought about the Industrial Revolution were (1) the invention of machines to do the work of hand tools; (2) the use of steam, and later of other kinds of power, in place of the muscles of human beings and of animals; and (3) the adoption of the factory system.

It is almost impossible to imagine what the world would be like if the effects of the Industrial Revolution were swept away. Electric lights would go out. Automobiles and airplanes would vanish. Telephones, radios, and television would disappear Most of the abundant stocks on the shelves of department stores would be gone. The children of the poor would have little or no schooling and would work from dawn to dark on the farm or in the home. Before machines were invented, work by children as well as by adults was needed in order to provide enough food, clothing, and shelter for all.

The Industrial Revolution came gradually. It happened in a short span of time, however, when measured against the centuries people had worked entirely by hand. Until John Kay invented the flying shuttle in 1733 and James Hargreaves the spinning jenny 31 years later, the making of yarn and the weaving of cloth had been much the same for thousands of years. By 1800 a host of new and faster processes were in use in both manufacture and transportation.

This relatively sudden change in the way people live deserves to be called a revolution. It differs from a political revolution in its greater effects on the lives of people and in not coming to an end, as, for example, did the French Revolution.

Instead, the Industrial Revolution grew more powerful each year as new inventions and manufacturing processes added to the efficiency of machines and increased productivity. Indeed, since World War I the mechanization of industry has increased so enormously that another revolution in production is taking place.

Expanding Commerce Affects Industry

Commerce and industry have always been closely related. Sometimes one is ahead and sometimes the other, but the one behind is always trying to catch up. Beginning in about 1400, world commerce grew and changed so greatly that

writers sometimes use the term "commercial revolution" to describe the economic progress of the next three and a half centuries.

NOTES

Many factors helped bring about this revolution in trade. The Crusades opened up the riches of the East to Western Europe. America was discovered, and European nations began to acquire rich colonies there and elsewhere. New trade routes were opened. The strong central governments which replaced the feudal system began to protect and help their merchants. Trading firms, such as the British East India Company, were chartered by governments. Larger ships were built, and flourishing cities grew up.

With the expansion of trade, more money was needed. Large-scale commerce could not be carried on by barter, as much of the earlier trade had been. Gold and silver from the New World helped meet this need. Banks and credit systems developed. By the end of the 17th century Europe had a large accumulation of capital. Money had to be available before machinery and steam engines could come into wide use for they were costly to manufacture and install.

By 1750 large quantities of goods were being exchanged among the European nations, and there was a demand for more goods than were being produced. England was the leading commercial nation, and the manufacture of cloth was its leading industry.

Organizing Production

Several systems of making goods had grown up by the time of the Industrial Revolution. In country districts families produced most of the food, clothing, and other articles they used, as they had done for centuries. In the cities merchandise was made in shops much like those of the medieval craftsmen, and manufacturing was strictly regulated by the guilds and by the government. The goods made in these shops, though of high quality, were limited and costly.

The merchants needed cheaper items, as well as larger quantities, for their growing trade. As early as the 15th century they already had begun to go outside the cities, beyond the reach of the hampering regulations, and to establish another system of producing goods.

From Cottage Industry to Factory

Cloth merchants, for instance, would buy raw wool from the sheep owners, have it spun into yarn by farmers' wives, and take it to country weavers to be made into textiles. These country weavers could manufacture the cloth more cheaply than city craftsmen could because they got part of their living from their gardens or small farms.

The merchants would then collect the cloth and give it out again to finishers and dyers. Thus, they controlled clothmaking from start to finish. Similar methods

NOTES

of organizing and controlling the process of manufacture came to prevail in other industries, such as the nail, cutlery, and leather goods.

Some writers call this the putting-out system. Others call it the domestic system because the work was done in the home ("domestic" comes from the Latin word for home). Another term is cottage industry, for most of the workers belonged to the class of farm laborers known as cotters and carried on the work in their cottages.

This system of industry had several advantages over older systems. It gave the merchant a large supply of manufactured articles at a low price. It also enabled him to order the particular kinds of items that he needed for his markets. It provided employment for every member of a craft worker's family and gave jobs to skilled workers who had no capital to start businesses for themselves. A few merchants who had enough capital had gone a step further. They brought workers together under one roof and supplied them with spinning wheels and looms or with the implements of other trades. These establishments were factories, though they bear slight resemblance to the factories of today.

Why the Revolution Began in England

English merchants were leaders in developing a commerce which increased the demand for more goods. The expansion in trade had made it possible to accumulate capital to use in industry. A cheaper system of production had grown up which was largely free from regulation.

There also were new ideas in England which aided the movement. One of these was the growing interest in scientific investigation and invention. Another was the doctrine of laissez-faire, or letting business alone. This doctrine had been growing in favor throughout the 18th century. It was especially popular after the British economist Adam Smith argued powerfully for it in his great work 'The Wealth of Nations' (1776).

For centuries the craft guilds and the government had controlled commerce and industry down to the smallest detail. Now many Englishmen had come to believe that it was better to let business be regulated by the free play of supply and demand rather than by laws. Thus, the English government for the most part kept its hands off and left business free to adopt the new inventions and the methods of production which were best suited to them.

The most important of the machines that ushered in the Industrial Revolution were invented in the last third of the 18th century. Earlier in the century, however, three inventions had been made which opened the way for the later machines. One was the crude, slow-moving steam engine built by Thomas Newcomen (1705), which was used to pump water out of mines. The second was John Kay's flying shuttle (1733). It enabled one person to handle a wide loom more rapidly than

two persons could operate it before. The third was a frame for spinning cotton thread with rollers, first set up by Lewis Paul and John Wyatt (1741). Their invention was not commercially practical, but it was the first step toward solving the problem of machine spinning.

NOTES

Inventions in Textile Industry

As the flying shuttle sped up weaving, the demand for cotton yarn increased. Many inventors set to work to improve the spinning wheel. James Hargreaves, a weaver who was also a carpenter, patented his spinning jenny in 1770. It enabled one worker to run eight spindles instead of one.

About the same time Richard Arkwright developed his water frame, a machine for spinning with rollers operated by water power. In 1779 Samuel Crompton, a spinner, combined Hargreaves' jenny and Arkwright's roller frame into a spinning machine, called a mule. It produced thread of greater fineness and strength than the jenny or the roller frame. Since the roller frame and the mule were large and heavy, it became the practice to install them in mills, where they could be run by water power. They were tended by women and children.

These improvements in spinning machinery called for further improvements in weaving. In 1785 Edmund Cartwright patented a power loom. In spite of the need for it, weaving machinery came into use very slowly. First, many improvements had to be made before the loom was satisfactory. Second, the hand weavers violently opposed its adoption because it threw many of them out of work. Those who got jobs in the factories were obliged to take the same pay as unskilled workers. Thus they rioted, smashed the machines, and tried to prevent their use. The power loom was only coming into wide operation in the cotton industry by 1813. It did not completely replace the hand loom in weaving cotton until 1850. It was not well adapted to the making of some woolens. As late as 1880 many hand looms were still in use for weaving woolen cloth.

Many other machines contributed to the progress of the textile industry. In 1785, Thomas Bell of Glasgow invented cylinder printing of cotton goods. This was a great improvement on block printing. It made successive impressions of a design "join up" and did the work more rapidly and more cheaply. In 1793 the available supply of cotton was increased by Eli Whitney's invention of the cotton gin. In 1804 J.M. Jacquard, a Frenchman, perfected a loom on which patterns might be woven in fabrics by mechanical means. This loom was later adapted to the making of lace, which became available to everyone

Watt's Steam Engine

While textile machinery was developing, progress was being made in other directions. In 1763 James Watt, a Scottish mechanic, was asked to repair a model

NOTES

of a Newcomen steam engine. He saw how crude and inefficient it was and by a series of improvements made it a practical device for running machinery.

Wheels turned by running water had been the chief source of power for the early factories. These were necessarily situated on swift-running streams. When the steam engine became efficient, it was possible to locate factories in more convenient places.

Coal and Iron

The first users of steam engines were the coal and iron industries. They were destined to be basic industries in the new age of machinery. As early as 1720 many steam engines were in operation. In coal mines they pumped out the water which usually flooded the deep shafts. In the iron industry they pumped water to create the draft in blast furnaces.

The iron industry benefited also from other early inventions of the 18th century. Iron was scarce and costly, and production was falling off because England's forests could not supply enough charcoal for smelting the ore. Ironmasters had long been experimenting with coal as a fuel for smelting. Finally the Darby family, after three generations of effort, succeeded with coal that had been transformed into coke. This created a new demand for coal and laid the foundation for the British coal industry. The next great steps were taken in the 1780s, when Henry Cort developed the processes of puddling and rolling. Puddling produced nearly pure malleable iron. Hand in hand with the adoption of the new inventions went the rapid development of the factory system of manufacture.

Changing Conditions in England

The new methods increased the amount of goods produced and decreased the cost. The worker at a machine with 100 spindles on it could spin 100 threads of cotton more rapidly than 100 workers could on the old spinning wheels. Southern planters in the United States were able to meet the increased demand for raw cotton because they were using the cotton gin. This machine could do the job of 50 men in cleaning cotton. Similar improvements were being made in other lines of industry. British merchants no longer found it a problem to obtain enough goods to supply their markets. On the contrary, at times the markets were glutted with more goods than could be sold. Then mills were closed and workers were thrown out of employment.

With English factories calling for supplies, such as American cotton, and sending goods to all parts of the world, better transportation was needed. The roads of England were wretchedly poor and often impassable. Packhorses and wagons crawled along them, carrying small loads. Such slow and inadequate transportation kept the cost of goods high. Here again the need produced the

invention. Thomas Telford and John MacAdam each developed a method of road construction better than any that had been known since the ancient Romans built their famous roads.

NOTES

BUILDING CANALS AND RAILWAYS

Many canals were dug. They connected the main rivers and so furnished a network of waterways for transporting coal and other heavy goods. A canalboat held much more than a wagon. It moved smoothly if slowly over the water, with a single horse hitched to the towline. In some places, where it was impossible to dig canals and where heavy loads of coal had to be hauled, mine owners laid down wooden or iron rails. On these early railroads one horse could haul as much coal as 20 horses could on ordinary roads.

Early in the 19th century came George Stephenson's locomotive and Robert Fulton's steamboat, an American invention. They marked the beginning of modern transportation on land and sea. Railroads called for the production of more goods, for they put factory-made products within reach of many more people at prices they could afford to pay.

THE CONDITION OF LABOR

As conditions in industry changed, social and political conditions changed with them. Farm laborers and artisans flocked to the manufacturing centers and became industrial workers. Cities grew rapidly, and the percentage of farmers in the total population declined.

The population of England as a whole began to increase rapidly after the middle of the 18th century. Because of progress in medical knowledge and sanitation, fewer people died in infancy or childhood and the average length of life increased.

Far-reaching changes were gradually brought about in the life of the industrial workers. For one thing, machines took a great burden of hard work from the muscles of human beings. Some of the other changes, however, were not so welcome.

The change from domestic industry to the factory system meant a loss of independence to the worker. The home laborer could work whenever he pleased. Although the need for money often drove him to toil long hours, he could vary the monotony of his task by digging or planting his garden patch. When he became a factory employee, he not only had to work long hours, but he had to leave his little farm. He lived near the factory, often in a crowded slum district. He was forced to work continuously at the pace set by the machine. The long hours and the monotonous toil were an especially great hardship for the women and children. The vast majority of the jobs were held by them by 1816.

NOTES

The change was particularly hard on the weavers and the other skilled workers who sank to the position of factory workers. They had been independent masters, capitalists in a small way, and managers of their own businesses. They had pride in their skill. When they saw themselves being forced into factories to do other men's bidding for the same pay as unskilled workers, it is no wonder that they rioted and broke up looms.

Problems of Capital and Labor

A person had to have a lot of capital to buy machines and open a factory. Those who were successful made huge profits with which to buy more machines, put up larger buildings, and purchase supplies in greater quantities at enormous savings. Thus, capital increased far more rapidly than it ever had before. Much of it was invested in building canals, railroads, and steamships and in developing foreign trade. The men who controlled these enterprises formed a powerful new class in England—the industrial capitalists.

The capitalists had a struggle to obtain a voice in the government. They needed a better system of banking, currency, and credit. They had to find and hold markets for their products. They had many difficulties in organizing their factories to run efficiently. They also had to make a profit on their investments in the face of intense competition.

Laissez-faire was the rule in England. This meant that the government had accepted the doctrine that it should keep hands off business. Factory owners could therefore arrange working conditions in whatever way they pleased. Grave problems arose for the workers—problems of working hours, wages, unemployment, accidents, employment of women and children, and housing conditions.

Children could tend most of the machines as well as older persons could, and they could be hired for less pay. Great numbers of them were worked form 12 to 14 hours a day under terrible conditions. Many were apprenticed to the factory owners and housed in miserable dormitories. Ill-fed and ill-clothed, they were sometimes driven under the lash of the overseer. The high death rate of these child slaves eventually roused Parliament to pass laws limiting the daily toil for apprentices.

Rise of Labor Unions

Workers sought to win improved conditions and wages through labor unions. These unions often started as "friendly societies" that collected dues from workers and extended aid during illness or unemployment. Soon, however, they became organizations for winning improvements by collective bargaining and strikes.

NOTES

Industrial workers also sought to benefit themselves by political action. They fought such legislation as the English laws of 1799 and 1800 forbidding labor organizations. They campaigned to secure laws which would help them. The struggle by workers to win the right to vote and to extend their political power was one of the major factors in the spread of democracy during the 19th century.

Revolution Spreads to the United States

Until 1815 France was busy with the Napoleonic wars. It had little opportunity to introduce machinery. When peace came France began to follow England. It followed slowly, however, and has never devoted itself as exclusively to manufacturing as England has. Belgium was ahead of France in adopting the new methods. The other European countries made little progress until the second half of the 19th century.

The United States too was slow in adopting machine methods of manufacture. Farming and trading were its chief interests until the Civil War. The new nation had little capital with which to buy the machinery and put up the buildings required. Such capital as existed was largely invested in shipping and commerce. Labor was scarce because men continued to push westward, clearing the forests and establishing themselves on the land.

A start in manufacturing, however, was made in New England in 1790 by Samuel Slater. An employee of Arkwright's spinning mills, Slater came to the United States in 1789. He was hired by Moses Brown of Providence, R. I., to build a mill on the Pawtucket, or Seekonk, River. English laws forbade export of either the new machinery or plans for making it. Slater designed the machine from memory and built a mill which started operation in 1790. When the Napoleonic wars and the War of 1812 upset commerce and made English products difficult to obtain, more American investors began to build factories.

Pioneer Industries and Inventions

New England soon developed an important textile industry. It had swift streams for power and a humid climate, which kept cotton and wool fibers in condition for spinning and weaving. In Pennsylvania iron for machines, tools, and guns was smelted in stone furnaces. They burned charcoal, plentiful in this forested land. Spinning machines driven by steam were operating in New York by 1810. The first practical power loom was installed at Waltham, Mass., by Francis Cabot Lowell in 1814. Shoemaking was organized into a factory system of production in Massachusetts in the early 19th century. New England was the first area in the United States to industrialize.

American inventors produced many new machines that could be applied to industry as well as to agriculture. Oliver Evans designed a steam engine more

NOTES

powerful than that of James Watt. Engineers quickly adopted the new engine and used it to power locomotives and steamboats.

Cyrus McCormick invented several machines used to mechanize farming. His mechanical reaper, patented in 1834, revolutionized harvesting, making it quicker and easier. Elias Howe's sewing machine eased the life of the housewife and made the manufacture of clothing less expensive.

Techniques of factory production were refined in American workshops. Eli Whitney led the movement to standardize parts used in manufacture. They became interchangeable, enabling unskilled workers to assemble products from boxes of parts quickly. American factories used machine tools to make parts. These machines were arranged in lines for more efficient production. This was called the "American system of manufacturing," and it was admired by all other industrial nations. It was first applied to the manufacture of firearms and later spread to other industries like clock and lock making.

Second Industrial Revolution

The machines of the Industrial Revolution in the 18th and early 19th centuries were simple, mechanical devices compared with the industrial technology that followed. Many new products were devised, and important advances were made in the system of mass production. Changes in industry were so great that the period after 1860 has been called the Second Industrial Revolution. New scientific knowledge was applied to industry as scientists and engineers unlocked the secrets of physics and chemistry. Great new industries were founded on this scientific advance: steel, chemicals, and petroleum benefited from new understandings of chemistry; breakthroughs in the study of electricity and magnetism provided the basis for a large electrical industry. These new industries were larger and more productive than any industries existing before. Germany and the United States became the leaders, and by the end of the 19th century they were challenging Great Britain in the world market for industrial goods.

The age of electricity began in 1882 when Thomas A. Edison introduced a system of electric lighting in New York City. Electricity was later applied to driving all kinds of machinery as well as powering locomotives and streetcars. Electric lighting quickly spread across the United States and was soon adopted in Europe. The electrical industry was dominated by large companies that developed new products and then manufactured and marketed them. These companies were based in Germany and the United States but sold their goods all over the world. They were the first multinational companies. Companies like Westinghouse and General Electric helped to electrify cities in Europe, Africa, and South America.

The steel and chemical industries used new technology that greatly increased production. The size of factories increased rapidly, employing more workers and

NOTES

using more machinery. These industries integrated all stages of production under a single corporate structure. They bought out competitors and acquired sources of raw materials and retail outlets. Corporations such as U.S. Steel and Standard Oil controlled all stages of manufacturing the product, from mining and drilling to delivering it to the customer. This gave them great economic power, and the United States government took measures to limit their monopolies in steel and petroleum.

The larger size of business presented great challenges to managers who administered enormous organizations with many branches and subsidiaries. Advances in communications and transportation helped decision makers to maintain control. The electric telegraph was invented by Samuel Morse in 1844 and was used to relay commercial information about prices and markets. It was used in the stock exchanges and on the railway systems. Alexander Graham Bell patented his telephone in 1876, and networks of telephone lines were built quickly across the United States.

The telephone became a useful tool for managers to keep in contact with the widely dispersed parts of their businesses. New methods of management were devised that stressed central control, planning, and efficient production methods. One of the leading advocates of "scientific management" was Frederick Winslow Taylor.

The Second Industrial Revolution marked great progress in the methods of mass production. More and more industries used interchangeable parts and machine tools. Electric power replaced steam power in factories; it was cheaper, faster, and more flexible. It allowed machine tools to be arranged more efficiently. Human power was replaced by machine power. In 1913 Henry Ford introduced the assembly line in the manufacture of his Model T Ford. Parts were assembled on a moving conveyor belt, and the Model T took shape as it moved from one work station to the next. The assembly line greatly increased the speed of manufacture and soon was used in many industries.

By the outbreak of World War I in 1914, only a small number of industries in the most industrialized nations of the world had adopted advanced production methods and organization. Much of the world had not yet begun a first industrial revolution. Russia, Canada, Italy, and Japan were just beginning to industrialize.

Only Great Britain, the United States, Germany, France, and some parts of the Scandinavian countries had successfully completed an industrial revolution. Most of the world's population still worked in primitive agricultural economies. China, India, and Spain did not begin to industrialize until well into the 20th century.

NOTES

2.6 EXPANSION OF EUROPE

The global expansion of western Europe between the 1760s and the 1870s differed in several important ways from the expansionism and colonialism of previous centuries. Along with the rise of the Industrial Revolution, which economic historians generally trace to the 1760s, and the continuing spread of industrialization in the empire-building countries came a shift in the strategy of trade with the colonial world. Instead of being primarily buyers of colonial products (and frequently under strain to offer sufficient salable goods to balance the exchange), as in the past, the industrializing nations increasingly became sellers in search of markets for the growing volume of their machine-produced goods. Furthermore, over the years there occurred a decided shift in the composition of demand for goods produced in the colonial areas. Spices, sugar, and slaves became relatively less important with the advance of industrialization, concomitant with a rising demand for raw materials for industry (*e.g.*, cotton, wool, vegetable oils, jute, dyestuffs) and food for the swelling industrial areas (wheat, tea, coffee, cocoa, meat, butter).

This shift in trading patterns entailed in the long run changes in colonial policy and practice as well as in the nature of colonial acquisitions. The urgency to create markets and the incessant pressure for new materials and food were eventually reflected in colonial practices, which sought to adapt the colonial areas to the new priorities of the industrializing nations. Such adaptation involved major disruptions of existing social systems over wide areas of the globe. Before the impact of the Industrial Revolution, European activities in the rest of the world were largely confined to: (1) occupying areas that supplied precious metals, slaves, and tropical products then in large demand; (2) establishing white-settler colonies along the coast of North America; and (3) setting up trading posts and forts and applying superior military strength to achieve the transfer to European merchants of as much existing world trade as was feasible. However disruptive these changes may have been to the societies of Africa, South America, and the isolated plantation and white-settler colonies, the social systems over most of the Earth outside Europe nevertheless remained much the same as they had been for centuries (in some places for millennia). These societies, with their largely self-sufficient small communities based on subsistence agriculture and home industry, provided poor markets for the mass-produced goods flowing from the factories of the technologically advancing countries; nor were the existing social systems flexible enough to introduce and rapidly expand the commercial agriculture (and, later, mineral extraction) required to supply the food and raw material needs of the empire builders.

The adaptation of the nonindustrialized parts of the world to become more profitable adjuncts of the industrializing nations embraced, among other things:

NOTES

(1) overhaul of existing land and property arrangements, including the introduction of private property in land where it did not previously exist, as well as the expropriation of land for use by white settlers or for plantation agriculture; (2) creation of a labour supply for commercial agriculture and mining by means of direct forced labour and indirect measures aimed at generating a body of wage-seeking labourers; (3) spread of the use of money and exchange of commodities by imposing money payments for taxes and land rent and by inducing a decline of home industry; and (4) where the precolonial society already had a developed industry, curtailment of production and exports by native producers.

The classic illustration of this last policy is found in India. For centuries India had been an exporter of cotton goods, to such an extent that Great Britain for a long period imposed stiff tariff duties to protect its domestic manufacturers from Indian competition. Yet, by the middle of the 19th century, India was receiving one-fourth of all British exports of cotton piece goods and had lost its own export markets.

Clearly, such significant transformations could not get very far in the absence of appropriate political changes, such as the development of a sufficiently cooperative local elite, effective administrative techniques, and peace-keeping instruments that would assure social stability and environments conducive to the radical social changes imposed by a foreign power. Consistent with these purposes was the installation of new, or amendments of old, legal systems that would facilitate the operation of a money, business, and private land economy. Tying it all together was the imposition of the culture and language of the dominant power.

The changing nature of the relations between centres of empire and their colonies, under the impact of the unfolding Industrial Revolution, was also reflected in new trends in colonial acquisitions. While in preceding centuries colonies, trading posts, and settlements were in the main, except for South America, located along the coastline or on smaller islands, the expansions of the late 18th century and especially of the 19th century were distinguished by the spread of the colonizing powers, or of their emigrants, into the interior of continents. Such continental extensions, in general, took one of two forms, or some combination of the two: (1) the removal of the indigenous peoples by killing them off or forcing them into specially reserved areas, thus providing room for settlers from western Europe who then developed the agriculture and industry of these lands under the social system imported from the mother countries, or (2) the conquest of the indigenous peoples and the transformation of their existing societies to suit the changing needs of the more powerful militarily and technically advanced nations.

At the heart of Western expansionism was the growing disparity in technologies between those of the leading European nations and those of the rest of the world. Differences between the level of technology in Europe and some of

NOTES

the regions on other continents were not especially great in the early part of the 18th century. In fact, some of the crucial technical knowledge used in Europe at that time came originally from Asia. During the 18th century, however, and at an accelerating pace in the 19th and 20th centuries, the gap between the technologically advanced countries and technologically backward regions kept on increasing despite the diffusion of modern technology by the colonial powers. The most important aspect of this disparity was the technical superiority of Western armaments, for this superiority enabled the West to impose its will on the much larger colonial populations. Advances in communication and transportation, notably railroads, also became important tools for consolidating foreign rule over extensive territories. And along with the enormous technical superiority and the colonizing experience itself came important psychological instruments of minority rule by foreigners: racism and arrogance on the part of the colonizers and a resulting spirit of inferiority among the colonized.

Naturally, the above description and summary telescope events that transpired over many decades and the incidence of the changes varied from territory to territory and from time to time, influenced by the special conditions in each area, by what took place in the process of conquest, by the circumstances at the time when economic exploitation of the possessions became desirable and feasible, and by the varying political considerations of the several occupying powers. Moreover, it should be emphasized that expansion policies and practices, while far from haphazard, were rarely the result of long-range and integrated planning. The drive for expansion was persistent, as were the pressures to get the greatest advantage possible out of the resulting opportunities. But the expansions arose in the midst of intense rivalry among major powers that were concerned with the distribution of power on the continent of Europe itself as well as with ownership of overseas territories. Thus, the issues of national power, national wealth, and military strength shifted more and more to the world stage as commerce and territorial acquisitions spread over larger segments of the globe. In fact, colonies were themselves often levers of military power—sources of military supplies and of military manpower and bases for navies and merchant marines. What appears, then, in tracing the concrete course of empire is an intertwining of the struggle for hegemony between competing national powers, the manoeuvring for preponderance of military strength, and the search for greatest advantage practically obtainable from the world's resources.

Stages of history rarely, if ever, come in neat packages: the roots of new historical periods begin to form in earlier eras, while many aspects of an older phase linger on and help shape the new. Nonetheless, there was a convergence of developments in the early 1760s, which, despite many qualifications, delineates a new stage in European expansionism and especially in that of the most successful

empire builder, Great Britain. It is not only the Industrial Revolution in Great Britain that can be traced to this period but also the consequences of England's decisive victory over France in the Seven Years' War and the beginnings of what turned out to be the second British Empire. As a result of the Treaty of Paris, France lost nearly all of its colonial empire, while Britain became, except for Spain, the largest colonial power in the world.

NOTES

THE SECOND BRITISH EMPIRE

The removal of threat from the strongest competing foreign power set the stage for Britain's conquest of India and for operations against the North American Indians to extend British settlement in Canada and westerly areas of the North American continent. In addition, the new commanding position on the seas provided an opportunity for Great Britain to probe for additional markets in Asia and Africa and to try to break the Spanish trade monopoly in South America. During this period, the scope of British world interests broadened dramatically to cover the South Pacific, the Far East, the South-Atlantic, and the coast of Africa.

The initial aim of this outburst of maritime activity was not so much the acquisition of extensive fresh territory as the attainment of a far-flung network of trading posts and maritime bases. The latter, it was hoped, would serve the interdependent aims of widening foreign commerce and controlling ocean shipping routes. But in the long run many of these initial bases turned out to be steppingstones to future territorial conquests. Because the indigenous populations did not always take kindly to foreign incursions into their homelands, even when the foreigners limited themselves to small enclaves, penetration of interiors was often necessary to secure base areas against attack.

LOSS OF THE AMERICAN COLONIES

The path of conquest and territorial growth was far from orderly. It was frequently diverted by the renewal or intensification of rivalry between, notably, England, France, Spain, and the Low Countries in colonial areas and on the European continent. The most severe blow to Great Britain's 18th-century dreams of empire, however, came from the revolt of the 13 American colonies. These contiguous colonies were at the heart of the old, or what is often referred to as the first, British Empire, which consisted primarily of Ireland, the North American colonies, and the plantation colonies of the West Indies. Ironically, the elimination of this core of the first British Empire was to a large extent influenced by the upsurge of empire building after the Seven Years' War. Great Britain harvested from its victory in that war a new expanse of territory about equal to its prewar possessions on the North American continent: French Canada, the Floridas, and the territory between the Alleghenies and the Mississippi River. The assimilation

NOTES

of the French Canadians, control of the Indians and settlement of the trans-Allegheny region, and the opening of new trade channels created a host of problems for the British government. Not the least of these were the burdensome costs to carry out this program on top of a huge national debt accumulated during the war. To cope with these problems, new imperial policies were adopted by the mother country: raising (for the first time) revenue from the colonies; tightening mercantile restrictions, imposing firm measures against smuggling (an important source of income for colonial merchants), and putting obstacles in the way of New England's substantial trade with the West Indies. The strains generated by these policies created or intensified the hardships of large sections of the colonial population and, in addition, disrupted the relative harmony of interests that had been built up between the mother country and important elite groups in the colonies. Two additional factors, not unrelated to the enlargement of the British Empire, fed the onset and success of the American War of Independence (1775–83): first, a lessening need for military support from the mother country once the menacing French were removed from the continent and, second, support for the American Revolutionary forces from the French and Spanish, who had much to fear from the enhanced sea power and expansionism of the British.

The shock of defeat in North America was not the only problem confronting British society. Ireland—in effect, a colonial dependency—also experienced a revolutionary upsurge, giving added significance to attacks by leading British free traders against existing colonial policies and even at times against colonialism itself. But such criticism had little effect except as it may have hastened colonial administrative reforms to counteract real and potential independence movements in dependencies such as Canada and Ireland.

Conquest of India

Apart from reforms of this nature, the aftermath of American independence was a diversion of British imperial interests to other areas—the beginning of the settlement of Australia being a case in point. In terms of amount of effort and significance of results, however, the pursuit of conquest in India took first place. Starting with the assumption of control over the province of Bengal (after the Battle of Plassey, 1757) and especially after the virtual removal of French influence from the Indian Ocean, the British waged more or less continuous warfare against the Indian people and took over more and more of the interior. The Marathas, the main source of resistance to foreign intrusion, were decisively defeated in 1803, but military resistance of one sort or another continued until the middle of the 19th century. The financing and even the military manpower for this prolonged undertaking came mainly from India itself. As British sovereignty spread, new land-revenue devices were soon instituted, which resulted in raising the revenue

to finance the consolidation of power in India and the conquest of other regions, breaking up the old system of self-sufficient and self-perpetuating villages and supporting an elite whose self-interests would harmonize with British rule.

NOTES

GLOBAL EXPANSION

Except for the acquisition of additional territory in India and colonies in Sierra Leone and New South Wales, the important additions to British overseas possessions between the Seven Years' War and the end of the Napoleonic era came as prizes of victory in wars with rival European colonial powers. In 1763, the first British Empire primarily centred on North America. By 1815, despite the loss of the 13 colonies, Britain had a second empire, one that straddled the globe from Canada and the Caribbean in the Western Hemisphere around the Cape of Good Hope to India and Australia. This empire was sustained by and in turn was supported by maritime power that far exceeded that of any of Britain's European rivals.

POLICY CHANGES

The half century of global expansion is only one aspect of the transition to the second British Empire. The operations of the new empire in the longer run also reflected decisive changes in British society. The replacement of mercantile by industrial enterprise as the main source of national wealth entailed changes to make national and colonial policy more consistent with the new hierarchy of interests.

The restrictive trade practices and monopolistic privileges that sustained the commercial explosion of the 16th and most of the 17th centuries—built around the slave trade, colonial plantations, and monopolistic trading companies—did not provide the most effective environment for a nation on its way to becoming the workshop of the world.

The desired restructuring of policies occurred over decades of intense political conflict: the issues were not always clearly delineated, interest groups frequently overlapped, and the balance of power between competing vested interests shifted from time to time. The issues were clearly drawn in some cases, as for example over the continuation of the British East India Company's trade monopoly. The company's export of Indian silk, muslins, and other cotton goods was seen by all who were involved in any way in the production of British textiles to be an obstacle to the development of markets for competing British manufactures. Political opposition to this monopoly was strong at the end of the 18th century, but the giant step on the road to free trade was not taken until the early decades of the 19th century (termination of the Indian trade monopoly, 1813; of the Chinese trade monopoly, 1833).

NOTES

In contrast, the issues surrounding the strategic slave trade were much more complicated. The West Indies plantations relied on a steady flow of slaves from Africa. British merchants and ships profited not only from supplying these slaves but also from the slave trade with other colonies in the Western Hemisphere. The British were the leading slave traders, controlling at least half of the transatlantic slave trade by the end of the 18th century. But the influential planter and slave-trade interests had come under vigorous and unrelenting attack by religious and humanitarian leaders and organizations, who propelled the issue of abolition to the forefront of British politics around the turn of the 19th century. Historians are still unravelling the threads of conflicting arguments about the priority of causes in the final abolition of the slave trade and, later, of slavery itself, because economic as well as political issues were at play: glutted sugar markets (to which low-cost producers in competing colonies contributed) stimulated thoughts about controlling future output by limiting the supply of fresh slaves; the compensation paid to plantation owners by the British government at the time of the abolition of slavery rescued many planters from bankruptcy during a sugar crisis, with a substantial part of the compensation money being used to pay off planters' debts to London bankers. Moreover, the battle between proslavery and antislavery forces was fought in an environment in which free-trade interests were challenging established mercantilist practices and the West Indies sugar economy was in a secular decline.

The British were not the first to abolish the slave trade. Denmark had ended it earlier, and the U.S. Constitution, written in 1787, had already provided for its termination in 1808. But the British Act of 1807 formally forbidding the slave trade was followed up by diplomatic and naval pressure to suppress the trade. By the 1820s Holland, Sweden, and France had also passed anti-slave-trade laws. Such laws and attempts to enforce them by no means stopped the trade, so long as there was buoyant demand for this commodity and good profit from dealing in it. Some decline in the demand for slaves did follow the final emancipation in 1833 of slaves in British possessions. On the other hand, the demand for slaves elsewhere in the Americas took on new life—*e.g.*, to work the virgin soils of Cuba and Brazil and to pick the rapidly expanding U.S. cotton crops to feed the voracious appetite of the British textile industry. Accordingly, the number of slaves shipped across the Atlantic accelerated at the same time Britain and other maritime powers outlawed this form of commerce.

Involvement in Africa

Although Britain's energetic activity to suppress the slave trade was far from effective, its diplomatic and military operations for this end led it to much greater involvement in African affairs. Additional colonies were acquired (Sierra Leone,

1808; Gambia, 1816; Gold Coast, 1821) to serve as bases for suppressing the slave trade and for stimulating substitute commerce. British naval squadrons touring the coast of Africa, stopping and inspecting suspected slavers of other nations, and forcing African tribal chiefs to sign antislavery treaties did not halt the expansion of the slave trade, but they did help Britain attain a commanding position along the west coast of Africa, which in turn contributed to the expansion of both its commercial and colonial empire.

NOTES

The Growth of Informal Empire

The transformation of the old colonial and mercantilist commercial system was completed when, in addition to the abolition of slavery and the slave trade, the Corn Laws and the Navigation Acts were repealed in the late 1840s. The repeal of the Navigation Acts acknowledged the new reality: the primacy of Britain's navy and merchant shipping. The repeal of the Corn Laws (which had protected agricultural interests) signalled the maturation of the Industrial Revolution. In the light of Britain's manufacturing supremacy, exclusivity and monopolistic trade restraints were less important than, and often detrimental to, the need for ever-expanding world markets and sources of inexpensive raw materials and food.

With the new trade strategy, under the impetus of freer trade and technical progress, came a broadening of the concept of empire. It was found that the commercial and financial advantages of formal empire could often be derived by informal means. The development of a worldwide trade network, the growth of overseas banking, the export of capital to less advanced regions, the leading position of London's money markets—all under the shield of a powerful and mobile navy—led to Great Britain's economic preeminence and influence in many parts of the world, even in the absence of political control.

Anticolonial Sentiment

The growing importance of informal empire went hand in hand with increased expressions of dissatisfaction with the formal colonial empire. The critical approach to empire came from leading statesmen, government officials in charge of colonial policy, the free traders, and the philosophic Radicals (the latter, a broad spectrum of opinion makers often labelled the Little Englanders, whose voices of dissent were most prominent in the years between 1840 and 1870). Taking the long view, however, some historians question just how much of this current of political thought was really concerned with the transformation of the British Empire into a Little England. Those who seriously considered colonial separation were for the most part thinking of the more recent white-settler colonies, such as Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, and definitely not of independence for India nor, for that matter, for Ireland. Differences of opinion among the various political factions

NOTES

naturally existed over the best use of limited government finance, colonial administrative tactics, how much foreign territory could in practice be controlled, and such issues as the costs of friction with the United States over Canada. Yet, while there were important differences of opinion on the choice between formal and informal empire, no important conflict arose over the desirability of continued expansion of Britain's world influence and foreign commercial activity. Indeed, during the most active period of what has been presumed to be anticolonialism, both the formal and informal empires grew substantially: new colonies were added, the territory of existing colonies was enlarged, and military campaigns were conducted to widen Britain's trading and investment area, as in the Opium Wars of the mid-19th century.

Decline of Colonial Rivalry

An outstanding development in colonial and empire affairs during the period between the Napoleonic Wars and the 1870s was an evident lessening in conflict between European powers. Not that conflict disappeared entirely, but the period as a whole was one of relative calm compared with either the almost continuous wars for colonial possessions in the 18th century or the revival of intense rivalries during the latter part of the 19th and early 20th centuries. Instead of wars among colonial powers during this period, there were wars against colonized peoples and their societies, incident either to initial conquest or to the extension of territorial possessions farther into the interior. Examples are Great Britain in India, Burma, South Africa (Kaffir Wars), New Zealand (Maori Wars); France in Algeria and Indochina; the Low Countries in Indonesia; Russia in Central Asia; and the United States against the North American Indians.

Contributing to the abatement of intercolonial rivalries was the undisputable supremacy of the British Navy during these years. The increased use of steamships in the 19th century helped reinforce this supremacy: Great Britain's ample domestic coal supply and its numerous bases around the globe (already owned or newly obtained for this purpose) combined to make available needed coaling stations. Over several decades of the 19th century and until new developments toward the end of the century opened up a new age of naval rivalry, no country was in a position to challenge Britain's dominance of the seas. This may have temporarily weakened Britain's acquisitive drive: the motive of preclusive occupation of foreign territory still occurred, but it was not as pressing as at other times.

On the whole, despite the relative tranquillity and the rise of anticolonial sentiment in Britain, the era was marked by a notable wave of European expansionism. Thus, in 1800 Europe and its possessions, including former colonies, claimed title to about 55 percent of the Earth's land surface: Europe, North and South America, most of India, the Russian part of Asia, parts of the East Indies,

NOTES

and small sections along the coast of Africa. But much of this was merely claimed; effective control existed over a little less than 35 percent, most of which consisted of Europe itself. By 1878—that is, before the next major wave of European acquisitions began—an additional 6,500,000 square miles (16,800,000 square kilometres) were claimed; during this period, control was consolidated over the new claims and over all the territory claimed in 1800. Hence, from 1800 to 1878, actual European rule (including former colonies in North and South America) increased from 35 to 67 percent of the Earth's land surface.

Decline of The Spanish and Portuguese Empires

During the early 19th century, however, there was a conspicuous exception to the trend of colonial growth, and that was the decline of the Portuguese and Spanish empires in the Western Hemisphere. The occasion for the decolonization was provided by the Napoleonic Wars. The French occupation of the Iberian Peninsula in 1807, combined with the ensuing years of intense warfare until 1814 on that peninsula between the British and French and their respective allies, effectively isolated the colonies from their mother countries. During this isolation the long-smouldering discontents in the colonies erupted in influential nationalist movements, revolutions of independence, and civil wars. The stricken mother countries could hardly interfere with events on the South American continent, nor did they have the resources, even after the Peninsular War was over, to bring enough soldiers and armaments across the Atlantic to suppress the independence forces.

Great Britain could have intervened on behalf of Spain and Portugal, but it declined. British commerce with South America had blossomed during the Napoleonic Wars. New vistas of potentially profitable opportunities opened up in those years, in contrast with preceding decades when British penetration of Spanish colonial markets consisted largely of smuggling to get past Spain's mercantile restrictions. The British therefore now favoured independence for these colonies and had little interest in helping to reimpose colonial rule, with its accompanying limitations on British trade and investment. Support for colonial independence by the British came in several ways: merchants and financiers provided loans and supplies needed by insurrectionary governments; the Royal Navy protected the shipment of those supplies and the returning specie; and the British government made it clear to other nations that it considered South American countries independent. The British forthright position on independence, as well as the availability of the Royal Navy to support this policy, gave substance to the U.S. Monroe Doctrine (1823), which the United States had insufficient strength at that time to really enforce.

NOTES

After some 15 years of uprisings and wars, Spain by 1825 no longer had any colonies in South America itself, retaining only the islands of Cuba and Puerto Rico. During the same period Brazil achieved its independence from Portugal. The advantages to the British economy made possible by the consequent opening up of the Latin-American ports were eagerly pursued, facilitated by commercial treaties signed with these young nations. The reluctance of France to recognize their new status delayed French penetration of their markets and gave an advantage to the British. In one liberated area after another, brokers and commercial agents arrived from England to ferret out business opportunities. Soon the continent was flooded with British goods, often competing with much weaker native industries. Actually, Latin America provided the largest single export market for British cotton textiles in the first half of the 19th century.

Despite the absence of formal empire, the British were able to attain economic preeminence in South America. Spanish and Portuguese colonialism had left a heritage of disunity and conflict within regions of new nations and between nations, along with conditions that led to unstable alliances of ruling elite groups. While this combination of weaknesses militated against successful self-development, it was fertile ground for energetic foreign entrepreneurs, especially those who had technically advanced manufacturing capacities, capital resources, international money markets, insurance and shipping facilities, plus supportive foreign policies. The early orgy of speculative loans and investments soon ended. But before long, British economic penetration entered into more lasting and self-perpetuating activities, such as promoting Latin-American exports, providing railroad equipment, constructing public works, and supplying banking networks. Thus, while the collapse of the Spanish and Portuguese empires led to the decline of colonialism in the Western Hemisphere, it also paved the way for a significant expansion of Britain's informal empire of trade, investment, and finance during the 19th century.

The Emigration of European Peoples

European influence around the globe increased with each new wave of emigration from Europe. Tides of settlers brought with them the Old World culture and, often, useful agricultural and industrial skills. An estimated 55,000,000 Europeans left their native lands in the 100 years after 1820, the product chiefly of two forces: (1) the push to emigrate as a result of difficulties arising from economic dislocations at home and (2) the pull of land, jobs, and recruitment activities of passenger shipping lines and agents of labour-hungry entrepreneurs in the New World. Other factors were also clearly at work, such as the search for religious freedom, escape from tyrannical governments, avoidance of military conscription, and the desire for greater upward social and economic mobility. Such motives

had existed throughout the centuries, however, and they are insufficient to explain the massive population movements that characterized the 19th century. Unemployment induced by rapid technological changes in agriculture and industry was an important incentive for English emigration in the mid-1800s. The surge of German emigration at roughly the same time is largely attributable to an agricultural revolution in Germany, which nearly ruined many farmers on small holdings in southwestern Germany.

NOTES

Under English rule, the Irish were prevented from industrial development and were directed to an economy based on export of cereals grown on small holdings. A potato blight, followed by famine and eviction of farm tenants by landlords, gave large numbers of Irish no alternative other than emigration or starvation. These three nationalities—English, German, and Irish—composed the largest group of migrants in the 1850s. In later years Italians and Slavs contributed substantially to the population spillover. The emigrants spread throughout the world, but the bulk of the population transfer went to the Americas, Siberia, and Australasia. The population outflow, greatly facilitated by European supremacy outside Europe, helped ease the social pressures and probably abated the dangers of social upheaval in Europe itself.

Advance of the U.S. Frontier

The outward movement of European peoples in any substantial numbers naturally was tied in with conquest and, to a greater or lesser degree, with the displacement of indigenous populations. In the United States, where by far the largest number of European emigrants went, acquisition of space for development by white immigrants entailed activity on two fronts: competition with rival European nations and disposition of the Indians. During a large part of the 19th century, the United States remained alert to the danger of encirclement by Europeans, but in addition the search for more fertile land, pursuit of the fur trade, and desire for ports to serve commerce in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans nourished the drive to penetrate the American continent.

The most pressing points of tension with European nations were eliminated during the first half of the century: purchase of the Louisiana Territory from France in 1803 gave the United States control over the heartland of the continent; settlement of the War of 1812 ended British claims south of the 49th parallel up to the Rocky Mountains; Spain's cession of the Floridas in 1819 rounded out the Atlantic coastal frontier; and Russia's (1824) and Great Britain's (1846) relinquishment of claims to the Oregon territory gave the United States its window on the Pacific. The expansion of the United States, however, was not confined to liquidating rival claims of overseas empires; it also involved taking territory from neighbouring Mexico. Settlers from the United States wrested Texas from

NOTES

Mexico (1836), and war against Mexico (1846–48) led to the U.S. annexation of the southwestern region between New Mexico and Utah to the Pacific Ocean.

Diplomatic and military victories over the European nations and Mexico were but one precondition for the transcontinental expansion of the United States. In addition, the Indian tribes sooner or later had to be rooted out to clear the new territory. At times, treaties were arranged with Indian tribes, by which vast areas were opened up for white settlement. But even where peaceful agreements had been reached, the persistent pressure of the search for land and commerce created recurrent wars with Indian tribes that were seeking to retain their homes and their land. Room for the new settlers was obtained by forced removal of natives to as yet non-white-settled land—a process that was repeated as white settlers occupied ever more territory. Massacres during wars, susceptibility to infectious European diseases, and hardships endured during forced migrations all contributed to the decline in the Indian population and the weakening of its resistance. Nevertheless, Indian wars occupied the U.S. Army's attention during most of the 19th century, ending with the eventual isolation of the surviving Indians on reservations set aside by the U.S. government.

2.7 THE NEW IMPERIALISM (1875–1914)

Although there are sharp differences of opinion over the reasons for, and the significance of, the "new imperialism," there is little dispute that at least two developments in the late 19th and in the beginning of the 20th century signify a new departure : (1) notable speedup in colonial acquisitions; (2) an increase in the number of colonial powers.

New Acquisitions

The annexations during this new phase of imperial growth differed significantly from the expansionism earlier in the 19th century. While the latter was substantial in magnitude, it was primarily devoted to the consolidation of claimed territory (by penetration of continental interiors and more effective rule over indigenous populations) and only secondarily to new acquisitions. On the other hand, the new imperialism was characterized by a burst of activity in carving up as yet independent areas: taking over almost all Africa, a good part of Asia, and many Pacific islands. This new vigour in the pursuit of colonies is reflected in the fact that the rate of new territorial acquisitions of the new imperialism was almost three times that of the earlier period. Thus, the increase in new territories claimed in the first 75 years of the 19th century averaged about 83,000 square miles (215,000 square kilometres) a year. As against this, the colonial powers added an average of about 240,000 square miles (620,000 square kilometres) a year between the late 1870s and World War I (1914–18). By the beginning of that war, the new

territory claimed was for the most part fully conquered, and the main military resistance of the indigenous populations had been suppressed. Hence, in 1914, as a consequence of this new expansion and conquest on top of that of preceding centuries, the colonial powers, their colonies, and their former colonies extended over approximately 85 percent of the Earth's surface. Economic and political control by leading powers reached almost the entire globe, for, in addition to colonial rule, other means of domination were exercised in the form of spheres of influence, special commercial treaties, and the subordination that lenders often impose on debtor nations.

NOTES

New Colonial Powers

This intensification of the drive for colonies reflected much more than a new wave of overseas activities by traditional colonial powers, including Russia. The new imperialism was distinguished particularly by the emergence of additional nations seeking slices of the colonial pie: Germany, the United States, Belgium, Italy, and, for the first time, an Asian power, Japan. Indeed, this very multiplication of colonial powers, occurring in a relatively short period, accelerated the tempo of colonial growth. Unoccupied space that could potentially be colonized was limited. Therefore, the more nations there were seeking additional colonies at about the same time, the greater was the premium on speed. Thus, the rivalry among the colonizing nations reached new heights, which in turn strengthened the motivation for preclusive occupation of territory and for attempts to control territory useful for the military defense of existing empires against rivals.

The impact of the new upsurge of rivalry is well illustrated in the case of Great Britain. Relying on its economic preeminence in manufacturing, trade, and international finance as well as on its undisputed mastery of the seas during most of the 19th century, Great Britain could afford to relax in the search for new colonies, while concentrating on consolidation of the empire in hand and on building up an informal empire. But the challenge of new empire builders, backed up by increasing naval power, put a new priority on Britain's desire to extend its colonial empire. On the other hand, the more that potential colonial space shrank, the greater became the urge of lesser powers to remedy disparities in size of empires by redivision of the colonial world. The struggle over contested space and for redivision of empire generated an increase in wars among the colonial powers and an intensification of diplomatic manoeuvring.

Russia's Eastward Expansion

European nations and Japan at the end of the 19th century spread their influence and control throughout the continent of Asia. Russia, because of its geographic position, was the only occupying power whose Asian conquests were

NOTES

overland. In that respect there is some similarity between Russia and the United States in the forcible outward push of their continental frontiers. But there is a significant difference: the United States advance displaced the indigenous population, with the remaining Indians becoming wards of the state. On the other hand, the Russian march across Asia resulted in the incorporation of alien cultures and societies as virtual colonies of the Russian Empire, while providing room for the absorption of Russian settlers.

Although the conquest of Siberia and the drive to the Pacific had been periodically absorbing Russia's military energies since the 16th century, the acquisition of additional Asian territory and the economic integration of previously acquired territory took a new turn in the 19th century. Previously, Russian influence in its occupied territory was quite limited, without marked alteration of the social and economic structure of the conquered peoples. Aside from looting and exacting tribute from subject tribes, the major objects of interest were the fur trade, increased commerce with China and in the Pacific, and land. But changes in 19th-century Russian society, especially those coming after the Crimean War (1853–56), signaled a new departure. First, Russia's resounding defeat in that war temporarily frustrated its aspirations in the Balkans and the Near East; but, because its dynastic and military ambitions were in no way diminished, its expansionist energies turned with increased vigour to its Asian frontiers. Second, the emancipation of the serfs (1861), which eased the feudal restrictions on the landless peasants, led to large waves of migration by Russians and Ukrainians—first to Siberia and later to Central Asia. Third, the surge of industrialization, foreign trade, and railway building in the post-Crimean War decades paved the way for the integration of Russian Asia, which formerly, for all practical purposes, had been composed of separate dependencies, and for a new type of subjugation for many of these areas, especially in Central Asia, in which the conquered societies were "colonized" to suit the political and economic needs of the conqueror.

This process of acquisition and consolidation in Asia spread out in four directions: Siberia, the Far East, the Caucasus, and Central Asia. This pursuit of tsarist ambitions for empire and for warm-water ports involved numerous clashes and conflicts along the way. Russian expansion was ultimately limited not by the fierce opposition of the native population, which was at times a stumbling block, but by the counterpressure of competitive empire builders, such as Great Britain and Japan. Great Britain and Russia were mutually alarmed as the distances between the expanding frontiers of Russia and India shortened. One point of conflict was finally resolved when both powers agreed on the delimitation of the northern border of Afghanistan. A second major area of conflict in Central Asia was settled by an Anglo-Russian treaty (1907) to divide Persia into two separate spheres of influence, leaving a nominally independent Persian nation.

NOTES

As in the case of Afghanistan and Persia, penetration of Chinese territory produced clashes with both the native government and other imperialist powers. At times China's preoccupation with its struggle against other invading powers eased the way for Russia's penetration. Thus, in 1860, when Anglo-French soldiers had entered Peking, Russia was able to wrest from China the Amur Province and special privileges in Manchuria (Northeast Provinces) south of the Amur River. With this as a stepping-stone, Russia took over the seacoast north of Korea and founded the town of Vladivostok. But, because the Vladivostok harbour is icebound for some four months of the year, the Russians began to pay more attention to getting control of the Korean coastline, where many good year-round harbours could be found. Attempts to acquire a share of Korea, as well as all of Manchuria, met with the resistance of Britain and Japan. Further thrusts into China beyond the Amur and maritime provinces were finally thwarted by defeat in 1905 in the Russo-Japanese War.

Partition of Africa

By the turn of the 20th century, the map of Africa looked like a huge jigsaw puzzle, with most of the boundary lines having been drawn in a sort of game of give-and-take played in the foreign offices of the leading European powers. The division of Africa, the last continent to be so carved up, was essentially a product of the new imperialism, vividly highlighting its essential features. In this respect, the timing and the pace of the scramble for Africa are especially noteworthy. Before 1880 colonial possessions in Africa were relatively few and limited to coastal areas, with large sections of the coastline and almost all the interior still independent. By 1900 Africa was almost entirely divided into separate territories that were under the administration of European nations. The only exceptions were Liberia, generally regarded as being under the special protection of the United States; Morocco, conquered by France a few years later; Libya, later taken over by Italy; and Ethiopia.

The second feature of the new imperialism was also strongly evident. It was in Africa that Germany made its first major bid for membership in the club of colonial powers: between May 1884 and February 1885, Germany announced its claims to territory in South West Africa (now South West Africa/Namibia), Togoland, Cameroon, and part of the East African coast opposite Zanzibar. Two smaller nations, Belgium and Italy, also entered the ranks, and even Portugal and Spain once again became active in bidding for African territory. The increasing number of participants in itself sped up the race for conquest. And with the heightened rivalry came more intense concern for preclusive occupation, increased attention to military arguments for additional buffer zones, and, in a period when free trade was giving way to protective tariffs and discriminatory practices in colonies as well as at home, a growing urgency for protected overseas markets.

NOTES

Not only the wish but also the means were at hand for this carving up of the African pie. Repeating rifles, machine guns, and other advances in weaponry gave the small armies of the conquering nations the effective power to defeat the much larger armies of the peoples of Africa. Rapid railroad construction provided the means for military, political, and economic consolidation of continental interiors. With the new steamships, settlers and materials could be moved to Africa with greater dispatch, and bulk shipments of raw materials and food from Africa, prohibitively costly for some products in the days of the sailing ship, became economically feasible and profitable.

Penetration of Islamic North Africa was complicated, on the one hand, by the struggle among European powers for control of the Mediterranean Sea and, on the other hand, by the suzerainty that the Ottoman Empire exercised to a greater or lesser extent over large sections of the region. Developments in both respects contributed to the wave of partition toward the end of the 19th century. First, Ottoman power was perceptibly waning: the military balance had tipped decisively in favour of the European nations, and Turkey was becoming increasingly dependent on loans from European centres of capital (in the late 1870s Turkey needed half of its government income just to service its foreign debt). Second, the importance of domination of the Mediterranean increased significantly after the Suez Canal was opened in 1869.

France was the one European nation that had established a major beachhead in Islamic North Africa before the 1880s. At a time when Great Britain was too preoccupied to interfere, the French captured the fortress of Algiers in 1830. Frequent revolts kept the French Army busy in the Algerian interior for another 50 years before all Algeria was under full French rule. While Tunisia and Egypt had been areas of great interest to European powers during the long period of France's Algerian takeover, the penetration of these countries had been informal, confined to diplomatic and financial maneuvers. Italy, as well as France and England, had loaned large sums to the ruling beys of Tunisia to help loosen that country's ties with Turkey. The inability of the beys to service the foreign debt in the 1870s led to the installation of debt commissioners by the lenders. Tunisia's revenues were pledged to pay the interest due on outstanding bonds; in fact, the debt charges had first call on the government's income. With this came increased pressure on the people for larger tax payments and a growing popular dissatisfaction with a government that had "sold out" to foreigners. The weakness of the ruling group, intensified by the danger of popular revolt or a military coup, opened the door further for formal occupation by one of the interested foreign powers. When Italy's actions showed that it might be preparing for outright possession, France jumped the gun by invading Tunisia in 1881 and then completed its conquest by defeating the rebellions precipitated by this occupation.

NOTES

The course of Egypt's loss of sovereignty resembled somewhat the same process in Tunisia: easy credit extended by Europeans, bankruptcy, increasing control by foreign-debt commissioners, mulcting of the peasants to raise revenue for servicing the debt, growing independence movements, and finally military conquest by a foreign power. In Egypt, inter-imperialist rivalry, mainly between Great Britain and France, reached back to the early 19th century but was intensified under the circumstances of the new imperialism and the construction of the Suez Canal. By building the Suez Canal and financing Egypt's ruling group, France had gained a prominent position in Egypt. But Britain's interests were perhaps even more pressing because the Suez Canal was a strategic link to its empire and its other Eastern trade and colonial interests. The successful nationalist revolt headed by the Egyptian army imminently threatened in the 1880s the interests of both powers. France, occupied with war in Tunisia and with internal political problems, did not participate in the military intervention to suppress the revolt. Great Britain bombarded Alexandria in 1882, landed troops, and thus obtained control of Egypt. Unable to find a stable collaborationist government that would also pay Egypt's debts and concerned with suppressing not only the rebellion but also a powerful anti-Egyptian Mahdist revolt in the Sudan, Britain completely took over the reins of government in Egypt.

The rest of North Africa was carved up in the early 20th century. France, maneuvering for possession of Morocco, which bordered on her Algerian colony, tried to obtain the acquiescence of the other powers by both secret and open treaties granting Italy a free hand in Libya, allotting to Spain a sphere of influence, and acknowledging Britain's paramountcy in Egypt. France had, however, overlooked Germany's ambitions, now backed by an increasingly effective army and navy. The tension created by Germany led to an international conference at Algeciras (1906), which produced a short-lived compromise, including recognition of France's paramount interest, Spanish participation in policing Morocco, and an open door for the country's economic penetration by other nations. But France's vigorous pursuit of her claims, reinforced by the occupation of Casablanca and surrounding territory, precipitated critical confrontations, which reached their peak in 1911 when French troops were suppressing a Moroccan revolt and a German cruiser appeared before Agadir in a show of force. The resulting settlements completed the European partition of North Africa: France obtained the lion's share of Morocco; in return, Germany received a large part of the French Congo; Italy was given the green light for its war with Turkey over control of Tripoli, the first step in its eventual acquisition of Libya; and Spain was enabled to extend its Río de Oro protectorate to the southern frontier of Morocco. The more or less peaceful trade-offs by the occupying powers differed sharply from the

NOTES

long, bitter, and expensive wars they waged against the indigenous peoples and rulers of Islamic North Africa to solidify European rule.

The Race for Colonies in Sub-Saharan Africa

The partition of Africa below the Sahara took place at two levels: (1) on paper—in deals made among colonial powers who were seeking colonies partly for the sake of the colonies themselves and partly as pawns in the power play of European nations struggling for world dominance—and (2) in the field—in battles of conquest against African states and tribes and in military confrontations among the rival powers themselves. This process produced, over and above the ravages of colonialism, a wasp's nest of problems that was to plague African nations long after they achieved independence. Boundary lines between colonies were often drawn arbitrarily, with little or no attention to ethnic unity, regional economic ties, tribal migratory patterns, or even natural boundaries.

Before the race for partition, only three European powers—France, Portugal, and Britain—had territory in tropical Africa, located mainly in West Africa. Only France had moved into the interior along the Sénégal River. The other French colonies or spheres of influence were located along the Ivory Coast and in Dahomey (now Benin) and Gabon. Portugal held on to some coastal points in Angola, Mozambique (Moçambique), and Portuguese Guinea (now Guinea-Bissau). While Great Britain had a virtual protectorate over Zanzibar in East Africa, its actual possessions were on the west coast in the Gambia, the Gold Coast, the Sierra Leone, all of them surrounded by African states that had enough organization and military strength to make the British hesitate about further expansion. Meanwhile, the ground for eventual occupation of the interior of tropical Africa was being prepared by explorers, missionaries, and traders. But such penetration remained tenuous until the construction of railroads and the arrival of steamships on navigable waterways made it feasible for European merchants to dominate the trade of the interior and for European governments to consolidate conquests.

Once conditions were ripe for the introduction of railroads and steamships in West Africa, tensions between the English and French increased as each country tried to extend its sphere of influence. As customs duties, the prime source of colonial revenue, could be evaded in uncontrolled ports, both powers began to stretch their coastal frontiers, and overlapping claims and disputes soon arose. The commercial penetration of the interior created additional rivalry and set off a chain reaction. The drive for exclusive control over interior areas intensified in response to both economic competition and the need for protection from African states resisting foreign intrusion. This drive for African possessions was intensified by the new entrants to the colonial race who felt menaced by the possibility of being completely locked out.

NOTES

Perhaps the most important stimulants to the scramble for colonies south of the Sahara were the opening up of the Congo River basin by Belgium's king Leopold II and Germany's energetic annexationist activities on both the east and west coasts. As the dash for territory began to accelerate, 15 nations convened in Berlin in 1884 for the West African Conference, which, however, merely set ground rules for the ensuing intensified scramble for colonies. It also recognized the Congo Free State (now Congo [Kinshasa]) ruled by King Leopold, while insisting that the rivers in the Congo basin be open to free trade. From his base in the Congo, the king subsequently took over mineral-rich Katanga region, transferring both territories to Belgium in 1908.

In West Africa, Germany concentrated on consolidating its possessions of Togoland and Cameroon (Kamerun), while England and France pushed northward and eastward from their bases: England concentrated on the Niger region, the centre of its commercial activity, while France aimed at joining its possessions at Lake Chad within a grand design for an empire of contiguous territories from Algeria to the Congo. Final boundaries were arrived at after the British had defeated, among others, the Ashanti, the Fanti Confederation, the Opobo kingdom, and the Fulani; and the French won wars against the Fon kingdom, the Tuareg, the Mandingo, and other resisting tribes. The boundaries determined by conquest and agreement between the conquerors gave France the lion's share: in addition to the extension of its former coastal possessions, France acquired French West Africa and French Equatorial Africa, while Britain carved out its Nigerian colony.

In southern Africa, the intercolonial rivalries chiefly involved the British, the Portuguese, the South African Republic of the Transvaal, the British-backed Cape Colony, and the Germans. The acquisitive drive was enormously stimulated by dreams of wealth generated by the discovery of diamonds in Griqualand West and gold in Matabeleland. Encouraged by these discoveries, Cecil Rhodes (heading the British South Africa Company) and other entrepreneurs expected to find gold, copper, and diamonds in the regions surrounding the Transvaal, among them Bechuanaland, Matabeleland, Mashonaland, and Trans-Zambezia. In the ensuing struggle, which involved the conquest of the Nbele and Shona peoples, Britain obtained control over Bechuanaland and, through the British South Africa Company, over the areas later designated as the Rhodesias and Nyasaland. At the same time, Portugal moved inland to seize control over the colony of Mozambique. It was clearly the rivalries of stronger powers, especially the concern of Germany and France over the extension of British rule in southern Africa, that enabled a weak Portugal to have its way in Angola and Mozambique.

The boundary lines in East Africa were arrived at largely in settlements between Britain and Germany, the two chief rivals in that region. Zanzibar and the future Tanganyika were divided in the Anglo-German treaty of 1890: Britain

NOTES

obtained the future Uganda and recognition of its paramount interest in Zanzibar and Pemba in exchange for ceding the strategic North Sea island of Heligoland (Helgoland) and noninterference in Germany's acquisitions in Tanganyika, Rwanda, and Urundi. Britain began to build an East African railroad to the coast, establishing the East African Protectorate (later Kenya) over the area where the railroad was to be built.

Rivalry in northeastern Africa between the French and British was based on domination of the upper end of the Nile. Italy had established itself at two ends of Ethiopia, in an area on the Red Sea that the Italians called Eritrea and in Italian Somaliland along the Indian Ocean. Italy's inland thrust led to war with Ethiopia and defeat at the hands of the Ethiopians at Adwa in 1896. Ethiopia, surrounded by Italian and British armies, had turned to French advisers. The unique victory by an African state over a European army strengthened French influence in Ethiopia and enabled France to stage military expeditions from Ethiopia as well as from the Congo in order to establish footholds on the Upper Nile. The resulting race between British and French armies ended in a confrontation at Fashoda in 1898, with the British army in the stronger position. War was narrowly avoided in a settlement that completed the partition of the region: eastern Sudan was to be ruled jointly by Britain and Egypt, while France was to have the remaining Sudan from the Congo and Lake Chad to Darfur.

Germany's entrance into southern Africa through occupation and conquest of South West Africa touched off an upsurge of British colonial activity in that area, notably the separation of Basutoland (Lesotho) as a crown colony from the Cape Colony and the annexation of Zululand. As a consequence of the South African (Boer) War (1899–1902) Britain obtained sovereignty over the Transvaal and the Afrikaner Orange Free State.

2.8 THE NEW ERA IN EUROPE (AFTER 1871 AD)

Through much of the nineteenth century, Great Britain avoided the kind of social upheaval that intermittently plagued the Continent between 1815 and 1870. Supporters of Britain claimed that this success derived from a tradition of vibrant parliamentary democracy. While this claim holds some truth, the Great Reform Bill of 1832, the landmark legislation that began extending the franchise to more Englishmen, still left the vote to only twenty percent of the male population. A second reform bill passed in 1867 vertically expanded voting rights, but power remained in the hands of a minority—property-owning elites with a common background, a common education, and an essentially common outlook on domestic and foreign policy. The pace of reform in England outdistanced that of the rest of Europe, but for all that remained slow. Though the Liberals and Conservatives did advance different philosophy on the economy and government

NOTES

in its most basic sense, the common brotherhood on all representatives in parliament assured a relatively stable policy-making history.

In the 1880s, problems of unemployment, urban housing, public health, wages, working conditions, and healthcare upset this traditional balance and led the way for the advent of a new and powerful political movement in Great Britain: the Labour Party. By 1900, wages were stagnating while prices continued to rise throughout the country. The urban centers of London and Manchester faced crumbling housing and tenements arose throughout every major industrial center. Workers responded to their problems by putting their faith not in the Liberal Party, the group that traditionally received the worker vote since industrialization, but in the oft-militant trade unions, organizations that advanced worker demands in Parliament, cared for disabled workers, and assisted in pension, retirement, and contract matters.

In 1892 James Kier Hardie, an independent workingman from Scotland, became the first such man to sit in the House of Commons. He represented the Labour Party and built upon trade union support to craft a workers' party dedicated to advancing the cause of working Englishmen. For the first time in its history, the British Parliament began to represent class distinctions in English society. By 1906, twenty-nine seats in Parliament went to Labour.

Pressured by the new Labour movement, Liberals and Conservatives were forced to act for fear of losing any substantial labor vote. The so-called New Liberals, led by Chancellor of the Exchequer David Lloyd George, supported legislation to strengthen the right of unions to picket peacefully. The Liberal government passed the National Insurance Act of 1911, providing payments to workers for sickness and introducing unemployment benefits. In addition, heeding Labour's call for a more democratic House, Lloyd George pushed the Parliament Bill of 1911 that reduced the House of Lords (the upper house of Parliament that had always been dominated by conservatives averse to worker legislation) to a position lower than the House of Commons. Since the Parliament Bill, the Commons could raise taxes without the Lords approval and pay for any needed worker legislation. Finally, in 1913, the powerful Labour movement, about to eclipse the Liberals as the Conservative's opposition, pushed through the Trade Unions Act. This law granted unions legal rights to settle their grievances with management directly, without the interference of a generally conservative Parliament.

Rise of New Industrialized Nations

Parallel with the emergence of new powers seeking a place in the colonial sun and the increasing rivalry among existing colonial powers was the rise of industrialized nations able and willing to challenge Great Britain's lead in industry, finance, and world trade. In the mid-19th century Britain's economy outdistanced

NOTES

by far its potential rivals. But, by the last quarter of that century, Britain was confronted by restless competitors seeking a greater share of world trade and finance; the Industrial Revolution had gained a strong foothold in these nations, which were spurred on to increasing industrialization with the spread of railroad lines and the maturation of integrated national markets.

Moreover, the major technological innovations of the late 19th and early 20th centuries improved the competitive potential of the newer industrial nations. Great Britain's advantage as the progenitor of the first Industrial Revolution diminished substantially as the newer products and sources of energy of what has been called a second Industrial Revolution began to dominate industrial activity. The late starters, having digested the first Industrial Revolution, now had a more equal footing with Great Britain: they were all starting out more or less from the same base to exploit the second Industrial Revolution. This new industrialism, notably featuring mass-produced steel, electric power and oil as sources of energy, industrial chemistry, and the internal-combustion engine, spread over western Europe, the United States, and eventually Japan.

New Militarism

The complex of social, political, and economic changes that accompanied the new industrialism and the vastly expanded and integrated world commerce also provided a setting for intensified commercial rivalry, the rebuilding of high tariff walls, and a revival of militarism. Of special importance militarily was the race in naval construction, which was propelled by the successful introduction and steady improvement of radically new warships that were steam driven, armour-plated, and equipped with weapons able to penetrate the new armour. Before the development of these new technologies, Britain's naval superiority was overwhelming and unchallengeable. But because Britain was now obliged in effect to build a completely new navy, other nations with adequate industrial capacities and the will to devote their resources to this purpose could challenge Britain's supremacy at sea.

The new militarism and the intensification of colonial rivalry signalled the end of the relatively peaceful conditions of the mid-19th century. The conflict over the partition of Africa, the South African War (the Boer War), the Sino-Japanese War, the Spanish-American War, and the Russo-Japanese War were among the indications that the new imperialism had opened a new era that was anything but peaceful.

The new imperialism also represented an intensification of tendencies that had originated in earlier periods. Thus, for example, the decision by the United States to go to war with Spain cannot be isolated from the long-standing interest of the United States in the Caribbean and the Pacific. The defeat of Spain and the

suppression of the independence revolutions in Cuba and the Philippines gave substance to the Monroe Doctrine: the United States now became the dominant power in the Caribbean, and the door was opened for acquisition of greater influence in Latin America. Possession of the Philippines was consistent with the historic interest of the United States in the commerce of the Pacific, as it had already manifested by its long interest in Hawaii (annexed in 1898) and by an expedition by Commodore Matthew Perry to Japan (1853).

1907, Second Hague Peace Conference

The Second Hague Peace Conference, was convened in 1907 at the initiative of President Theodore Roosevelt. The Second Hague Peace Conference of 1907 [15 June-18 October 1907] produced thirteen separate conventions. The Second Hague Peace Conference dealt with the subjects of the immunity of unoffending private property of the enemy upon the high seas, the limitation of force in the collection of contract debts, arbitration, an international prize court, and the project for the establishment of a permanent court of arbitral justice, composed of judges acting under a sense of judicial responsibility and representing the various languages and systems of law.

Germany initially had no ambition to embark on a policy of big battleships, and it was hoped that by a reduction of non-essential weights it would be possible to construct battleships of 11,000 to 13,000 tons displacement at least equal in fighting power to British, American, and French ships of somewhat greater size. Moreover, the North Sea coast of Germany, in the opinion of British naval officers, was so shallow as to be unsuited to big ships. Restricted views dominated the design of all the docks which were constructed for the German fleet. They were built to suit battleships of the Kaiser Frederick III class, and a slight margin only was left in view of possible increase in the size of men-of-war. The German Admiralty thought that 15,000 was the extreme limit of size in other European navies, and conjectured that by economies of weights they could obtain equal fighting efficiency for their purpose on about 13,000 tons, especially as they had no belief in the tactical value of high speed, which then meant heavy machinery and boiler equipment, before the advent of the Parsons marine turbine and water-tube boilers of various types. But with the advent of the HMS Dreadnought in 1906, all these considerations were cast aside as Germany joined the world-wide move towards larger all-big-gun warships.

During the Second Hague Peace Conference America and Britain tried and failed to get arms limitation agreements. President Theodore Roosevelt suggested that the size of battleships be limited to 15,000-ton class vessels, to halt the construction of Dreadnought-type battleships. The limits were opposed by the Germans in no small measure because they saw them as efforts to limit German

NOTES

naval growth, then perceived as a challenge to the absolute supremacy of the Royal Navy in European waters, as well as world-wide. An increase in German and Japanese naval power was expected to place a heavy burden on the US which straddled both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. At the beginning of October 1906, the US military assessed that even if the Congress were to give the green light for the construction of two battleships a year, the US would be unable to keep up in the global race to become the second strongest navy in the world after England.

The attempt of various Governments, particularly the English and Russian Governments, to have the question of the limitation of armaments discussed at the Second Hague Conference failed as a result of the opposition of Germany. A special visit to the European cabinets, undertaken by the Councillor of State de Martens, had no result. Only twice during the Conference was the question of armaments touched. In the plenary session of 17 August 1907, Sir Edward Fry delivered an address which he closed with this declaration:

> "The Government of His Britannic Majesty, recognizing that several Powers desire to restrict their military expenditure, and that this object can only be realized by the independent action of each Power, has thought it to be its duty to inquire whether there are any means for satisfying these aspirations. My Government has therefore authorized us to make the following declaration:
>
> "The British Government believes that in this way it might be possible to arrive at an understanding with regard to the expenditure which the States which should undertake to adopt this course would be justified in incorporating in their estimates. The Government of Great Britain will be prepared to communicate annually to Powers which would pursue the same course the program for the construction of new ships of war and the expenditure which this program would entail. This exchange of information would facilitate an exchange of views between the Governments on the subject of the reductions which it might be possible to effect by mutual agreement."
>
> In conclusion, therefore, Mr. President, I have the honor to propose to you the adoption of the following resolution:
>
> "The Conference confirms the resolution adopted by the Conference of 1899 in regard to the limitation of military expenditure; and inasmuch as military expenditure has considerably increased in almost every country since that time, the Conference declares that it is eminently desirable that the Governments should resume the serious examination of this question."

NOTES

After the United States of America, France and Spain had expressed their sympathy with the words of Fry, and the United States and Spain had expressly declared that at the time of the convocation of the Conference they had reserved the right of discussing the question of armaments, the President proposed the adoption of the English motion, which was unanimously voted.

2.9 SOCIALISM AND ITS EFFECTS ON EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

One of the features of the Enlightenment was the exaltation of property rights to the status of a bulwark of liberty by philosophers such as John Locke. In older Europe property had always been accompanied by power; but that power was justified by the belief in the inevitability of aristocratic rule—the concept that the wealth of the nobility was their God-given right. To some slight degree it was balanced by a traditional Christian suspicion of wealth which endorsed holy poverty for the clergy and preached to the wealthy that they owed charity to the poor. Further, its power was limited by its basis—agriculture—which could expand only so far.

The Industrial Revolution had many profound effects on European civilization. It rendered much of the old aristocracy irrelevant, boosted the bourgeoisie to economic and political power, and drafted much of the old peasant class into its factories. The result was naturally a shift in attitude toward wealth. Capitalist wealth seemed to have no natural limits. Partly because the new industrial modes of production had no preassigned place in feudal order of things, the industrialists viewed themselves as the creators of their wealth and considered it something to be proud of.

This class also created the various movements for democratic government which swept across Europe; and it was only natural that they should have viewed their economic and political ideals as functioning hand in hand. Democracy was necessary to wrest power from the old nobility, to pass laws enabling business to thrive, and to guarantee their property rights.

Rousseau had argued in his Social Contract that true democracy could not thrive in a society with great extremes of wealth and poverty because power always naturally flows toward the wealthy, whatever the electoral system; but the sort of democracy the bourgeoisie advocated was for a long time reserved for property owners: merchants, manufacturers, landlords and bankers. One of the great struggles of the 19th Century was for the gradual expansion of the vote, first to working men, and—much later—to women.

The notion of liberty promulgated by the "liberals" of the 19th century (who held opinions now called "conservative") was based on the concept that only on the basis of economic independence and security could freedom be

NOTES

secured; and that liberty was a product of natural law, not of a Christian theology which had sometimes censured excessive wealth. Indeed, greed itself was often celebrated as the engine that drove the economy and provided work and prosperity for all. Dependency was considered self-destructive, so the poor were punished for their poverty by harsh laws designed to drive them to work.

These ideas are very familiar to us today: just consider how the news eagerly reports increases in consumer spending as a sign of a healthy economy, how the current movements for "welfare reform" use much the same concepts that justified the draconian "poor laws" of 19th-Century England. Investment is viewed, now as then, as the engine that drives the economy. Any measure which can encourage investors to buy more stock is viewed as beneficial to society as a whole.

But such a profound revolution was bound to cause negative reactions as well as positive ones. Not everyone agreed that the shift of power into the hands of the new rich was entirely benign.

In the first half of the 19th Century the working classes in the newly industrializing countries of England and Germany suffered under many forms of exploitation. The old feudal restrictions which had fixed peasants in place on the land and limited their income had also guaranteed them a place in the world. They may not have prospered, but they were often able to fend off starvation and homelessness simply because they had been born onto estates from which they could not be removed against their wills.

The dissolution of this old order meant that workers could be hired and fired at will and had to sell their labor for whatever the going rate was—and that rate was determined by their competition with each other to work cheaply enough to gain them an advantage in the job market. Traditional rules and protections went by the board in the new factories, which often ran for twenty-four hours a day (two twelve-hour shifts), seven days a week under the most inhumane conditions. Women and children were absorbed into the work force as well, often preferred because they cost much less than men. Living standards and educational levels actually declined in many areas.

Many of the industries severely polluted their environments, their machinery maimed and killed many workers, and food in the new factory towns was often of poor quality and in short supply. Even many well-to-do people became concerned over the wretched conditions under which the new working class labored, as is reflected in the popular novels of Charles Dickens.

But other side-effects of the industrial revolution had more immediate effects on the middle classes. The older economy had been a regulated one, fairly predictable except for the traditional crises caused by plague, war, and drought. The new economy brought a new kind of crisis that seemed to have no natural or

NOTES

rational basis—the "bust." What is now called "the business cycle" seemed to be beyond anyone's control. There would be a more or less prolonged period of economic growth, with plenty of jobs and rising wages during which most people prospered; but then, for no apparent reason, profits and wages would begin to fall and millions would be plunged into unemployment and poverty, and even the wealthy could abruptly find themselves much less well off, if not absolutely impoverished.

Industrialists tried to stabilize these wild cycles of "boom and bust" in the runaway engine of the capitalist economy by passing regulations setting maximum wages and banning labor unions (to conserve profits), regulating imports (to preserve national commercial advantages), and combining into huge monopolistic "trusts" designed to reduce or eliminate competition.

Although competition is the engine of capitalism, it is not to the advantage of individual capitalists that it be entirely unfettered. The ultimate success in competition, indeed, is to absorb or destroy rivals and emerge at the top of the heap, able to dictate wages and prices. Although as the century passed these efforts to stabilize and concentrate wealth grew more successful, they were never able to prevent the recurrence of periodic "crashes."

Some began to argue that this unstable new system which glorified greed while impoverishing the common people needed radical reform. These were the early socialists.

The notion of socialism can be traced back centuries in various forms, notably among the earliest Christians (see the remarkable story in Acts 4:34-5:11); and the model of monastic communism, with individuals owning nothing except what they collectively shared was constantly before the eyes of Europeans throughout much of the Christian era. But the roots of modern socialism lie in our period, in France, Germany and England during the period of the industrial revolution.

"Socialism" is an exceedingly fuzzy term which has been used to label an extraordinarily wide array of political and economic beliefs. Its definition is further obscured by the tendency of its enemies to label any idea with which they disagree "socialist." But generally socialists advocate a democratically controlled economy run for the benefit of all. The unfettered competition of capitalists is replaced by cooperation and the business cycle by planned stability. Often they believe—like the early Christians—that property should be shared in common, and private ownership of industry and land abolished.

Many 19th-Century socialists rejected the argument that the wealthy deserve their wealth because they have created it, instead believing that wealth is created by the working classes and wrongfully appropriated by the rich who benefit disproportionately from their underpaid labor. Much ink has been spilled to

NOTES

"prove" the capitalist or labor theories of value; but they are in essence not theories that can be proven, but rather irreconcilable philosophical views. Clearly both capital and labor are vital to industry, and arguing which produces the other is a variation on the old argument over which came first, the chicken or the egg, except that it is far more fraught with political tensions.

Such arguments had little appeal for most ordinary socialists: they simply saw poverty and its attendant misery spreading around them and wanted to do something about it. Their ideals were equality, cooperation, democracy, and shared prosperity.

These ideals were also shared by two other groups: the anarchists and the Communists. We have touched on anarchism in the context of Zola's Germinal, and it is sufficient to point out that its advocates rejected socialists' trust in even the most democratic of governments, arguing that only the most decentralized grass-roots sort of organization could prevent tyranny. Their critique of the usual socialist program was an acute one, but they failed to achieve much because the more peaceful anarchists could change little and the violent ones aroused more reaction against themselves than against the state which they dreamed of destroying.

Communism's relationship to socialism is a more complex matter. Traditionally, "communism" with a small "c" has been taken to stand for a form of social organization in which people live in groups, sharing labor and property collectively, whether this takes the form of a small commune or a large state. Those forms of socialism which merely emphasize publically financed social programs based on the heavy taxation of private business cannot properly be called "communist."

However, Marxists also consider themselves socialists. For modern Communists (with a big "C"), socialism is the more comprehensive term: Communism is regarded as an advanced stage of socialism, and this definition is adopted in this essay. Theoretically, the socialist state is an interim measure necessary to carry out the reorganization of society, which will then "wither away" to produce very much the same results as are aimed at in anarchism: a moneyless society in which market forces play no role, in which production is for the use of the producers, in which lands and factories are commonly owned by those who work them, and in which the state—and with it, war—is abolished. Unfortunately for this theory, the modern Communist states have withered only by retreating into capitalism, not by moving forward into anarchism.

It was not so clear in the mid-19th Century that socialism would not succeed. We are so used to capitalism by now that we take it for granted, supposing that investment, marketing and market forces must have been the central driving forces of human society for all time. This is very far from being the case. Property

and privilege have always existed in some form, but not necessarily in the forms which they take under capitalism. It is difficult to remember, for instance, that in most early societies, including early Medieval Europe, few people ever handled money: barter was the rule.

NOTES

Sophisticated thinkers in the 18th and early 19th Centuries were very aware that industrial capitalism had not always existed and indeed was emerging among lingering remnants of feudalism all over Europe. If such a profound revolution in social relations could take place in their own time, surely it was not unthinkable that another could succeed it—a socialist revolution.

The earliest thinkers to be called "socialists" were the Frenchmen Henri de Saint-Simon (1760-1825) and François-Marie-Charles Fourier (1772-1837) and the Welshman Robert Owen ((1771-1858). All three of them were visionaries with little political sense, hoping to bring about a better society through the voluntary efforts of people of good will. In this way, they were very much products of the enlightenment. Among them, Owen was the only one who was able to put any of his ideas into practice, since as an idealistic wealthy industrialist he had the means to do so. Various Owenite communities were founded, especially in America, but none of them lasted long.

Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865), though more properly considered an anarchist, articulated a hostility toward capitalists that was echoed in the writings of many socialists. His slogan "property is theft" was a handy, if inflammatory, summation of the labor theory of value, and much influenced popular socialism among the working classes. However, like the majority of socialists and Communists, he was not strictly opposed to all private property: one should be free to own one's own home and domestic goods, for instance. What he objected to was property used to extract wealth from the labor of others: factories, mines, railroads, etc.; and Marx, whom he met in Paris in the 1840s, generally followed this line of thought. He was also an important influence on Marx's opponent, Bakunin, the Russian anarchist Zola used as inspiration for the character of Souvarine in Germinal.

When Marx and Engels wrote The Communist Manifesto in 1848, they were far from dominating the socialist movement. Proudhon had wider influence than they, and they often had to struggle to get their ideas taken seriously in socialist circles.

If it had only been idealistic industrialists and middle-class intellectuals who had espoused socialism, it never would have gotten far; but in its simpler forms its ideas found a fairly widespread appeal among working people. It comes as a shock to many modern students to discover that perhaps the majority of labor movements in the 19th Century embraced socialism as their goal. Zola's miners

NOTES

were not alone in seeing union organizing as only a preliminary stage on the advance toward state power.

Well into the 20th Century, labor unions often had at least nominally socialist programs, even in the notoriously conservative U.S. In Europe they routinely organized labor parties which competed in elections on socialist platforms, and sometimes won, though rarely implementing more than a few of their more modest goals, such as nationalizing railroads, mines, and some other industries.

The link between labor organizing and socialism was reinforced by the efforts of capitalists to suppress all labor movements, viewing any form of unionization, no matter how mild, as posing the threat of revolution. Socialists like Marx welcomed these popular movements as providing the only viable vehicle for radical change.

Clearly, he thought, ever larger masses of workers drafted into the industrial armies of capital, tormented by poverty and the insecurity born of the wild fluctuations of the business cycle, would grow to be the dominant force in society, outnumber everyone else. Their pressure for radical change would inevitably lead to a confrontation in which the capitalist rulers of society would abandon all pretense of democracy and thereby become the targets of an irresistable armed uprising. Marx's notion of revolution was always one of the vast majority of society seizing power from a tiny minority of capitalists for the common good of all.

That no such revolution ever took place is due in part to the remarkable successes of the labor movement in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Against incredibly difficult odds, often beaten, imprisoned, and shot, union members successfully waged campaigns to shorten the working day, increase wages, and improve working conditions until most workers no longer felt they had "nothing to lose" by destroying the system which they were substantially reshaping.

Meanwhile it should be said that the competitive forces of capitalism made their own contribution to worker prosperity despite the best efforts of the monopolistic trust-builders by continually producing more cheap, abundant goods which effectively raised the common standard of living. The new goods might lack the quality of the old hand-made products of the feudal age, but they were geneally available to people of even modest means. The twin pressures of maket competition and labor organization meant, on average, that—despite the misery prevalent in many quarters and the chaos created by periodic "busts," the majority of workers during the second half of the the 19th Century were better off than their parents.

The wave of democratic revolutions in 1848 which established parliamentary government in a number of European nations did not embrace the socialist ideals of the Communist Manifesto published that same year. It was not until 1864 that

the International Working Men's Association (the "First International") was formed, powerfully influenced by Marxism, and became a dominant force in continental European socialism.

NOTES

Meanwhile Marx's fellow German, Ferdinand Lassalle (1825-1864), was arguing for the formation of voluntary worker cooperatives as the basis of socialism. This reformist approach was worlds removed from Marx's revolutionary ideas and brought down his scorn; but many, like Étienne Lantier in Germinal, were drawn to them. Lassalle's cooperatives can be seen as the forerunners of many organizations thriving today even in the midst of capitalism: credit unions, mutual insurance companies, food coops, and the like. Cooperatives never succeeded in transforming society, but they have often offered alternatives to profit-oriented private enterprise.

Marx and Lasalle were the leading—and feuding—influences in the formation of the German Social Democratic Party, which was for some decades the leading Socialist organization in the world. Marx would have been astounded to discover that his theories were to find their most effective implementation in Russia rather than in his native Germany. By 1891, the party had a million and a half members and was experiencing substantial electoral success. However, the very political success of the Social Democrats meant that despite their fiery rhetoric—often more fiery than Marx at this period—their activities were absorbed into conventional political activities rather than into creating revolution.

Paralleling the shift of the successful labor movement, in the early 20th Century, the party became more and more moderate in its views, ultimately abandoning the goal of revolution altogether and aligning itself at the outbreak of World War I with the aggressive militarism of Kaiser Wilhelm in a move which destroyed its credibility with socialists abroad. The first great period of international socialism was destroyed by the war as labor parties all across Europe fell into line in support of their own governments, disproving the Marxist doctrine that enlightened workers would feel more loyalty to each other across international boundaries than they would to the governments dominated by their capitalist ruling classes. Only in the U.S. did the socialists refuse to endorse the war, but the American Socialist Party never gained more than six percent of the vote, and was a marginal factor in both national and international politics.

Social democrats were more successful in Europe, particularly in Scandinavia, following a gradualist approach which involved high taxes to enforce relative economic equality, government regulation of industry, nationalization of large industries, and social welfare. Elements of these ideas are still in place throughout much of Europe, though increasingly under attack and now in the process of being largely dismantled, but not without vigorous resistance from

NOTES

workers who have benefitted by the systems built before the collapse of international Communism.

One brief moment in history, the Paris Commune of March 18 to May 28, 1871, is worth mention because it belies the anti-Communist stereotype that Communism was always a conspiratorial plot imposed from above by would-be tyrants rather than a popular political movement. In the wake of the defeat of France in the Franco-German War and the collapse of the Second Empire (1852-70), the citizens of Paris elected a radical government which included both old-style Republicans bent on recreating the politics of 1789 (the Jacobins) and followers of the socialist Prudhon. Other communes were created in Lyon, Saint-Étienne, Marseille, and Toulouse, but were quickly suppressed. The national government centered in Versailles used the army to suppress the Paris Commune in a wave of bloody retaliation. This story is told in the sequel to Germinal—The Débacle—in which Zola makes Étienne Lantier one of the leaders of the Commune.

The Commune was important not because of its concrete achievements, but because of its symbolism. Karl Marx duly noted and commented on the episode, and it encouraged many socialists as a sign that the working classes were ready for radical measures.

The story of the Russian Revolution of 1917 would take us beyond the scope of this course, but it is necessary to make a few observations about its consequences since without that revolution we would probably not feel the need to study Marx today.

Marx's tough-minded "scientific" approach to socialism which dismissed the early socialists as idle utopians was hardened in the work of V. I. Lenin, whose pragmatism justified many harsh measures during and after the Russian Revolution which would have appalled Marx. His doctrine of "democratic centralism" which forbade further debate once an issue had been settled within the Communist Party and the role of the Party as the dominating "vanguard of the proletariat" can be argued as having sown the seeds of the homicidal tyranny that emerged under Joseph Stalin. Marxists are prone to argue that Marx would never have accepted Stalin's excesses and that he should not be blamed for them, yet there is a harshness in his tone and an uncompromising dogmatism in his analyses which may have made figures like Stalin and Mao inevitable once power was gathered in their hands.

It is a tribute to the appeal of the logically dubious concept of "natural law" that both Communists and anti-Communists wound up appealing to it during the long nightmare of the Cold War. The Marxist notion of necessary, scientifically inevitable revolution was only a variation on the attempt of Voltaire to ground his ideas in reason and the laws of nature. Once socialism had been transformed

from a mere philosophical ideal to the iron law of history, its inevitability was used to justify any number of repressive measures. And of course anti-Communist democratic forces appealed to the traditional notion of naturally based liberties to denounce Marxism.

NOTES

Some argue that the reason socialism failed so catastrophically in the Soviet Union and China to attain its Marxist ideals was that these were preindustrial economies far from the stage of economic development which Marx viewed as the necessary platform for building Communism. He envisaged his revolution as redistributing a previously created wealth and seizing hold of a previously developed industrial system to run it more rationally and equitably. But the new socialist rulers of the U.S.S.R. and China had to create the very material base on which Marx assumed socialism would be built. They became the harsh taskmasters of the workers they claimed to represent, super-Capitalists, if you will, reproducing in an abbreviated period and on an unprecedented scale the accomplishments of the Industrial Revolution, reproducing its accompanying misery as well, but without the countervailing pressure of a vital labor movement to moderate their extreme measures.

There is doubtless much truth in this theory. No modern industrialized state ever underwent the sort of revolution Marx envisaged, and the successes of socialism in places like England, Sweden, and Denmark fell far short of his vision. Thus, it is often said that Marxism did not fail: it was never tried. However, the failures of such socialism as was built in the former Communist world suggest that even under the best of conditions, Marx's ideals could not have been carried out on a large scale.

In the end, the Communist economies failed to be more rational than capitalist ones partly because their leaders never had enough accurate data to plan and execute effective economic measures. The temptation of authorities from top to bottom of the system to lie about both supply and demand constantly disorted the process. It was not "totalitarianism" which destroyed the Soviet Union—it was the "private enterprise" of workers stealing from their factories, managers overestimating their output, and bureaucrats reporting whatever the current leadership would be most pleased to hear which in the end brought the system to its knees. Capitalism's cycles may be irrational and painful, but they proved in the long run less self-destructive than vain attempts to control every aspect of large modern economies.

Oddly enough, as Communism has collapsed in Eastern Europe, devolved into a sort of Capitalism with a Communist face in China, leaving only North Korea and Cuba as true believers, Marxist thought has achieved extraordinary prestige in Western academies. Professors in the humanities and social sciences speak of "late capitalism" as if it were in its twilight years and debate the merits of

NOTES

such 20th-Century Marxists as Antonio Gramcsci, applying his ideas to social policy, art history, and literary theory. The result is that the aspiring graduate student would do well to have some Marxist background in order to understand much of the academic debate encountered in American and European universities these days; yet these debates seem headed nowhere in a world increasingly infatuated with a reinvigorated capitalism.

The situation of workers in contemporary America well illustrates the problems inherent in Marxist analyses. The power of labor unions has been largely crushed and capitalists are free to engage in huge mergers aimed at reducing labor costs and workers have been weakened dramatically. Their working hours have been lengthened and their income decreased relative to inflation, but they are mostly afraid to organize to resist lest they be thrown out of work entirely where no socialist-inspired safety net remains to catch them.

Meanwhile, almost half of all Americans have substantial sums invested in the stock markets through retirement-plan mutual funds. Downward pressures on the current incomes of workers may well enhance their future prospects in retirement and the inheritances of their offspring. In such a situation the line between "proletarian" and "capitalist" is hopelessly obscured. It is true that an ever-tinier proportion of the population possesses and controls an ever more enormous majority of the national wealth; but workers often identify their welfare with the prosperity of the rich, expressing little or no resistance to repeated tax breaks and other favors granted big business.

In an atmosphere like this, the academic study of socialism can seem futile indeed; but at the very least we need to understand the forces that got us where we are. In addition, the socialist critique of capitalism still has much persuasive power, and socialist arguments are often effectively wielded by non-socialist reformers. The dwindling of the socialist ideal to its present residual state may not be a permanent condition, since capitalism has not ushered in the golden age either for the poor of this world. It remains to be seen whether socialism can revive in some new, modified way at some point in the future. In the meantime, it must be frankly recognized that an era has passed—the era when Marxist socialism appealed to a broad array of people internationally as an alternative to capitalism.

2.10 THIRD REPUBLIC IN FRANCE

The French Third Republic rose out of the ashes of Napoleon III's Second Empire after its defeat in the Franco-Prussian War. The Third Republic was a parliamentary republic, often unstable and constantly seeking legitimacy. By the end of the 1870s, the Third Republic found its home in the center of the French revolutionary and democratic tradition. The government enacted legislation aimed

at solidifying the common identity of all Frenchmen: compulsory schooling, centralized curricula, civics education, mandatory military service, and the central control of all media and government information from Paris. But it was the Boulanger Affair and the Dreyfus Affair (so commonly known that the latter simply became known as "The Affair") that, for better or for worse, gave the French Third Republic before World War I its own historical identity.

NOTES

General Georges Boulanger was a popular figure who captured the imagination of the French press. He found total army support when he reorganized the military as minister of war; he received business support when he led troops to end worker strikes. Most importantly, the agrarian poor were enchanted with this horseback riding hero as the preeminent French patriot. In 1889, Boulanger decided to use his popularity for his own advancement in the political arena: Boulanger hoped to establish a dictatorship in France on the heels of his election to the presidency by mass mandate. Through skillful manipulation of the media and popular symbols, Boulanger's campaign associated the would-be military dictator with patriotism, military victory, honor, constitutional reform, democracy, social welfare, and a whole litany of policies that gave each constituent group something to look forward to in a Boulanger administration. He was able to amass a large enough group to scare the Third Republic, but failed to gain the support he needed. His effort failed when he lost the election.

However, it was the Dreyfus Affair that truly galvanized and held the attention of the entire French nation. In 1894, Alfred Dreyfus, an Alsatian Jewish army officer accused of passing French military secrets to the Germans, was convicted of treason. His trial provided an outlet for virulent French xenophobia and anti-Semitism. Sentenced to exile to Devil's Island, Dreyfus maintained his innocence in the face of a French public captivated by scare tactics from the radical right. Eventually, the evidence crucial in cementing Dreyfuss' conviction was shown to have been forged and fabricated. When the illegal activities and forged evidence came to be known in the mass press, the entire country divided into two camps: the pro-Dreyfusards (usually political allied of the left and the Third Republic) who supported Dreyfus's innocence; and the anti-Dreyfusards (usually allies of traditionally conservative institutions such as the Church and the army, alongside rabid anti-Semites) who maintained his guilt in the name of French honor, national integrity, and racial purity. The entire country organized into leagues of small groups—intellectuals, workers, soldiers, clerics, leftists, *et cetera*—all in the name of their position on "The Affair". Dreyfus was eventually exonerated in the press and in the court after conclusive evidence unearthed by the media determined that it was one of Dreyfus's colleagues on the General Staff who leaked the secrets and framed the Jewish scapegoat.

NOTES

COMMENTARY

The French Third republic from 1871 to 1914 provides the first example of politics in the new era of mass politics and mass media and mass culture. Just as Napoleon III could have been considered the first real modern politician because of his skillful manipulation of pictures, photo-ops, and the media, the French Third Republic can be considered the first fully modern political society. The media provided the essential building block in that scenario. Due to the Third Republic's tendencies toward centralization, farmers in the most remote areas read Parisian newspapers, centralized railroads made communication of news easy and quick, and central education requirements made the French nation into one solid entity and, thus, into a mass culture. That mass culture was susceptible to cheap slogans taking aim at foreigners and outsiders, hence the near success of Boulanger's coup and Dreyfus's accusers. Nothing in particular saved democracy and justice from its conservative enemies—in Boulanger's case, he simply did not receive enough support, and in Dreyfus's case, had conclusive evidence not turned up, who knows what would have happened. Though the Third Republic survived—it, in fact, was never really in danger of collapsing until the interwar years—its new mass media was now a force to be considered.

2.11 SUMMARY

- After the loss of the American colonies in 1783 Britain began to look for new colonies in order to find cheap sources of raw materials. The 19th century brought about the greatest prosperity in Britain. Its sources lay in colonial expansion, industrialization, improved transport, and social reforms.
- By the 1780s, the British Industrial Revolution, which had been developing for several decades, began to further accelerate. Manufacturing, business, and the number of wage laborers skyrocketed, starting a trend that would continue into the first half of the 19th century. Meanwhile, technology changed: hand tools were replaced by steam- or electricity-driven machines.
- The most important of the changes that brought about the Industrial Revolution were (1) the invention of machines to do the work of hand tools; (2) the use of steam, and later of other kinds of power, in place of the muscles of human beings and of animals; and (3) the adoption of the factory system.
- Although Britain's energetic activity to suppress the slave trade was far from effective, its diplomatic and military operations for this end led it to much greater involvement in African affairs. Additional colonies were acquired (Sierra Leone, 1808; Gambia, 1816; Gold Coast, 1821) to serve as

bases for suppressing the slave trade and for stimulating substitute commerce.

- Although there are sharp differences of opinion over the reasons for, and the significance of, the "new imperialism," there is little dispute that at least two developments in the late 19th and in the beginning of the 20th century signify a new departure : (1) notable speedup in colonial acquisitions; (2) an increase in the number of colonial powers.
- The Second Hague Peace Conference, was convened in 1907 at the initiative of President Theodore Roosevelt. The Second Hague Peace Conference of 1907 [15 June-18 October 1907] produced thirteen separate conventions.

2.12 REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Discuss the social and economic conditions of England in 19th century.
2. Describe the industrial revolution of Britain.
3. What were those changes that caused industrial revolution?
4. State the history of European expansion.
5. Discuss the scenario of establishment of New Imperialism in the world.
6. Give the description of the evolution of third republic in France.

2.13 FURTHER READINGS

- Baumgart, Winfried, *Imperialism: The Idea and Reality of British and French Colonial Expansion*, 1880-1914. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Betts, Raymond F. *The False Dawn: European Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Doyle, Michael W. *Empires. Ithaca, NY: Cornell* University Press, 1986.
- Hobsbawn, Eric. *The Age of Empire, 1875-1914. New York:* Pantheon, 1987.
- Kishlansky, Mark et al. *Civilization in the West. Vol. II.* New York: Longman, 1998.
- Pakenham, Thomas. *The Scramble for Africa. New York:* Random House, 1991.
- Wehler, Hans-Ulrich. *The German Empire, 1871-1918.* Leamington Spa, England: Berg Publishers, 1985.

NOTES

CHAPTER– 3

EUROPE IN 19TH AND 20TH CENTURY

STRUCTURE

3.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After studying the chapter, students will be able to :

- state the history of German Empire from 1871-1914;
- understand the history of Russia from 1870 to 1914;
- explain the history of Italy between 1870 and world war I;
- describe the causes of friction between Austria, Hungry and Serbia after 1890;
- discuss the causes and consequences of World War I and II.

NOTES

3.2 INTRODUCTION

The year 1871 marked the beginning of the German Empire under the Prussian crown. An empire in name, Germany was actually administered by its chancellor Otto von Bismarck, a landed aristocrat (or, Junker) from east Prussia. Though Germany maintained universal manhood suffrage, the Reichstag, the house of Parliament in the German Empire, held only very restricted powers of legislation. Most power remained with Bismarck himself.

Through the 1870s, Bismarck formed expedient alliances with the German center- left parties that had held the majority in German politics since the inception of the empire. These alliances allowed Bismarck to maintain power and thereby establish the main elements of national administration: legal codes, railroad and banking systems, a judicial apparatus, and the civil service structure. In addition, the liberals called on Bismarck's assistance for their anti-Papal campaign, a movement Bismarck was only too happy to lead. Known as the Kulturkampf, or "struggle for civilization", the anti-Church campaign aimed to eliminate Catholics who, Bismarck thought, could never maintain true loyalty to the state because of their higher loyalty to Rome. The legislation of the Kulturkampf removed priests from state service, restricted religious education, elevated civil marriage, and arrested and expelled defiant priests and bishops. Bismarck's attack on the Church was not altogether successful, since it inspired widespread concern over the social fabric of the new state, allowing the Catholic Center party to rally the Catholic vote and other supporters to oppose Bismarck's policies. After his catholic adversaries gained scores of seats in the Reichstag in 1878, Bismarck saw defeat and reached out to the new Pope, Leo XIII, to negotiate a settlement between Germany and the Church. The Kulturkampf ended and Catholic toleration became law.

Without the opposition of the Kulturkampf the Catholic party lost some of its steam, and the powerful Social Democratic Party emerged as Bismarck's key enemy. Led by Eduard Bernstein, the Social Democrats were Marxists who called for a gradual development of the capitalist system into a state socialist system. Among other things, the Social Democrats advocated working within the system to advance the needs of the workers through welfare legislation, trade union power, economic regulation, and nationalization or regulation of industry. Bismarck, recognizing the appeal to Germany's growing working classes, initiated a "carrot and stick" approach of simultaneous repression and an overt effort to acquire popular support. To repress (the stick), Bismarck passed the Anti- Socialist Law, expanding police powers and forbidding socialist meetings, fundraising, and the distribution of printed materials. Police could now arrest any suspected socialist under only a minimum of suspicion. To bring popular support to the state (the carrot), Bismarck pushed extensive social welfare legislation through the Reichstag.

NOTES

The state provided accident insurance, sickness benefits, old age pensions, disability payments, et cetera. However, these moderate reforms did nothing to undermine the growing popularity of the Marxist movement under the Social Democrats. By 1890, the year Kaiser Wilhelm II fired Bismarck, the Social Democrats controlled over twenty percent of the electorate and thirty-five seats in the Reichstag; by 1914, the Social Democrats were the largest single party in German politics.

To keep the Social Democrats in the minority, Wilhelm II required mass conservative support—from the traditional aristocrats to the middle classes and the agrarian poor. Wilhelm found that such a coalition could best be built and maintained through the manipulation of nationalist and militaristic sentiments in the name of an aggressive foreign policy that called for colonial expansion, military development, and espoused German superiority in Europe. Such a system characterized German politics through to the end of World War I.

3.3 GERMAN EMPIRE

The German Empire refers to Germany during the "Second Reich" period from the unification of Germany and proclamation of William I as German Emperor on 18 January 1871 to 1918, when it became a federal republic after defeat in World War I and the abdication of the Emperor William II.

The German Empire consisted of 27 constituent territories (most of them ruled by royal families). While the Kingdom of Prussia contained most of the population and most of the territory of the Reich; the Prussian leadership became supplanted by German leaders and Prussia itself played a lesser role. The three large neighbors were Imperial Russia in the east, France in the west, both rivals, and Austria-Hungary in the south, an ally.

After 1850 Germany industrialized rapidly, with a foundation in coal, iron (and later steel), chemicals and railways. From a population of 41 million people in 1871 it grew to 68 million in 1913. From a heavily rural nation in 1815, it was now predominantly urban. During its 47 years of existence, the German Empire operated as an industrial, technological and scientific giant, receiving more Nobel Prizes in science than Britain, France, Russia and the United States combined.

It was a great power, with the most powerful army in the world, and its navy went from negligible to being second only to the British Empire in less than a decade. After the removal of the powerful Chancellor Otto von Bismarck in 1890 following the death of Emperor William I, the young Emperor Wilhelm II engaged in increasingly reckless foreign policies that left the Empire isolated. When the great crisis of 1914 arrived, it had only two weak allies (Austria and Turkey) left. It defeated Russia, carving out large Eastern territories in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, and could hold off France and Britain, but when the United States entered the war in 1917 the high command gambled on one last offensive in spring 1918

(before the Americans arrived in force), which failed. The Great War ruined the economy and dissolved faith in the authoritarian political system. The army could no longer hold off the Allied attacks and the Empire collapsed overnight in the November 1918 Revolution, and was subsequently destroyed in the Versailles treaty.

3.4 BISMARCK'S FOUNDING OF THE EMPIRE

German nationalism rapidly shifted from its liberal and democratic character in 1848, called Pan-Germanism, to Prussian prime minister Otto von Bismarck's pragmatic Realpolitik. Bismarck sought to extend Hohenzollern hegemony throughout the German states; to do so meant unification of the German states and the elimination of Prussia's rival, Austria, from the subsequent empire. He envisioned a conservative, Prussian-dominated Germany.

Three wars led to military successes and helped to persuade German people to do this: the Second war of Schleswig against Denmark in 1864, the Austro-Prussian War against Austria in 1866, and the Franco-Prussian War, known as the German-French War in Germany, against France in 1870–71. During the Siege of Paris in 1871, the northern German states, supported by its German allies from outside of the confederation (excluding Austria), formed the German Empire with the proclamation of the Prussian king Wilhelm I of Prussia as German Emperor in the Hall of Mirrors at the Palace of Versailles.

Bismarck himself prepared a broad outline—the 1866 North German Constitution, which became the 1871 German Constitution with some adjustments. Germany acquired some democratic features. The new empire had a parliament with two houses. The lower house, or Reichstag, was elected by universal male suffrage. However, the original constituencies drawn in 1871 were never redrawn to reflect the growth of urban areas. As a result, by the time of the great expansion of German cities in the 1890s and first decade of the 20th century, rural areas were grossly overrepresented.

Legislation also required the consent of the Bundesrat, the federal council of deputies from the states. Executive power was vested in the emperor, or Kaiser (Caesar), who was assisted by a chancellor responsible only to him. The emperor was given extensive powers by the constitution. He alone appointed and dismissed the chancellor, was supreme commander-in-chief of the armed forces, and final arbiter of all foreign affairs. Officially, the chancellor was a one-man cabinet and was responsible for the conduct of all state affairs; in practice, the State Secretaries (bureaucratic top officials in charge of such fields as finance, war, foreign affairs, etc.) acted as unofficial portfolio ministers. The Reichstag had the power to pass, amend or reject bills and to initiate legislation.

NOTES

Although nominally a league of equals, in practice the empire was dominated by the largest and most powerful state, Prussia. It stretched across the northern two thirds of the new Reich, and contained three fifths of its population. The imperial crown was hereditary in the House of Hohenzollern, the ruling house of Prussia. With the exception of the years 1872–1873 and 1892–1894, the chancellor was always simultaneously the prime minister of Prussia. With 17 out of 58 votes in the Bundesrat, Berlin needed only a few votes from the small states to exercise effective control.

The other states retained their own governments, but had only limited aspects of sovereignty. For example, both postage stamps and currency were issued for the empire as a whole. Coins through one mark was also minted in the name of the empire, while higher valued pieces were issued by the states. But these larger gold and silver issues were virtually commemorative coins and had limited circulation.

While the states issued their own decorations, and some had their own armies, the military forces of the smaller ones were put under Prussian control. Those of the larger states, such as the Kingdoms of Bavaria and Saxony, were coordinated along Prussian principles and would in wartime be controlled by the federal government.

The evolution of the German Empire is somewhat in line with parallel developments in Italy which became a united nation state shortly before the German Empire. Some key elements of the German Empire's authoritarian political structure were also the basis for conservative modernization in Imperial Japan under Meiji and the preservation of an authoritarian political structure under the Tsars in the Russian Empire.

One factor in the social anatomy of these governments had been the retention of a very substantial share in political power by the landed elite, the Junkers, resulting from the absence of a revolutionary breakthrough by the peasants in combination with urban areas.

Although authoritarian in many respects, the empire permitted the development of political parties. Bismarck's intention was to create a constitutional façade which would mask the continuation of authoritarian policies. In the process, he created a system with a serious flaw. There was a significant disparity between the Prussian and German electoral systems. Prussia used a highly restrictive three-class voting system in which the richest third of the population could choose 85% of the legislature, all but assuring a conservative majority. As mentioned above, the king and (with two exceptions) the prime minister of Prussia were also the emperor and chancellor of the empire – meaning that the same rulers had to seek majorities from legislatures elected from completely different franchises.

INDUSTRIAL POWER

In 30 years, Germany had fought with Britain for Europe's leading industrial power, though it fell behind the United States. Representative of its industrial was the steel giant Krupp, whose first factory was built in Essen. By 1902, the factory alone had become "A great city with its own streets, its own police force, fire department and traffic laws. There are 150 kilometres of rail, 60 different factory buildings, 8,500 machine tools, seven electrical stations, 140 kilometres of underground cable and 46 overhead."

Under Bismarck, Germany was a world innovator in building the welfare state. German workers enjoyed sickness, accident and maternity benefits, canteens, changing rooms and a national pension scheme.

3.5 BISMARCK'S ERA AND POLICIES

Bismarck's domestic policies played a great role in forging the authoritarian political culture of the Kaiserreich. Less preoccupied by continental power politics following unification in 1871, Germany's semi-parliamentary government carried out a relatively smooth economic and political revolution from above that pushed them along the way towards becoming the world's leading industrial power of the time.

FOREIGN POLICY

Bismarck's post-1871 foreign policy was conservative and sought to preserve the balance of power in Europe. His biggest concern was France, which was left defeated and resentful after the Franco-Prussian War. As the French lacked the strength to defeat Germany by themselves, they sought an alliance with Russia, which would trap Germany between the two in a war (as would ultimately happen in 1914). Bismarck wanted to prevent this at all costs and maintain friendly relations with the Russians, and thereby formed an alliance with them and Austria-Hungary (which by the 1880s was being slowly reduced to a German satellite), the Dreikaiserbund (League of Three Emperors).

During this period, individuals within the German military were advocating a preemptive strike against Russia, but Bismarck knew that such ideas were foolhardy. He once wrote that "the most brilliant victories would not avail against the Russian nation, because of its climate, its desert, and its frugality, and having but one frontier to defend," and because it would leave Germany with another bitter, resentful neighbor. Bismarck once contrasted his nation's foreign policy difficulties with the easy situation of the U.S. (the only strong power in the Western Hemisphere), saying "The Americans are a very lucky people. They're bordered to the north and south by weak neighbors, and to the east and west by fish."

NOTES

Meanwhile, the chancellor remained wary of any foreign policy developments that looked even remotely warlike. In 1886, he moved to stop an attempted sale of horses to France on the grounds that they might be used for cavalry and also ordered an investigation into large Russian purchases of medicine from a German chemical works. Bismarck stubbornly refused to listen to Georg Herbert zu Munster (ambassador to France), who reported back that the French were not seeking a revanchist war, and in fact were desperate for peace at all costs.

Bismarck and most of his contemporaries were conservative-minded and focused their foreign policy attention on Germany's neighboring states. In 1914, 60% of German foreign investment was in Europe, as opposed to just 5% of British investment. Most of the money went to developing nations such as Russia that lacked the capital or technical knowledge to industrialize on their own. The construction of the Baghdad Railway, financed by German banks, was designed to eventually connect Germany with the Turkish Empire and the Persian Gulf, but it also collided with British and Russian geopolitical interests.

Colonies

Bismarck secured a number of German colonial possessions during the 1880s in Africa and the Pacific, but he never saw much value in an overseas colonial empire; Germany's colonies remained badly undeveloped. However, they excited the interest of the religious-minded, who supported an extensive network of missionaries.

Germans had dreamed of colonial imperialism since 1848. Bismark began the process, and by 1884 had acquired German New Guinea. By the 1890s, German colonial expansion in Asia and the Pacific (Kiauchau in China, the Marianas, the Caroline Islands, Samoa) led to frictions with Britain , Russia, Japan and the U.S. The largest colonial enterprises were in Africa, where the harsh treatment of the Nama and Herero in what is now Namibia in 1906–07 led to charges of genocide against the Germans.

Economy

Railways

Lacking a technological base at first, the Germans imported their engineering and hardware from Britain, but quickly learned the skills needed to operate and expand the railways. In many cities, the new railway shops were the centres of technological awareness and training, so that by 1850, Germany was self sufficient in meeting the demands of railroad construction, and the railways were a major impetus for the growth of the new steel industry. However, German unification in 1870 stimulated consolidation, nationalisation into state-owned companies, and further rapid growth. Unlike the situation in France, the goal was support of

industrialization, and so heavy lines crisscrossed the Ruhr and other industrial districts, and provided good connections to the major ports of Hamburg and Bremen. By 1880, Germany had 9,400 locomotives pulling 43,000 passengers and 30,000 tons of freight, and forged ahead of France.

NOTES

Industry

Industrialization progressed dynamically in Germany and German manufacturers began to capture domestic markets from British imports, and also to compete with British industry abroad, particularly in the U.S. The German textiles and metal industries had by 1870 surpassed those of Britain in organization and technical efficiency and usurped British manufacturers in the domestic market. Germany became the dominant economic power on the continent and was the second largest exporting nation after Britain.

Technological progress during German industrialization occurred in four waves: the railway wave (1877–86), the dye wave (1887–96), the chemical wave (1897–1902), and the wave of electrical engineering (1903–18). Since Germany industrialized later than Britain, it was able to model its factories after those of Britain, thus making more efficient use of its capital and avoiding legacy methods in its leap to the envelope of technology. Germany invested more heavily than the British in research, especially in the chemistry, motors and electricity. Imperial Germany dominated in physics and chemistry so that one-third of all Nobel Prizes went to German inventors and researchers.

The German cartel system (known as Konzerne), being significantly concentrated, was able to make more efficient use of capital. Germany was not weighted down with an expensive worldwide empire that needed defense. Following Germany's annexation of Alsace-Lorraine in 1871, it absorbed parts of what had been France's industrial base.

By 1900, the German chemical industry dominated the world market for synthetic dyes. The three major firms BASF, Bayer and Hoechst produced several hundred different dyes, along with the five smaller firms. In 1913, these eight firms produced almost 90% of the world supply of dyestuffs and sold about 80% of their production abroad. The three major firms had also integrated upstream into the production of essential raw materials and they began to expand into other areas of chemistry such as pharmaceuticals, photographic film, agricultural chemicals and electrochemicals. Top-level decision-making was in the hands of professional salaried managers; leading Chandler to call the German dye companies "the world's first truly managerial industrial enterprises". There were many spinoffs from research—such as the pharmaceutical industry, which emerged from chemical research.

By the start of World War I (1914–1918), German industry switched to war production. The heaviest demands were on coal and steel for artillery and shell

NOTES

production, and on chemicals for the synthetization of materials that were subject to import restrictions and for chemical weapons and war supplies.

No Expansion

The creation of the Empire under Prussian leadership was a victory for the concept of Kleindeutschland (Smaller Germany) over the Großdeutschland concept. This meant that Austria, a multi-ethnic Empire with a considerable German-speaking population, would remain outside of the German nationstate. Bismarck's policy was to support this solution diplomatically. The effective alliance between Germany and Austria played a major role in Germany's decision to enter World War I in 1914.

Bismarck announced there would be no more territorial additions to Germany in Europe, and his diplomacy after 1871 was focused on stabilizing the European system and prevent any wars. He succeeded, and only after his ouster in 1890 did the diplomatic tensions start rising again.

Social Issues

After achieving formal unification in 1871, Bismarck devoted much of his attention to the cause of national unity under the ideology of Prussianism. He opposed conservative Catholic activism and emancipation, especially the powers of the Vatican under Pope Pius IX, and working class radicalism, represented by the emerging Social Democratic Party.

Kulturkampf

Prussia in 1871 included 16,000,000 Protestants, both Reformed and Lutheran, and 8,000,000 Catholics. Most people were generally segregated into their own religious worlds, living in rural districts or city neighborhoods that were overwhelmingly of the same religion, and sending their children to separate public schools where their religion was taught. There was little interaction or intermarriage. On the whole, the Protestants had a higher social status, and the Catholics were more likely to be peasant farmers or unskilled or semiskilled industrial workers. In 1870, the Catholics formed their own political party, the Centre Party, which generally supported unification and most of Bismarck's policies. However, Bismarck distrusted parliamentary democracy in general and opposition parties in particular, especially when the Centre Party showed signs of gaining support among dissident elements such as the Polish Catholics in Silesia. A powerful intellectual force of the time was anti-Catholicism, led by the liberal intellectuals who formed a vital part of Bismarck's coalition. They saw the Catholic Church as a powerful force of reaction and anti-modernity, especially after the proclamation of papal infallibility in 1870, and the tightening control of the Vatican over the local bishops.

NOTES

The Kulturkampf launched by Bismarck 1871–1880 affected Prussia; although there were similar movements in Baden and Hesse, the rest of Germany was not affected. According to the new imperial constitution, the states were in charge of religious and educational affairs; they funded the Protestant and Catholic schools. In July 1871, Bismarck abolished the Catholic section of the Prussian Ministry of ecclesiastical and educational affairs, depriving Catholics of their voice at the highest level. The system of strict government supervision of schools was applied only in Catholic areas; the Protestant schools were left alone.

Much more serious were the May laws of 1873. One made the appointment of any priest dependent on his attendance at a German university, as opposed to the seminaries that the Catholics typically used. Furthermore, all candidates for the ministry had to pass an examination in German culture before a state board which weeded out intransigent Catholics. Another provision gave the government a veto power over most church activities. A second law abolished the jurisdiction of the Vatican over the Catholic Church in Prussia; its authority was transferred to a government body controlled by Protestants.

Nearly all German bishops, clergy, and laymen rejected the legality of the new laws, and were defiant in the face of heavier and heavier penalties and imprisonments imposed by Bismarck's government by 1876, all the Prussian bishops were imprisoned or in exile, and a third of the Catholic parishes were without a priest. In the face of systematic defiance, the Bismarck government increased the penalties and its attacks, and were challenged in 1875 when a papal encyclical declared the whole ecclesiastical legislation of Prussia was invalid, and threatened to excommunicate any Catholic who obeyed. There was no violence, but the Catholics mobilized their support, set up numerous civic organizations, raised money to pay fines, and rallied behind their church and the Centre Party. The government had set up a "Old-Catholic Church," which attracted only a few thousand members. Bismarck, a devout pietistic Protestant, realized his Kulturkampf was backfiring when secular and socialist elements used the opportunity to attack all religion. In the long run, the most significant result was the mobilization of the Catholic voters, and their insistence on protecting their religious identity. In the elections of 1874, the Centre party doubled its popular vote, and became the second-largest party in the national parliament—and remained a powerful force for the next 60 years, so that after Bismarck it became difficult to form a government without their support.

Social Reform

Bismark built on a tradition of welfare programs in Prussia and Saxony that began as early as in the 1840s. In the 1880s he introduced old age pensions, accident insurance, medical care and unemployment insurance that formed the basis of the modern European welfare state. He came to realize that this sort of policy was

NOTES

very appealing, since it bound workers to the state, and also fit in very well with his authoritarian nature. The social security systems installed by Bismarck (health care in 1883, accident insurance in 1884, invalidity and old-age insurance in 1889) at the time were the largest in the world and, to a degree, still exist in Germany today.

Bismarck's paternalistic programs won the support of German industry because its goals were to win the support of the working classes for the Empire and reduce the outflow of immigrants to America, where wages were higher but welfare did not exist. Bismarck further won the support of both industry and skilled workers by his high tariff policies, which protected profits and wages from American competition, although they alienated the liberal intellectuals who wanted free trade.

Germanisation

One of the effects of the unification policies was the gradually increasing tendency to eliminate the use of non-German languages in public life, schools and academic settings with the intent of pressuring the non-German population to abandon their national identity in what was called "Germanization". These policies had often the reverse effect of stimulating resistance, usually in the form of home schooling and tighter unity in the minority groups, especially the Poles.

The Germanization policies were targeted particularly against the significant Polish minority of the empire, gained by Prussia in the Partitions of Poland. Poles were treated as a ethnic minority even where they made up the majority, as in the Province of Posen, where a series of anti-Polish measures were enforced. Numerous anti-Polish laws had no great effect especially in the province of Posen where the German-speaking population dropped from 42.8% in 1871 to 38.1% in 1905, despite all efforts.

Anti-Semitism

Anti-Semitism was an endemic problem in Germany. Before Napoleon's decrees ended the ghettos in Germany, it had been religiously-motivated, but by the 19th century, it was a factor in German nationalism. The last legal barriers on Jews in Prussia were lifted by the 1860s, and within 20 years, they were well represented in the white-collar professions and much of academia. Despite the often crude anti-Semitism of German elites such as Bismarck, many of them utilized the services of Jews, such as Bismarck's banker Gerson Bleichroder (1822–1893). In the popular mind Jews became a symbol of capitalism and modernity, two things that were resented by the Prussian aristocracy, who were finding their power and prestige rapidly diminished in the new, unified Germany. On the other hand, the constitution and legal system protected the rights of Jews as German citizens. Anti-Semitic parties were formed but soon collapsed.

NOTES

3.6 GERMAN EMPIRE (1891-1914)

From 1871 to 1914, Germany's population rose by a third to 65 million. German industries boomed, and the arts flourished. Nationalism soared as Germany was seen more and more as a single nation. The National Liberal progressive parties, which represented the middle class, and Socialist Party became important in the German Empire. Between 1872 and 1879, Otto von Bismarck instituted a series of reforms within Germany as an attempt to lower the importance of the Catholic Church. This was known as the Kulturkampf (cultural struggle).

During this time, Bismarck brought exiled priests who had been disobedient and suppressed many religious orders. Relations between the Catholic Church and Bismarck cooled in 1879 when Bismarck needed the support of the center to put in place high tariffs to protect German agriculture and industry. Bismarck's policies were popular with businessmen and land owners. Next, Bismarck turned to the increasingly popular Socialist Party. Blaming two assasination attempts upon the emperor as a spring board, Bismarck had a new Reichstag elected, one that would support the high tariff and outlaw socialism. However, when the Socialist Party won many seats in the Reichstag in 1890, Bismarck was ready to abolish the constitution, but he would never get the chance. Germany planted colonies in Africa, but these were more for prestige than for any real economic purposes. A league was attempted to be formed by Bismarck between Russia and Austria-Hungary, however, his attempts failed and the Triple Alliance between Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy was formed in its place. During the early 1900s, Germany's navy expanded greatly, and by WWI, it was the second largest navy in the world. In response, Russia, Britain, and France formed the Triple Entente and the powder keg's fuse was ready to be set. Kaiser Wilhelm I's was replaced by another king. However, this king was terminally ill, and really only served as a sort of buffer before Wilhelm II came to power. After that king died and Wilhelm II took the throne, fearing Bismarcks power, he forced him to step down and retire. Despite Bismarck's leaving the position of prime minister, his policies were mostly continued. During Wilhelm II's reign, very little occurred by way of major events prior to WWI.

Major economic growth caused capital-labor problems to arise. Wilhelm II often practiced contradictory foreign affairs policies. He said that Great Britain and Germany were friendly, and yet his policies forced Britain into an alliance with France and Russia. He supported a policy of friendship with Russia, and supported them in East Asia, but supported Austria in the Balkans. Wilhelm II believed that the Triple Alliance would help to prevent a war. His imperialistic policies aggravated friction that eventually culminated to WWI. Wilhelm II did achieve moderate success in curbing the growth of the Social-Democratic Party.

NOTES

A rapid naval expansion occurred in Germany during his reign, which also helped to add fuel to the international fire. Overall, the state of Germany was excellent prior to WWI with industry growing at an incredible rate. In 1914, Austria's archduke was assassinated by a Serbian nationalist, and Europe exploded into war.

Kruger Telegram

Message sent by Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany to President Kruger of the Transvaal 3 January 1896, congratulating him on defeating the Jameson raid of 1895. The text of the telegram provoked indignation in Britain and elsewhere, and represented a worsening of Anglo-German relations, in spite of a German government retraction.

The telegram was applauded by the German press, but caused huge indignation in Great Britain and led to a further deterioration in relations between the two countries. The telegram was taken to mean that the Kaiser endorsed the Transvaal's independence in what was seen by the British as their own sphere of influence, and the reference to "friendly powers" interpreted by them as meaning that assistance would have been available from Germany if asked for — and such assistance might be available in the future.

The Times newspaper proclaimed that "England will concede nothing to menaces and will not lie down under insult." The windows of German shops were broken, and German sailors were attacked in London. The German diplomatic response was essentially conciliatory, with the Kaiser responding to a letter from Queen Victoria (his grandmother) with "Never was the Telegram intended as a step against England or your Government...."

The Kruger Telegram is often seen as marking the point at which Anglo-German antagonism became firmly established. This antagonism and the naval arms race which it promoted were important factors behind the outbreak of the First World War.

Decline and Fall

After war was declared, Germany mobilized. Wilhelm II was talked into following the Schlieffen Plan by Molkte (the Younger), his military chief of staff, and invaded Belgium. Belgium was overrun and the French army was flanked. A German army pursuing fleeing French were attacked on the Marne by a French army. On September 6th, three days after the battle began, the Germans pulled back. After that a stalemate began in France. Germany also had initial success against Russian armies that invaded early on in the war. Realizing that he was incapable of leading the military skillfully, Wilhelm II allowed his military chiefs of staff, Paul von Hinderburg and Eric Ludendorf. In early 1915, a German/Austrian

offensive was launched that caused the Russian armies to flee further, giving up Galicia and Poland. In 1915, the naval battle of Jutland ended indecisively, however, the German High Seas Fleet remained bottled up for the rest of the war, leaving Germany to depend on submarine warfare.

Austrian failures caused Germany to divert soldiers from their own front to fight on those of Austria. Italy, who had somewhat betrayed the league by remaining neutral, then joined the Allies and fought Austria. In 1916, the Germans attempted an offensive in Verdun to divert French troops to that front. The French troops were diverted, however, the Germans were repulsed. A stalemate ensued along all fronts for years until October, 1917, when an Austrian/German army drove the Italians to the Piave, and the German spring offensive of 1918. In 1917, the Reichstag presented a possible peace offer, however, Wilhelm II would not allow it, and the war continued. Economic crisis in Germany caused by British blockades caused an uprising in Germany in the summer of of 1918. The Kaiser fled and the Weimar Republic was founded.

3.7 KAISER WILHELM I (1797–1888)

The first emperor of Germany, Wilhelm I was born in 1797. When revolution swept through Germany in 1848, he fled to England, but returned one year later to command the troops that crushed the insurrection in Baden. When his brother was declared insane, Wilhelm became the regent of Prussia in 1858, and king upon his brother's death. Wilhelm then set about refoming the military, but met considerable opposition in the Landtag. He then appointed Bismarck as prime minister of Prussia, who through political maneuvering, successfully got the military reforms through. Bismarck accounted for most of the actions of Prussia, and Wilhelm usually simply let him do them.

After being crowned emperor of Germany on January 1871, Wilhelm became the symbol of reborn German unity, and the general public loved him, but his militarism and belief in a divine right brought fierce resentment from radicals. In fact, two attempts were made on his life. Wilhelm often disagreed with Bismarck on many things, but was usually persuaded to follow go along with him. Wilhelm died in 1888, leaving a crucial impression on Europe.

Otto von Bismarck 1815–1898 : Bismarck was the most important leader in German unification. Born in 1815, he studied at Gottingen, Berlin, and was elected to the Prussian Landtag in 1847. Bismarck advocated German unity under Prussian rule, and opposed the radical liberal movements of the day. Prussian minister of the Frankfurt Diet (1851-1859) ambassador to Russia (1859-1862) and France (1862), he gained political experience. Appointed Prime Minister of Prussia in 1862, Bismarck got the military reforms passed through the Landtag in 1862, and, throughout most of his administration, went through without parlimentary

NOTES

approval. Bismarck then maneuvered Prussia into a successful war with Denmark, caused arguments between Austria and Prussia, and maneuvered Prussia into total victory in a war with Austria. After the war with Austria, he aggravated France by convincing a Hohenzollern prince into becoming a candidate for Spanish king, and denying France the land he had implied they would get for staying neutral. This created the image that France was acting aggressively against Germany, and caused Prussia to seem more like a guardian than the militaristic state it had been viewed as. In 1870, the two nations went to war, with Prussia winning victory after victory. Using the new sense felt for Prussia as a spring board, Bismarck got Wilhelm elected as the German emperor. During his administration as German Chancellor, Bismarck got into quarrels with the Reichstag, socialists, and the Catholic Church. Upon Wilhelm II's coronation, a power struggle occurred between the emperor and prime minister, and, in 1890, Bismarck was forced to step down. Bismarck retired to his dukedom and often criticised Wilhelm II's policies. In 1898, Otto von Bismarck died.

Helmuth Karl Bernhard von Moltke 1800-1891- 1800-1891, Prussian field marshal. Following his graduation from the Royal Military Academy of Denmark, he entered the Danish service, but resigned his commission in 1822 to join the Prussian army. He became (1833) a member of the general staff, and three years later with official sanction he entered the service of the Ottoman sultan as military adviser. His advice was not followed in the campaign against Muhammad Ali of Egypt, and he returned (1839) to Prussia, where he advanced rapidly and was made chief of the general staff in 1858. He worked tirelessly to mold the Prussian army into a formidable war machine. The successful completion of the Danish War (1864) and of the Austro-Prussian War (1866) was due to his tactics, and in the Franco-Prussian War (1870-71) Moltke's genius, evinced especially in his plan of mobilization, led to complete Prussian victory. On receiving news of the fall of Metz, William I made him a count. Moltke owed many of his military successes to the elasticity of his strategy. Unlike Napoleon, he gave his subleaders liberty in making decisions. When he resigned as chief of staff in 1888, he was made chairman of the committee for national defense. Moltke was a member of the North German Confederation (1867-71) and of the Reichstag (1871-91). He wrote noteworthy books on tactics, including The Franco-German War of 1870–71 (tr. 1892).

Kaiser Wilhelm II (1859-1841): Born in 1859, Fredrich Wilhelm Viktor Albert attended the University of Bonn. After a period of military service in the 1880s, he married the princess of Schleswig-Holstein. Almost immediatly after taking power, he forced Otto von Bismarck to step down. Wilhelm, therefore, had a free hand to do as he wished in politics, unhindered. Wilhelm II, however, lacked the political

NOTES

genius (and somewhat totalitarian practices) of Bismark to achieve great success, making him a mediocre leader. His reign was marked by major economic growth, capital-labor relations, and often contradictory policies. Wilhelm's aggressive policies were largely responsible for the outbreak of WWI (although policies, treaties, and alliances had made war inevitable, Wilhelm II just made it come faster). When Germany was engulfed in uprisings in the summer of 1918, Wilhelm fled to the Neatherlands in exile. Representatives of the allies attempted to get him brought up on charges of war crimes, however these failed. In his remaining years, Wilhelm II spent his time in seclusion in Doorn Castle, Netherlands, after WWI. After his wife died in 1821, he remarried. Wilhelm II lived to see the rise of military importance of Germany. In 1941, he died and was buried with military honors.

3.8 KAISER WILHELM II AND HIS POLICIES

In 1888, Wilhelm II ascended to the German throne as Kaiser. The policies and style of government he instigated over the next 26 years played a major role in the outbreak of war in 1914. In a marked change from the conservative Bismarckian politics of the 1870s and 1880s, Wilhelm II embarked upon a militaristic and expansionist political path in an attempt to 'defend Germany's so called "place in the sun"'. While some historians have downplayed the role of the Kaiser and of Germany in the outbreak of war, an analysis of the events of July 1914 and the role Germany played appears to prove otherwise. Moreover, by realising that military and foreign affairs were solely the prerogative of the Kaiser, it becomes clear that there was a strong link between the Wilhelmine system, the Kaiser himself, and the outbreak of war in 1914.

Wars in 1864, 1866 and 1871 respectively against Denmark, Austria and France, eventually leading to the creation of a united Germany, had created a precarious diplomatic situation. Skilful diplomatic negotiations by Bismarck with Russia, Britain and Austria between 1871 and 1890 had isolated France and created a peaceful continental Europe. However, Bismarck's system has been described as 'crisis management' and relatively short-term: while creating peace in Europe it began the process of forming alliances, which was one of the major causes of the First World War. Bismarck's foreign policy required a very competent successor to ensure that Germany could maintain its treaties and continue to isolate France. Instead Wilhelm II's nationalistic and expansionist foreign policy destroyed the fragile situation which Bismarck had worked so hard to achieve. German foreign policy under Wilhelm II was influenced by the same militaristic and nationalistic sentiments that brought about the unification of Germany in 1871.

To found a nation on military success can be seen as very dangerous, and the constitution of Germany that was created reflected the militaristic foundation of the new empire. The Wilhelmine system was not an autocracy, but neither was it a constitutional monarchy: the Bundesrat, the Reichstag under leadership of

NOTES

the Chancellor, as well as the Prussian Cabinet and the military establishment all had real political power. The Reichstag, which was elected through a universal franchise for all males over the age of 24, gave Germany a legislative body that was as democratic as any political system in Europe. However, this whole system was held together by the Kaiser, and greatly relied upon his ability to mediate between the different political bodies. In effect, this gave the Kaiser considerable political power, and Wilhelm II maximised the influence which the constitution gave him in order to fulfil his belief in 'personal rule'. Therefore, it is difficult to distinguish whether the political system can be blamed for the outbreak of war, or whether it was Wilhelm II's mismanagement of the system which led to war.

The first major political move for Wilhelm II was his decision to force Bismarck to resign in 1890; the Chancellor was 79 years old at this time, while Wilhelm II was only 29. Their political ideologies were in direct conflict, Bismarck's conservatism contrasting with 'the brashly self-assertive young Kaiser'. Wilhelm II was convinced of his divine right to rule, and was not prepared to play a passive role alongside Bismarck as his grandfather Wilhelm I had done. Once rid of Bismarck, Wilhelm II was able to implement the policies that he personally desired, including naval armament and a colonial empire for Germany. Both these policies, while uplifting German national pride, were in direct conflict with the interests of Germany's European neighbours and undermined the precarious alliance system that Bismarck had created during the 1870s and 1880s in order to isolate France and ensure German security.

With the breakdown of Bismarck's system of alliances, clearly shown by the failure to renew the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia in 1893 and Wilhelm II's failure to negotiate a settlement with Britain, a new system of alliances was created with Germany in a far worse position than it had been under Bismarck. France was no longer isolated, the Dual Alliance of 1894 between France and Russia ensuring that if war was to break out then the Germans would have to fight on two fronts, leaving them increasingly reliant on the declining Austro-Hungarian empire. Germany's reliance on Austria-Hungary drew it into the tumultuous Balkan region and into ever increasing conflict with Russia.

Wilhelm II's desire for 'personal rule' meant that any of his personal traits would be very important; therefore 'Wilhelm II's impulsiveness and infirmity of purpose aroused mistrust everywhere'. Historians are in general agreement that Wilhelm II did not have the right personality to be a competent leader. Furthermore, because he had constitutional prerogative over foreign and military affairs, such a mismatch between personality and power would have disastrous results. Wilhelm II's desire for Germany to impose itself on the European stage, through military armament (and potentially war) as well as by acquiring a colonial empire brought Germany into conflict with every major European power except the unstable

Austria-Hungary, whose alliance can be seen as more of a hindrance rather than a help to Germany's cause.

Some historians believe that Germany did not intentionally seek war; they were backed into a corner where the only escape was through a European war because of their other interests and the diplomatic incompetence of Wilhelm II. However, this argument is not universally accepted. Other historians believe that Germany played a more active role in the outbreak of war in that the Sarajevo assassinations served only as an excuse to re-ignite the militaristic Prussian tradition that looked towards war as a method of solving any problems, domestic or international. Chancellor Bulow insisted that the fate of Germany depended on the 'sharpness of the Prussian sword'. Such a view epitomised the attitude of many high-ranking German policymakers from 1900-1914.

The direction of German policy during the July crisis in 1914, following the assassination of the Austrian archduke Franz Ferdinand undoubtedly escalated the crisis, by providing Austria-Hungary with a 'blank cheque'. Moreover, ensuring that any attempts at mediation would prove fruitless does present a strong argument that Germany viewed a war as desirable. Wilhelm II stated publicly that it was 'now or never for Austria to deal the Serbs', which led to Austria-Hungary being pressured into declaring war on Russia on August 6, thus escalating a localised conflict between Austria-Hungary and Serbia into a European war. There was definitely motivation for Germany to declare war against France and Russia sooner rather than later as the armament programmes of Germany's two main potential enemies were due to be completed by 1917 and war would have been much more difficult to win if it had been fought then. A general consensus within Germany was reached just before the outbreak of war, when the Reichstag unanimously voted for the war act and to dissolve itself, handing all power over to the Kaiser and the military establishment.

The capitulation of any anti-war sentiment can be seen as a manifestation of the endemic militarism of the Wilhelmine system; however all over Europe similar decisions were being reached in political systems as diverse as Russian Tsarism and British democracy. Is it therefore fair to blame the outbreak of war and the accompanying pro-war sentiment on the Wilhelmine system when it appears that a similar sequence of events was occurring throughout Europe? Much of the pro-war sentiment in other European nations was in response to the threat of German invasion: it is completely logical that a population would react more actively towards conflict if it is directly under threat. In France and Russia a direct threat was posed by Germany and the populations responded in a way that could only be expected, which cannot undermine Germany's role in provoking much of this reaction.

NOTES

The nature of the Wilhelmine system, especially the important political role Kaiser Wilhelm II himself played was most definitely conducive to the outbreak of war in 1914. By destroying Bismarck's carefully constructed (although admittedly shortsighted) alliance system Wilhelm II re-ignited many diplomatic problems which had been created by the unification of Germany in 1871. Through a nationalistic and militaristic foreign policy, Wilhelm II alienated Britain and Russia – two potential allies – and created a situation where only the slightest spark would explode into a Europe-wide conflict. Whether this was the result of incompetence on Wilhelm's behalf or a specific desire to go to war remains a moot point; however it is clear that there is a strong link between the Wilhelmine system and the outbreak of war in 1914.

3.9 RUSSIA (1870 TO 1914)

As the imperial game raged throughout the world, the map of Europe was changing as well. From 1815-1870, in the aftermath of Napoleon's near domination of Europe, the European power developed a system of military and political balance. The aptly-named balance of power in Europe was a system that aimed to maintain international order and peace by following any increase in strength of one nation-state with an increase in strength of his geographic or political enemy. By upholding this precarious system, the argument continued, no country would be willing to embark on a course of military expansion for fear of reprisal by an equally powerful force. The years 1870 and 1871 marked the consolidation of Italy and Germany, respectively, into viable and strong nation-states in the heart of Europe, changing the structure of the balance of power.

With the creation of Germany in 1871, the old balance of power involving France, a rump Brandenburg-Prussia, Austria-Hungary, and Russia was replaced by a new system. Under the leadership of Chancellor Otto von Bismarck, Germany forged ahead in 1873 by joining the two most conservative powers in Europe—Austria-Hungary and Russia-to form the Three Emperors' League. The three empires pledged to consult one another on mutual interests in Europe and to remain neutral when any one member state took military action against a non- member, particularly France or the Balkan nations

The Reign of Alexander II "The Czar Liberator" 1855–1881

> "It is better to abolish serfdom from above than to wait for the time when it will begin to abolish itself from below." Alexander II on serfdom

The Serfs

Alexander was the eldest son of Emperor Nicholas I and was born in Moscow on 17 April 1818. He came to the throne on 19 February 1855, after the death of his father.

NOTES

Defeat in the Crimean War convinced the Czar that reform was necessary. He implemented important reforms. Most notable was the abolition of serfdom in 1861 (The Emancipation Decree). Unfortunately under this measure, he offered so many concessions to landlords that many peasants found themselves in worse economic circumstances than before. Many of the plots of land the peasants received were smaller than those they had farmed as serfs. The repayments over forty-nine years were a massive burden for the peasants.

Political and Legal Reforms

Although he refused to consider introducing an elected parliament, he did bring in some political reforms. This included permitting each district to set up a Zemstvo. These were local councils with powers to provide roads, schools and medical services. *However, the right to elect members was restricted to the wealthy.*

The legal system was also reformed in 1864. The judiciary became an independent branch of government. Favour under the law for the wealthy and upper classes was replaced by what was supposed to be equality before the law. Trial by jury was introduced for serious criminal offenses.

Alexander also reformed the military, reducing duty from twenty-five years to six and people from all classes were obliged to serve. Corporal punishment was abolished for soldiers and an effort was made to improve the professionalism of the officer corps.

Opposition to His Policies

The major weakness of his policy was the absence of a genuinely representative parliament. Reformers in Russia wanted the same democratic rights as those enjoyed in other European countries. In 1876, a group of reformers established Land and Liberty. As it was illegal to criticize the Russian government, the group had to hold its meetings in secret.

The movement split on tactics and in October 1879, a new group, the People's Will was formed. The group advocated the use of violence to achieve reform and decided to assassinate Alexander II.

They made several failed attempts on his life but killed several of his senior officials. On 1 March 1881, they succeeded in killing the Czar when a bomb was thrown at his carriage. His death ended any hope of reform of the system from above.

Reign of Alexander III 1881-1894 "Nationalism,Orthodoxy and Autocracy"

Political Policies

A physically imposing man, the new Czar had watched his father die in a St. Petersburg Palace. As a result of the assassination, Alexander III would not consider granting a parliament. He tightened censorship of the press and sent thousands of revolutionaries to Siberia.

NOTES

In his Accession Manifesto, he declared his intention to have "full faith in the justice and strength of the autocracy" that he had been entrusted with. Any liberal proposals in government were quickly dismissed. Judges and officials who were sympathetic to Liberal ideas were removed from office.

His reign is often referred to as the Age of Counter Reform. He is known as a reactionary ruler. To many westerners he appeared crude and not very intelligent. Queen Victoria commented that she thought him as "a sovereign whom she does not look upon as a gentlemen."

He was greatly influenced by his tutor Constantine Pobedonostsev who instilled into him conservative values. His political ideal was a nation containing only one nationality, one language, one religion and one form of administration.

Repression

A policy of Russification was introduced. This involved imposing the Russian language and Russian schools on the Germans, the Poles and the Finns and all other minority nationalities. Russian had also to be used by local officials and in the courts. The policy was not successful and bred resentment.

As Figes commented:

> "Trying to stamp out the native language was not just an insulting and demoralizing policy... it was ridiculous as well. Polish students at Warsaw University, for example, had to suffer the absurd indignity of studying their own native literature in Russian translation."

Schools were also forced to raise their fees to prevent the poorer classes gaining an education. In 1897, the illiteracy rate was 79%. Universities lost most of the freedoms gained under Alexander II and censorship was tightened considerably. He strengthened the security police, reorganizing it into an agency known as the Okhrana.

He encouraged the Orthodox Church at the expense of other religions especially the Catholic Church. It was an offence to convert from the Orthodox Church to another faith. Divorce could only be granted through a church court. The Orthodox Church was given control of primary schools.

Alexander also persecuted the Jews. Many blamed them for the assassination of Alexander II. Over six hundred anti-Jewish measures were introduced. For example the number who could attend university was limited. They were forbidden to trade on Christian holy days.

There were many pogroms or attacks on Jews although they were not officially encouraged. Anti-Jewish policies led to large scale Jewish emigration to Europe and the US. Many others joined revolutionary organisations opposed to the Czarist government.

NOTES

Industrialization

One major success during the reign of Alexander III was the acceleration of industrial development that continued under his son Nicholas II. The man most associated with this policy was Sergei Witte who was Minister of Finance from 1892 until 1903. He encouraged foreign investment and placed the rouble on the gold standard.

From 1889 large amounts of the finance necessary for industrial investment had come from French investors, a factor that contributed to the alliance that developed between the two countries in 1894. British and German money was also significant.

It was in these years that coal mining and great iron and steel plants developed in the Ukraine, oil around Baku (where the Nobel brothers were investors), textiles around Moscow and engineering in the capital St Petersburg.

Russia's coal, iron, steel, and oil production tripled between 1890 and 1900. Her GNP grew more quickly than any other major European power. Railroad mileage almost doubled, giving Russia the most track of any nation other than the United States. The greatest project of the period was the construction of the Trans Siberian Railway linking Moscow and Vladivostok. It was started in 1891 and completed in 1905 and ran for 5,785 miles.

The urban labour force grew rapidly. For example, the population of St Petersburg and Moscow increased by over 100%. Nearly 50% of workers worked in factories with over 1000 employees. Wages, hours of work and housing conditions were usually very poor. This was especially true in Moscow. Government attempts to improve conditions were resisted bitterly by employers there. The development of a large industrial working class was to create a lot of political problems for Czar Nicholas II.

Nicholas II 1894-1917: The Last Czar

> "His character is the source of all our misfortunes. His outstanding weakness is a lack of willpower."— Sergei Witte
>
> "The Czar can change his mind from one minute to the next; he's a sad man; he lacks guts."— Rasputin
>
> "It was not a weakness of will that was the undoing of the last Czar but... a wilful determination to rule from the throne, despite the fact that he clearly lacked the necessary qualities to do so."— Orlando Figes

Nicholas II, the last Russian Emperor, was the eldest son of Alexander III and was born in 1868. He ascended the throne after the death of his father in 1894, and was crowned on 14 May 1896. The ceremony in Moscow was overshadowed by a catastrophe on Khodynskoe Field, where more than a thousand spectators were crushed to death.

NOTES

He married the daughter of Grand Duke of Hesse, Alexandra (Grand daughter of Queen Victoria), and had five children. The Czarevich (Heir to the throne) Alexei suffered from haemophilia and was a permanent invalid. He also had four daughters. Olga, Tatiana, Maria and Anastasia.

Life Sketch

Highly educated, hard working and deeply religious, Nicholas was gentle and approachable. Those who met him easily forgot that they were face to face with the Emperor.

However he could be weak and inconsistent. For example he found it very difficult to dismiss ministers and left it to others. The more powerful a minister became the more jealous Nicholas became and talented ministers were seen as a threat, *e.g.*, Witte and Stolypin.

He was a stubborn supporter of the right of the sovereign, despite growing pressure for revolution. He had had the same tutor as his father. Soon after his accession Nicholas stated that he intended to maintain the autocratic system. He said he saw it as his duty to —

> "maintain the principle of autocracy just as firmly and unflinchingly as it was preserved by my unforgettable dead father."

But as Figes wrote —

> "Nicholas had not been blessed with either his father's strength of character or his intelligence."

He would have made a good constitutional monarch but his personality made him unsuited to deal with Russia's serious political problems. His reign was characterized by revolution at home and defeat abroad.

Political Opposition to the Czar

The Czar's failure to consider reform led to the growth of political opposition. Liberals (Kadets) wanted to see the system reformed on the British model (a strong parliament with a figurehead king). They were mainly members of the middle class.

The growth of the working class saw the development of socialism. In 1898 the Russian Social and Democratic Labour party was formed. The party followed the ideas of Karl Marx and called for an end to the Czarist state. It split in 1903 into two factions, the Bolsheviks (led by Lenin) and the more moderate Mensheviks.

In 1901, the Social Revolutionary Party was formed. It drew its support from the peasantry. It advocated land reform and many of its members favoured direct action or the use of violence.

The depth of opposition to the Czar was shown by the events of 1905 that was brought on by defeat in the Russo-Japanese War.

NOTES

THE RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR

Since the Congress of Berlin, Russia had been expanding eastwards and extending her influence into the Chinese province of Manchuria and into Korea. In 1898, she acquired the Chinese town of Port Arthur (now Dalian). She moved troops into Manchuria during the Boxer Rising in 1900. She came into conflict with Japan who also had ambitions in the region.

The Japanese tried to reach a negotiated settlement but the Russian government was inflexible. It was willing to risk an armed conflict in the belief that Japan was bound to be defeated and that a Russian victory would head off the growing threat of internal revolution in Russia.

The negotiations failed and in February 1904 the Japanese attacked Port Arthur and war began. They decided to attack before the Trans-Siberian Railway was completed. The colonial nature of the war was shown by the fact that the land war was fought in China.

The Russians fought bravely but a mixture of poor leadership, supply difficulties, Japanese military ability and poor luck insured her eventual defeat. In January 1905, Port Arthur fell to the Japanese. In March after a two week battle at Mukden, the Japanese emerged victorious.

PEACE TREATY

In May, the Russian fleet that had sailed around the world from the Baltic was ambushed and annihilated at the Battle of Tsushima. Both sides were prepared to accept an offer of mediation from the US president Theodore Roosevelt. The Treaty of Portsmouth was signed in September and this greatly reduced Russian influence in the region. The war was to have a number of consequences:

- It was the first defeat of a European power by an Asian country and marked the emergence of Japan as a great power.
- The conduct of the war exposed the inefficiency and corruption of the Czarist system of government and contributed directly to the revolution of 1905.
- It marked the end of major Russian expansion in Asian and caused Russia to take a greater interest in European affairs especially the Balkans.
- The Battle of Mukden was to be very similar to those of World War I with two large armies of 300,000 men involved and very heavy causalities on both sides.

THE REVOLUTION OF 1905

"A dress rehearsal for the real revolution of 1917", Leon Trotsky.

NOTES

Causes

- Political discontent caused by the absence of political reform.
- Economic discontent caused by poor wages and increasing taxation.
- Defeat and poor management of the war against Japan.

The revolution was sparked by an event that became known as "Bloody Sunday". On 22 January 1905, a police agent Fr Gapon led a peaceful demonstration of 200,000 men, women and children to the Winter Palace in St Petersburg calling for reform and an end to the war. The police and troops guarding the palace opened fire and over 1000 people were killed or wounded. This event had two important effects :

- Although he had not ordered the troops to fire, the killings destroyed the centuries' old belief among common people that the Czar was the "Little Father" who had their interests at heart.
- It sparked off a wave of strikes and terrorism throughout Russia. By the end of January over 400,000 people were on strike. The Czar's uncle was assassinated in February.

Discontent Spreads

Strikes spread throughout the Russian empire especially to the non-Russian lands such as Poland. At the same time peasants attacked the houses of nobles throughout the country.

The crew of the battleship Potemkin mutinied. This event raised the worrying prospect of the Czar losing the support of the army. Matters were not helped by bad new from the war with Japan.

The Czar refused to listen to demands for political change and in October a general strike occurred as workers in the railways, industry and the banks went on strike.

Soviets or councils were formed in the major cities. The most famous was in the capital St Petersburg. These councils were made up of members who represented the workers. They were very powerful and controlled the towns.

The October Manifesto

The Czar turned to advice to Count Witte who urged him to agree to fundamental reform.

On 30 October, the Czar issued the October Manifesto that promised a constitution and a parliament or Duma elected by the people. The Russians were also promised full civil liberties.

The Manifesto succeeded in taking the wind out of the revolution. A further general strike failed and the government acted by closing both the St Petersburg and Moscow soviets.

NOTES

The Four Dumas

The First Duma: 1906

The new Duma or parliament promised under the October Manifesto was a cause of great hope for reformers in Russia. However, Nicholas II was determined to restrict its powers. He issued the Fundamental Law of the Empire that stated

"The Emperor of All Russia has supreme autocratic power".

The powers of the new Duma were restricted with many powers reserved by the Czar. For example, he had the right to declare war and he appointed ministers who were not responsible to the Duma. The elections were boycotted by the Social Revolutionaries and the Social Democrats.

The Kadets won the most seats. The overwhelming majority of deputies were opposed to the Czar and his ministers. They called for political and economic reform and passed a motion of no confidence in the Czarist government. In July frustrated by the actions of the Duma the Czar dissolved it. Kadet leaders issued the Vyborg Manifesto calling for a campaign of civil disobedience but this was largely ignored by the people.

Peter Stolypin

"I must carry through effective measures of reform and at the same time I must face revolution, resist it, and stop it".

In June the Czar appointed Peter Stolypin as PM. He was one of the Czar's ablest ministers, personally very brave with a strong character. He acted with great ruthlessness against the enemies of the Czar. Martial Law was introduced and courts martial were used to crush opposition. There were over 2,500 executions and the hangman's noose became known as Stolypin's neckties (although more people were killed by political terrorism). A further 60,000 were imprisoned or exiled.

When elections for the Second Duma in 1907 produced another anti-Czarist majority he closed it down and changed the electoral law. The Third Duma was elected under a restricted franchise that gave more representation to the wealthy at the expense of the workers and the non-Russian minorities. The new Duma had a majority of moderate supporters of the Czar and lasted until 1912 when a Fourth Duma was elected. These Dumas had good records in agriculture, national insurance for industrial workers and education (over 50,000 primary schools were established) .

Reforms

However Stolypin realised that repression alone would not succeed. His main device for resisting revolution was the introduction of land reform. He felt that this could make the better-off peasants loyal supporters of the regime. He

NOTES

introduced reforms in 1906 that allowed peasants to leave the local commune (Mir) where land was held in common and receive their share of land in private property. This would allow them to become permanent owners of their own farms. These reforms had some success and by 1915 about half of the peasants in European Russia owned their farms. He also encouraged smaller farmers to enlarge their holdings with aid from a Peasant Bank that he established. Peasants were encouraged to settle in Siberia in order to alleviate land shortage.

He also brought in measures to modernize local government, to improve the courts and the police, to protect civil liberties, the freedom of the press and end discrimination against Jews. However, he made many enemies and was particularly hated by revolutionaries. He was assassinated by a police agent in Kiev in 1911. As Figes notes "according to some historians the Czarist regime's last hope was wiped out by the assassin's bullets." The regime that he worked so hard to defend was to crumble as a result of the effects of the First World War.

Russian Foreign Policy

Main Aims

Russia's foreign policy was governed by the size of her Empire that covered one-sixth of the Earth's Land surface. Her main aims were :

- To gain a warm water port.
- To get the Straits of the Dardenelles (the entrance to the Black Sea from the Mediterranean) reopened to its warships. This had been closed to Russian ships after the Crimean War.
- To extend her influence in the Balkans, taking advantage of the decline of Turkish power.
- To promote a conservative, religious alliance among Slavs in Eastern Europe (Pan-Slavism) as a cover for expanding Russian control.
- To expand eastwards into Asia especially in Iran, Tibet and India.

Relations with each of the major powers :

Britain

Relations poor for most of this period. Britain distrusted Russian motives in Asia (especially concerning India). Britain was Turkey's traditional friend against spreading Russian influence in the Balkans *e.g.,* the Congress of Berlin. During the Russo-Japanese War 1904–1905 tension increased considerably as Britain was an ally of Japan. The Czar's regime was disliked intensely in Britain, although the Royal families were cousins.

Improbable allies after 1907. However this was an alliance of convenience not of conviction and was directed against a common threat, Germany. Tensions, especially over Iran, remained right up to 1914.

NOTES

Austria - Hungary

Both were rivals for control of the Balkans. Although they were allies in the 1870s, this did not last, as both Austrian and Russian aims were fundamentally at odds in the Balkans. Relations broke down at the Congress of Berlin over the issue of Bulgaria. Rivals again in the Bulgarian crisis of 1885-87.

A major issue of contention between the two after 1903 as Serbia became Austria's enemy and Russia's friend. Austrian annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1908 further increased the rivalry between the two. Bitterness of feeling between the two was a key cause of World War I.

Germany

Relations at first very good. Traditional allies in the 19th century. However German neutrality during the Congress of Berlin put severe strain on this friendship. But while Bismarck was in power relations were quite good. However, Kaiser William II was anti-Russian along with the German Foreign Office (although he and the Czar were cousins). Relations deteriorated after 1891. Russia was afraid of Germanys growing power in Europe.

France

Unlikely allies, as the Russians were deeply distrustful of France's republican system of government. However, mutual fear of Germany allied to French financing of Russian industrialization brought the two together. Core alliance of the Triple Entente (1894).

3.10 ITALY AFTER 1870

In the years that followed the revolutions of 1848, Italian nationalists–both those who wished to unify the country under the Kingdom of Sardinia and its ruling House of Savoy and those who favored a republican solution–saw the Papal States as the chief obstacle to Italian unity. Louis Napoleon, who had now seized control of France as Emperor Napoleon III, tried to play a double game, simultaneously forming an alliance with Sardinia and playing on his famous uncle's nationalist credentials on the one hand and maintaining French troops in Rome to protect the Pope's rights on the other.

After the Austro-Sardinian War of 1859, much of northern Italy was unified under the House of Savoy's government; in the aftermath, Garibaldi led a revolution that overthrew the Bourbon monarchy in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. Afraid that Garibaldi would set up a republican government in the south, the Sardinians petitioned Napoleon for permission to send troops through the Papal States to gain control of the Two Sicilies, which was granted on the condition that Rome was left undisturbed. In 1860, with much of the region already in rebellion against Papal rule, Sardinia conquered the eastern two-thirds of the Papal States and

NOTES

cemented its hold on the south. Bologna, Ferrara, Umbria, the Marches, Benevento and Pontecorvo were all formally annexed by November of the same year, and a unified Kingdom of Italy was declared. The Papal States were reduced to Latium, the immediate neighborhood of Rome.

Rome was declared Capital of Italy in March 1861, when the first Italian Parliament met in the kingdom's old capital Turin in Piemonte. However, the Italian Government could not take possession of its capital because Napoleon III kept a French garrison in Rome protecting Pope Pius IX. The opportunity to eliminate the last vestige of the Papal States came when the Franco-Prussian War began in July 1870. Emperor Napoleon III had to recall his garrison from Rome for France's own defence and could no longer protect the pope. Following the collapse of the Second French Empire at the battle of Sedan, widespread public demonstrations demanded that the Italian Government take Rome. King Victor Emmanuel II sent Count Gustavo Ponza di San Martino to Pius IX with a personal letter offering a face-saving proposal that would have allowed the peaceful entry of the Italian Army into Rome, under the guise of offering protection to the pope.

End of the Papal States

According to Raffaele De Cesare :

> "The Pope's reception of San Martino [10 September 1870] was unfriendly. Pius IX allowed violent outbursts to escape him. Throwing the King's letter upon the table he exclaimed, "Fine loyalty! You are all a set of vipers, of whited sepulchres, and wanting in faith." He was perhaps alluding to other letters received from the King. After, growing calmer, he exclaimed: "I am no prophet, nor son of a prophet, but I tell you, you will never enter Rome!" San Martino was so mortified that he left the next day."

On September 10, Italy declared war on the Papal States, and the Italian Army, commanded by General Raffaele Cadorna, crossed the papal frontier on 11 September and advanced slowly toward Rome, hoping that a peaceful entry could be negotiated. The Italian Army reached the Aurelian Walls on 19 September and placed Rome under a state of siege. Although the pope's tiny army was incapable of defending the city, Pius IX ordered it to put up at least a token resistance to emphasize that Italy was acquiring Rome by force and not consent. On September 20, the Bersaglieri entered Rome and marched down Via Pia, which was subsequently renamed Via XX Settembre. Rome and Latium were annexed to the Kingdom of Italy after a plebiscite.

In Chapter XXXIV De Cesare also made the following observations:

- The Roman question was the stone tied to Napoleon's feet—that dragged him into the abyss. He never forgot, even in August 1870, a month before

NOTES

Sedan, that he was a sovereign of a Catholic country, that he had been made Emperor, and was supported by the votes of the Conservatives and the influence of the clergy; and that it was his supreme duty not to abandon the Pontiff.

- For twenty years Napoleon III had been the true sovereign of Rome, where he had many friends and relations ... . Without him the temporal power would never have been reconstituted, nor, being reconstituted, would have endured.

This event, described in Italian history books as a liberation, was taken very bitterly by the Pope. The Italian government had offered to allow the Pope to retain control of the Leonine City on the west bank of the Tiber, but Pius rejected the overture. Early the following year, the capital of Italy was moved from Florence to Rome. The Pope, whose previous residence, the Quirinal Palace, had become the royal palace of the Kings of Italy, withdrew in protest into the Vatican, where he lived as a self-proclaimed "prisoner", refusing to leave or to set foot in St. Peter's Square, and forbidding (Non Expedit) Catholics on pain of excommunication to participate in elections in the new Italian state.

In October a plebiscite in Rome and the surrounding Campagna resulted in a vote for union with the kingdom of Italy. Pius IX refused to accept this act of force majeure. He remained in his palace, describing himself as a prisoner in the Vatican. However, the new Italian control of Rome did not wither, nor did the Catholic world come to the Pope's aid, as Pius IX had expected.

The provisional capital of Italy had been Florence since 1865. In 1871, the Italian government moved to the banks of the Tiber. Victor Emmanuel installed himself in the Quirinale Palace. Rome became once again, for the first time in thirteen centuries, the capital city of a united Italy.

Rome was unusual among capital cities only in that it contained the power of the Pope and a small parcel of land (Vatican City) beyond national control. This anomaly was not formally resolved until the Lateran pacts of 1929.

Last Years of Pius IX

Pope Pius spent the last eight years of his long pontificate - the longest in Church history - as prisoner of the Vatican. Catholics were forbidden to vote or being voted in national elections. However, they were permitted to participate in local elections, where they achieved successes.

Pius himself was active, during those years, by creating new diocesan seats and appointing bishops to numerous dioceses, which had been unoccupied for years. Asked if he wanted his successor to follow his Italian policies, the old pontiff replied:

NOTES

My successor may be inspired by my love to the Church and my wish, to do the right thing. Everything changed around me. My system and my policies had their time, I am to old to change direction. This will be the task of my successor.

Pope Leo XIII

Pope Leo XIII, considered a great diplomat, managed to improve relations with Russia, Prussia, German France, England and other countries. However, in light of a hostile anti-Catholic climate in Italy, he continued the policies of Pius IX towards Italy, without major modifications. He had to defend the freedom of he Church against Italian persecutions and attacks in the area of education, expropriation and violation of Catholic Churches, legal measures against the Church and brutal attacks, culminating in anticlerical groups attempting to throw the body of the deceased Pope Pius IX into the Tiber river on July 13, 1881. The Pope even considered moving the papacy to Trieste or Salzburg, two cities in Austria, an idea, which the Austrian monarch Franz Josef I gently rejected.

Recovery of Papal Prestige

Paradoxically, the eclipse of papal temporal power during the 19th century was accompanied by a recovery of papal prestige. The monarchist reaction in the wake of the French Revolution and the later emergence of constitutional governments served alike, though in different ways, to sponsor that development. The reinstated monarchs of Catholic Europe saw in the papacy a conservative ally rather than a jurisdictional rival. Later, when the institution of constitutional governments broke the ties binding the clergy to the policies of royal regimes, Catholics were freed to respond to the renewed spiritual authority of the pope.

The popes of the 19th and 20th centuries exercised their spiritual authority with increasing vigor and in every aspect of religious life. By the crucial pontificate of Pope Pius IX (1846–1878), for example, papal control over worldwide Catholic missionary activity was firmly established for the first time in history.

3.11 DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICIES OF ITALY

After centuries of foreign domination and territorial fracture, independence and unity came to the Italian peninsula with remarkable speed in the mid-nineteenth century. Italy's political landscape was completely transformed, 1859–70. The Italy created by the 1815 Vienna settlement – seven separate states under Austrian domination – was destroyed. In 1859, the largest independent state in the peninsula, the north-western Kingdom of Sardinia (commonly referred to as Piedmont), in alliance with France, had driven Austria out of neighbouring Lombardy. In the spring of 1860, the tiny northern duchies of Parma and Modena, the Grand Duchy of Tuscany and the central Italian 'legations' (papal-governed territory around Bologna and Ferrara) were annexed to Piedmont following

NOTES

revolutions in mid-1859 which had deposed the old pro-Austrian rulers. By the end of 1860, the southern Kingdom of Naples, too, had fallen under Piedmont's sway following Garibaldi's famous conquest of Sicily and mainland Naples. Piedmontese forces also occupied the remaining papal territory outside of Rome. In March 1861, King Victor Emmanuel II of Piedmont became King of Italy. Pope Pius IX ruled in Rome and Austria still held Venice, but the rest of the peninsula was now united under the Piedmontese Crown. In 1866, Venice was incorporated into the new Italian kingdom following the Austro-Prussian war (Italy had allied itself with Prussia). In 1870, Italian forces entered Rome after Napoleon III withdrew French forces 'protecting' Pius IX to fight in the Franco-Prussian war. Rome became capital of Italy in September 1870. The Pope's once extensive temporal authority now extended no further than the Vatican gardens.

The political form that the new Italian state took – a liberal-constitutional monarchy (hence the epithet 'liberal Italy') based on a moderate constitution (the Piedmontese statuto of 1848), a restricted franchise, and represented by two fluid parliamentary coalitions known as the destra storica (Historic Right) and sinistra storica (Historic Left) – was challenged from the outset from a variety of sources. First, there were the losers from the unification process: the old deposed rulers, the old regional elites (now smaller fish in a bigger pond) and, most importantly, the Catholic Church. Unification had destroyed the Pope's political power. Pius retaliated by denouncing all forms of 'progress, liberalism and modern civilization' (the Syllabus of Errors, 1864), by proclaiming papal infallibility (1870) and by rejecting a compromise settlement with the new Italian state (the Law of Guarantees, 1871). The self-styled 'prisoner in the Vatican' refused to recognize the existence of the Italian state and urged Italians not to participate in national political life (1874). Second, there were those who, though nationalists, were unhappy with the form that the new Italy took: the Mazzinian republicans, for example. Third, there were the ideological opponents of the liberal-bourgeois state: the anarchists, the revolutionary socialists and, later, the revolutionary nationalists and revolutionary syndicalists. Finally, there were those who were critical of the way in which the liberal state operated: of the parliamentary horse trading, the political corruption and the state-sponsored political repression that characterized much of the era; of the state's inability to deal adequately with united Italy's many and deep-seated social and economic problems; of its failure to create a sense of national belonging (the much discussed gulf between 'legal' and 'real' Italy, *i.e.*, between state and society).

Many of the contemporary criticisms levelled at the Italian liberal state were repeated subsequently by historians of the liberal period – and were apparently given added weight by the collapse of Italian liberalism after World War One and the rise of Fascism. Wedged between the romanticism of the Risorgimento

NOTES

(unification) and the brutality of the Fascist era, it was easy to look at the liberal period as a failure, one in which Italy deviated from what was assumed to be the 'normal' path of modern state development, represented by the likes of Britain and France, and instead trod its own path towards Fascism. To explain why Italian parliamentary democracy collapsed many historians and observers turned to the 'peculiarities' of liberal Italy's political, economic and social structures.

The critics of the liberal state have not had it entirely their own way, however. Many historians have defended its record. Liberal apologists have traditionally emphasized the scale of the problems facing the new state and have argued that Italy performed as well as could be expected under difficult circumstances. Again, though, the debate has been framed in the light of what came before and, more importantly, after liberalism.

The diametrical verdicts on liberal Italy offered by Benedetto Croce (1866–1952) and Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937), two of modern Italy's intellectual heavyweights, mark the poles of historical opinion on the liberal period, and for many years they defined the nature of the debate about liberal Italy. The past two decades, however, have witnessed a revisionist trend away from these traditional approaches that try to prove or disprove liberal Italy's 'peculiarity', 'deviancy', or answerability for what followed, towards more explicative, and less judgmental, political accounts of the liberal period. The emphasis now is on looking at liberal Italy 'on its own terms'. Just as attempts have been made to detach earlier nineteenth-century Italian history from unification and independence, so historians have attempted to detach the history of liberal Italy from the Risorgimento and from Fascism. In general, these accounts have helped bolster the reputation of Italian liberalism.

The Destra Storica : Government by the 'Right', 1861–76

The destra storica was a broad coalition of parliamentary deputies who had supported the Piedmontese moderate liberal-constitutional approach to Italian independence in the 1850s and early 1860s. The destra dominated government from the proclamation of the Kingdom of Italy in 1861 until 1876. From 1870, at least, destra rule was characterized by austere conservatism in domestic and foreign policy, with the aim of consolidating the new state. At home, great emphasis was placed on balancing the budget (the wars of 1859 and 1866, plus the huge cost of amalgamating so many hitherto separate states, had left united Italy with enormous debts), on maintaining (or imposing) law and order (especially in the south), and on guarding against both 'black' intrigues sponsored by the Vatican and republican agitation encouraged by the heirs of Mazzini. Abroad, Italian governments of the Right after 1870 settled for neutral and pacific diplomacy, in contrast to the extravagant and sometimes reckless foreign ventures and alliances of the previous decade.

NOTES

THE SINISTRA STORICA : GOVERNMENT BY THE 'LEFT', 1876–96

The fall of the destra in March 1876 and the landslide election victory of the sinistra storica under Agostino Depretis later in the year ended the monopoly of political power enjoyed by the Right since 1861. The widely held view that the triumph of the Left – *i.e.*, of the old Garibaldini – amounted to a political revolution was not borne out by events. Depretis, who governed for much of the following decade until his death in 1887, did little to alter the basic tenets of government. Domestically, Depretis continued the Right's economic policy of tight fiscal control, and he followed its tough line on law and order, the only difference being that 'red' sedition encouraged by Italian anarchists and socialists gradually replaced clericalism and republicanism as the government's main concern. Nor was Depretis a great reformer. An education bill was passed in 1877 and the franchise extended in 1882 (from 2 per cent to 7 per cent of the total population), but as under the Right no major social legislation was enacted. Foreign policy, however, did become more assertive. Italy abandoned neutrality in 1882 when it entered into a limited defensive alliance with Germany and Austria. The so-called Triple Alliance was renewed (and extended) on a regular basis until 1915. A modest first attempt at Italian empire building in East Africa followed the inauguration of the alliance but ended in military humiliation at the hands of Ethiopian troops at Dogali in 1887.

It was Depretis who instigated the much-criticized practice of trasformismo: the 'transformation' of one's political opponents into allies to secure and sustain a parliamentary majority. Trasformismo, argued its opponents, stunted the development of genuine political parties, blinded deputies to the national interest, and turned parliament into little more than a clearing-house where a deputy traded his support for patronage.

Trasformismo did not die with Depretis. His successor, Francesco Crispi, who had previously condemned trasformismo as 'parliamentary incest', was happy to maintain it once in power. However, Crispi's two periods in office, 1887–91 and 1893–96, did mark a fundamental shift in both the style and substance of government. Crispian politics meant more of everything: greater reforming zeal (Crispi's first ministry saw major reforms of the penal code and of local government, plus the first limited recognition of workers' rights); heavier repression to counter 'red' subversion and social unrest (the brutal crushing of the Sicilian fasci in 1893–94 and the subsequent nationwide attack on Italian socialism); higher levels of expenditure; and more frequent accusations of 'parliamentary dictatorship' (a charge previously levelled against Depretis but Crispi strengthened the powers of the prime minister's office and he often ignored parliament). Above all, Crispi instigated the most expansive and ambitious foreign policy of any Italian government since the Risorgimento. Crispi sought to strengthen Italy's alliance

NOTES

with Germany and Austria, he embarked on a programme of massive military expansion, he intensified the long-running rivalry between Italy and France (the Franco-Italian tariff war, 1888–98, just one example), and he relaunched Italian imperialism in East Africa. Crispi's determination 'to make Italy's words heard and respected' abroad ultimately cost him his political career. In 1896, Italian troops were overwhelmed at Adowa by the Ethiopian army. Nearly 5,000 Italian soldiers died, with 1,500 wounded (including 30 soldiers castrated during battle) and 2,000 captured. Crispi, who had staked his political reputation on the venture, resigned.

Government in Crisis and Transition, 1896–1900

Crispi left behind not only a badly damaged national ego but also a very unstable domestic political situation. His unrelenting persecution of socialism had divided parliamentary opinion. Radical and democratic elements within parliament protested against the level of repression and moved to defend the rights of socialists. Conservative deputies, however, contemplated even more drastic measures of control, most notably Sidney Sonnino's famous call for a 'return to the statuto' (1897) entailing a dramatic reduction in the role of parliament with executive power placed in the hands of the Crown. The parliamentary conflict came to a head in the wake of riots in Milan (May 1898).

The riots – the culmination of several weeks of protest and unrest across Italy provoked by high food prices and rising unemployment – were met with extreme force by the Italian army (at least 80 civilians were killed). A government crackdown on suspected 'subversives' followed. Shortly afterwards, the Prime Minister, General Luigi Pelloux, proposed legislation aimed at curbing the rights of association and restricting press freedom. The coercion bill brought the parliamentary crisis to a head in 1899–1900. Pelloux, frustrated by radical-democratic filibustering designed to delay the passage of the bill, attempted to force through the measures by the use of royal decree, effectively bypassing parliament. This pushed even moderate deputies to oppose the bill. When the Court of Cassation ruled the use of the royal decree to be unconstitutional, Pelloux chose to appeal to the electorate. Although he won a parliamentary majority, opposition groups registered a massive increase in support. Pelloux resigned in June 1900.

The 'Giolittian Age', 1900–14

In contrast to the upheavals and tensions of the 1890s, Italian parliamentary life during the subsequent 'Giolittian age' was, for the most part, relatively stable. Giovanni Giolitti had already held the premiership, albeit briefly, in the early 1890s, but it was as Prime Minister (and Minister of the Interior) in 1903–5, 1906–9 and

NOTES

1911–14 that he really stamped his authority on parliament. Such was his influence that even when out of office his absence was regarded as merely temporary or even tactical. In many ways, Giolittian politics broke with long-established norms and attitudes. Giolitti revised the traditional state policy of antagonism towards, and repression of, non-liberal forces – socialism, Catholicism, radicalism – choosing instead to open up the liberal system to these forces in an effort to 'absorb' them. Under Giolitti, organized worker and peasant protest was tolerated and press restrictions lifted. Socialist leaders were invited to join the government (they refused), radicals did participate in government, and even the Church ultimately endorsed Catholic participation in national elections on the side of the 'forces of order'.

Giolitti was also responsible for a wide range of reforms. A host of social welfare measures were introduced, ranging from general public health reforms (*e.g.*, state provision of quinine to tackle malaria) to the creation of a state monopoly of life insurance (1912). Labour legislation included stricter working conditions for women and children, and the creation of the Supreme Council of Labour (1902). New public holidays were announced and taxation on essential foodstuffs reduced. There was major electoral reform in 1912 (near universal male suffrage more than doubled the electorate to eight-and-a-half million). In addition, there was a huge increase in government spending on public works projects, particularly in the south. Education, agriculture, transport and communications services were also subject to reforms either passed by or initiated under Giolitti.

There were, however, continuities with the not so distant political past. Imperialism was revived in 1911–12 when Italy seized Libya from Turkey and in the process occupied the Turkish-controlled Greek Dodecanese islands. At home, Giolitti, even more so than his predecessors Depretis and Crispi, was accused of manipulating parliament through corrupt electoral practices and trasformismo. Liberal parliamentary government was attacked from both the Left and the Right as well as by a small but vociferous body from within Italy's cultural and intellectual élite. State repression, too, was not entirely abandoned.

Giolitti resigned as prime minister in March 1914 after Radical party deputies, unhappy with his recent alliance with the Catholic Electoral Union (the so-called Gentiloni Pact), left the government.

Giolitti was not expected to remain out of office for long. However, the outbreak of European war in September 1914 and the subsequent 'intervention crisis' in Italy significantly weakened his position. Giolitti did not return to power until 1920, and then only briefly, but with disastrous consequences for the liberal state.

NOTES

3.12 BERLIN CONGRESS 1878

On March 3, 1878, the Russo-Turkish war ended in the Peace Treaty of San Stefano. Russia tried use the war to settle the "Eastern Question" to its own advantage. Victorious, Russia sought to turn the Balkans into a sphere of influence, paying due respect to Austro-Hungarian interests in Bosnia and Hercegovina. Under the provisions of the Treaty of San Stefano, Serbia, Montenegro and Romania grew at the expense of the Ottoman Empire: Serbia extended as far as Rashka, Novi Pazar in the Sanjak and Sitnitsa and Laba in Kosovo; Montenegro occupied Plav, Podgoritsa, Nikshich, Gadsko, Zhablyak and Bar; Romania obtained the northern part of Dobruja.

By the Treaty of San Stefano a new, autonomous Bulgarian state was created, possessing its own government and army. The boundaries of San Stefano Bulgaria would include not only present-day Bulgaria, but also the Vranye district in Serbia (including the towns of Nish, Pirot and Vranye) and Macedonian territories encompassed within a boundary lying along Mt. Shar, Mt. Korab and the Crni Drim River to the town of Gramos (today, in Greece): encompassing Macedonia as far as Prespa and Ohrid Lakes and the town of Korche (currently, in Albania). The southern border would run from the border marked by Gramos and the Vardar River to the mouth of the Mesta River, leaving Thessaloniki and Chalcidice under Ottoman Rule, then on to the Rhodopes, across Lule Burgas to the Black Sea. Accordingly, a large part of ethnic and geographical Macedonia would be incorporated within San Stephan Bulgaria. Russian armies were to stay in Bulgaria in order to assist the solidification of the newly-established authority.

The San Stefano treaty and its proposed alterations of the Balkan balance of power alarmed Great Britain, Austria-Hungary, the German Empire, Serbia and Greece. The Great Powers, particularly Austria-Hungary, disliked the extension of Russian power into the Balkans, and Britain feared the consequences of a truncated Ottoman Empire. Serbia and Greece feared the creation of a Greater Bulgarian state which could endanger their independence and future designs on Ottoman territory. Faced by wide resistance to the provisions of San Stefano, Russia was forced to accept revision of the treaty.

Meanwhile, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, a powerful weapon of the Greek government, was used to organize protests opposing the inclusion of Macedonia within the new Bulgarian state. The Patriarchate was further used to support Greek annexation of Macedonia, or at the very least its continued existence as part of the Ottoman Empire (leaving open the possibility of future Greek annexation). Throughout Serbia, similar protests were conducted against the inclusion of "Serbian" territory in the newly-created principality. Serbia, however, did propose that if Macedonia could not be incorporated within the framework

of the Serbian state, it should granted an autonomous administration with a Christian governor.

In the midst of this turmoil Dimitar Robev, a former member of the Ottoman parliament from Macedonia, arrived in Belgrade in May. He condemned the actions of Serbia, Greece and Bulgaria to annex Macedonian territory, and stated that "the best solution for Macedonia is to remain independent" and that the Russian delegate in Constantinople, Count Ignatiev, had allegedly, told him that "Macedonia cannot belong to any of the three main peoples of the Balkan Peninsula".

NOTES

Exhausted by the war, Russia agreed that a congress be organized in Berlin whereby the Treaty of San Stefano could be revised. Negotiations between the Great Powers in Berlin lasted for an entire month (June 13 to July 13, 1878). The basic decisions reached by the Congress of Berlin were that Macedonia would remain under Ottoman rule, Bulgaria would extend from the Danube River to Mt. Stara Planina, and the region of Eastern Rumelia would remain autonomous but not part of the Bulgarian state. Bosnia and Hercegovina were annexed by Austria-Hungary, and an expanded Montenegro and Serbia were granted full independence from Turkish authority. The San Stefano fiction of Great Bulgaria-never realized, and "living" on paper for only three months-was to be a rallying cry for future Bulgarian ambitions and a serious factor of instability in the Balkans.

Article 23 of the Berlin Treaty was of particular importance for Macedonia: "The Sublime Porte is obliged to carefully implement the Organic Statute in the island of Crete, introducing changes which would be assessed as justified. Analogous statutes adapted to local requirements, with the exception of the tax exemption approved to Crete, will be equally introduced in the other parts of European Turkey as well, which are not subject of particular drawing up in this Treaty. The Sublime Porte is to engage special commissions, composed to a great extent of local members, which are to work out the details of the new statutes for each province. The organization projects to be worked out by the commissions will be submitted for examination to the Sublime Porte, which in turn, before passing any of the acts, will request the opinion of the European commission established for Eastern Rumelia." Article twenty-three was one of two basic documents which defined the concept of Macedonia in this period-the second being the 1878 constitution of the Macedonian insurgents.

Article twenty-three reveals clearly both the interests of the Great Powers concerning Macedonia and the compromises made in that respect between the Great Powers and the Ottoman Empire. The key article provides for Macedonia, as an Ottoman province, to have its own constitution and a special legal status similar to that of Crete within the framework of the Ottoman Empire. Accordingly, Macedonia was to have its own governor and military commander, who would

NOTES

be entrusted with commanding the army. By putting the principles of the territorial division of Crete into effect, Turkey was obliged to divide the territory of Macedonia into sanjaks (districts), the number of which was to be determined in the future. These administrative units would be governed by mutasariphs, half of whom would be Moslem and the other half Christian, but all would be officers of the sultan's government. The assistants of the Moslem mutasariphs would be Christians, and those of the Christian mutasariphs Moslems. The sanjaks would be further divided into kaazas, governed by kaymakams.

The Organic Constitution of Crete and the future constitution of Macedonia alike provided for the establishment of special administrative councils in each geographic-administrative area, consisting of three Moslems and three Christians. It was prescribed that such councils would be established in lower, local administration as well, and in areas where the entire population was Christian or Moslem such councils would be respectively composed of six Christian or Moslem representatives. These councils would be administered by the mutasariph or kaymakams.

More detailed elaboration and analysis of Article twenty-three of the Treaty of Berlin reveals that Macedonia was to gain political autonomy and the Macedonian people were to have increased possibilities to express their national individuality than under previous Turkish rule. Since that time onwards, the idea of autonomy of Macedonia was the leading idea which motivated the revolutionary and national movements in the region. It took various forms under various conditions, but it was always present as a goal of the Macedonian people. For the Macedonian themselves, autonomy became an ideal to which they dedicated their future struggle for national and political freedom, finding impetus in the fact that the establishment of an autonomous legal status for Macedonia was set out in an international agreement. The Treaty of Berlin represented international recognition of an autonomous status for Macedonia for the first time since Samuil's Empire, and Macedonians were treated as a separate ethnic community and territorial unit, recognized as "an ethnic territorial unit having elements of its independence and self-management". The Treaty of Berlin, containing within it recognition of an autonomous Macedonia, overturned the provisions of the Treaty of San Stefano and its proposed inclusion of Macedonia within a Greater Bulgarian state. Article twenty-three's provisions for self-government in Macedonia were not mirrored in the Treaty of San Stefano, suggesting that under the first treaty the Macedonian people would have merely traded Turkish overlords for Bulgarian overlords, remaining under foreign and alien rule.

Unfortunately, the signatories of the Treaty of Berlin left implementation of the treaty to the he Sublime Porte. The Porte, obliged to determine when the international commissions regarding reform in the empire would be created, never

initiated the implementation of the treaty. Consequently, Macedonia's promised self-government did not materialize.

Yet, it does not mean that spiritual or armed resistance against the Ottomans in Macedonia ceased, in expectation of action by the Great Powers.

NOTES

In April, 1880, the troops of the priest Kostadin Buvski and Leonid Vulgaris met at Gremen (Ostrovo). Discussing the situation in Macedonia, the two voivodes (commanders) came to the conclusion that the Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia were to blame for Macedonia's continued misery under the Turkish yoke. Accordingly, "the future of Macedonia lied in the creation of an independent Macedonian state."

The voivodes also concluded that the diversity of the population in Macedonia was the main factor hindering a mutual agreement to begin a rebellion. Unity of the nationalities in Macedonia might lead to a general and successful fight against the Ottomans.

At their initiative, in the period from May 1 to June 2, 1880, 32 delegates gathered in Gremen as representatives of the Macedonian, Vlach, Serbian and Albanian peoples (the Turkish representatives were left out). After discussing the platform of Vulgaris and Buvski, this National Assembly drew conclusions on the measures to be taken in order to accomplish "the national aim of the Macedonians". Among other matters, they stated that Macedonia, which had suffered for centuries under the Ottomans, had no possibility to liberate itself in a peaceful manner. The neighboring Balkan states destroyed the national unity of Macedonia through their religious and national propaganda and shrouded the Macedonians away from the eyes of European public opinion. Putting an emphasis on action was the only way that Macedonians would liberate themselves from Turkish slavery.

In reviewing the situation, the National Assembly stated that Turkish authorities had not implemented the programs set by the Great Powers at the Congress in Berlin. For that reason, the National Assembly decided to inform the Sublime Porte that the Macedonian people requested speedier implementation of Article twenty-three of the Treaty of Berlin. The Assembly was also to contact all representatives of the signatory Great Powers in Macedonia with a request for their intervention with the Porte in putting Article twenty-three of the Berlin Treaty into effect. If the existing situation remained and nothing was changed, the National Assembly would summon the Macedonian people to take up the arms under the slogan "Macedonia to the Macedonians for the re-establishment of Ancient Macedonia!" On that occasion, the National Assembly elected a Provisional government of Macedonia from among its members under the name "Unity".

On May 21, 1880, the Provisional government of Macedonia contacted the Russian consul general in Thessaloniki, N. Ulyanov, advising him that "at international congresses of the Great Powers, Macedonia has been left an orphan... only Macedonia, which had had its own civilization in ancient times and had

NOTES

given birth to Aristotle and Alexander the Great, is deprived of any help" and that, that, if the Sublime Porte did not take any steps to implement the Article twenty-three, "the Provisional government of Macedonia will summon the Macedonian people to take up the arms under the slogan: 'Macedonia to the Macedonians, for Macedonia, for re-establishment of ancient Macedonia!'"

This statement was signed by Vasil Simon, president of the provisional government, and the Kramontov, commander-in-chief of the rebel forces.

Nearly a year later on March 23, 1881, the provisional government sent a manifesto to all diplomatic representatives: "Foreign and distrustful peoples want to occupy our country and destroy our nationality, which shines with a high splendor and can not and will never disappear." The manifesto opined that "by being shifted from one yoke to another, the regeneration of the Macedonians will become impossible and our nationality will vanish. This moment is critical for Macedonia: it is a question of its life or death!" Addressing the Macedonian people as "True Macedonians, the faithful children of the fatherland!", the signatories of the manifesto, President Vasil Simon and Secretary Nikola Traykov exclaimed: "Do your best, for the words 'Unique and United Macedonia!' are written on the flag we are going to raise... Then, gather yourselves under the flag of Macedonia, being your unique national symbol, raise it high and make that glorious flag ready for writing on it: Long live the Macedonian people, long live Macedonia!"

Macedonian emigrants in Bulgaria were active as well. These included veterans from the Russo-Turkish War and the 1878 Macedonian Uprising who could not reconcile themselves to the suppression of Macedonia. About 1,800 veterans of battles against the Ottomans lived in Sofia; deciding that the struggle should continue until the final liberation of Macedonia, a Bulgarian-Macedonian League (later shortened to Macedonian League) was formed, founded on the motto "Freedom for Macedonia or death!" The League upheld the political independence of Macedonia and the creation of a Macedonian state. In order to be able to accomplish this objective, the League began to organize its own army and work out its own strategy to wage a war of independence in Macedonia. Declaring itself a people's front for the liberation of Macedonia, the League established a provisional administration for Macedonia with unitary political and military authority, to operate until the independence of Macedonia and creation of a Macedonian state was at hand. This provisional administration was headed by a chief voivode and composed of three senior voivodes and commander of headquarters. The military units of 180 soldiers each were formed, headed by voivodes.

The provisional administration of Macedonia, as the highest legislative body, worked out a constitution of Macedonia which contained a detailed elaboration of the status of the future Macedonian state. The constitution consisted of 103 Articles and was similar to the 1868 constitution of Crete, providing for political

NOTES

and cultural autonomy. According to its provisions, Macedonia was to remain part of the Ottoman Empire but possess the status of a federal unit within the empire. The Macedonian government would be headed by a governor-general and twelve ministers, ruling from Thessaloniki a federal territory based on the borders of the three Macedonian vilayets of Thessaloniki, Bitola and Skopje (minus Kosovo and Metohia).

In determining the borders of the future Macedonian federal province, the constitution of the provisional administration of Macedonia established elements which would "play a long-term, important role in the struggle of the Macedonian people in formulating the actions of the Macedonian revolutionary movement." The borders were based in part on knowledge of the complexity of economic and political interests, and the unifying factors of the "strengthening process of economic, political and national integration." Vlado Popovski notes that in such a context there would be the increasing presence of "the people's, national and, implicitly, political history" of the most numerous population on this territory, the Macedonian Slavs. "Naming themselves by the territorial name... [they] exerted influence and attracted other, less numerous national groups." In such a way, argues Popovski, members of diverse ethnic groups "accepted and felt Macedonia to be their common homeland and at the same time a separate whole, and hence a separate community." This was the beginning of the development, growth and affirmation of the awareness of an individual "social and political constituting of Macedonia" as an independent state.

It can be stated with certainty that the prospect of an autonomous Macedonia, even within the framework of the Ottoman Empire, stimulated the development of the concept of an independent Macedonia. "By creating a realistic attitude towards the fact that the Macedonian people and other nationalities in Macedonia were linked by fate, the idea of an autonomous Macedonia incorporated in itself their need for integration, based on the increasingly mutually-accepted social, political, economic and national interests. It was on such a basis and on such conceptions that the idea of a joint struggle of the Macedonian people and the other nationalities developed," concludes Aleksandar Hristov. In the process of assimilating the population of Macedonia, the idea of autonomy was present as a core element.

All this influenced the armed struggle of the Macedonian people, directing it toward establishing a form of political organization which would "...guarantee the creation of a separate political structure of power and relations." This leads to the conclusion that the idea of the autonomy of Macedonia incorporated in itself the concept of the Macedonian people as an individual people, having their own individual, national, political, economic and cultural interests differing and distinguished from those of other Balkan peoples. This, in turn, meant that the

NOTES

more the idea of an autonomous Macedonia was affirmed, the more the Macedonian people were identified as a nation.

It was the dispelling of the idea of an autonomous Macedonia that created new, complex relations in the Balkans and led to institutionalizing of the "Macedonian Question". The more Macedonians affirmed their national individuality and right to self-determination through the idea of Macedonian autonomy, the more other countries (Bulgaria, Greece and Serbia in particular), grew afraid that their territorial ambitions would be thwarted. Hence, "the retained right" of the three countries to dispute the legitimacy of the Macedonian national movement or the right of the Macedonian people to their own state.

The documents of the Macedonian League and provision administration of Macedonia clearly show that it was the concept of an autonomous Macedonia that was the basis for the decision to embark on an armed struggle to win Macedonia's ethnic and political liberation. These ideas grew into the program of the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization, less than 13 years later.

3.13 TURKISH REVOLUTION OF JULY 1908

The revolution was in essence the overthrow of the Sultan's autocratic power by the upper class Turks, and the substitution therefore of parliamentary government under their control. The earlier attempt to secure constitutional government, connected with the name of Midhat Pasha and resulting in the constitution of December 23, 1876, was a failure, due to the lack at that time of any feeling for its necessity among the ruling caste. Thirty years of increasingly centralized government, the universal espionage which made all life miserable, the assassination or exile of all who opposed the régime in the slightest detail, the loss of territory and of prestige, the consciousness that the economic penetration of the foreign powers could end only in the dissolution of the Empire, forced the Turks of all classes to consider the constitution their only salvation. The leaders in Paris studied in detail successful revolutions of the past, arranged their differences as between radical and conservative, invited in the other nationalistic revolutionary parties, especially the Armenians, but retained control in their own hands.

Outbreak of Revolution

The revolution seems to have been hastened by the announcement of Austria in February, 1908, that a railroad would be built through Novibazar, linking up the Bosnian and Salonika lines, which would bring all the western part of the Balkan peninsula under Austrian influence, and by the Reval interview.

The disturbance in Macedonia had brought together large numbers of Turkish troops. The common soldiers were unpaid and wasting their time, the officers were unable to preserve order and dissatisfied with the presence of the

NOTES

foreign officers, who were a constant reminder that the days of the Empire were numbered. Emissaries, sent out front Paris found a good reception, and the revolution was proclaimed July 6, 1908. At first foreigners thought little of it, but adhesion was rapid. Troops sent against the rebels refused to fight. Freedom was proclaimed for the Christians, and safety for foreign interests. The Sultan suddenly surrendered by granting a constitution all calling for an election. The rule of Abdul Hamid had been supported by Germany, even through the Armenian massacres. Popular feeling naturally turned against it, while France, the home for many years of the leaders of the Young Turks, and England, the friend of liberty, were much favored. In their turn, they acclaimed the revolution as a marvel, which it was in many respects. During this period, the grand vizier, Kiamil Pasha, was Anglophile. English and French aid largely was used in reconstructing the government.

Growth of German Influence

The new régime was soon discredited by the declaration of independence by Bulgaria, the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria, the declaration of annexation of Crete to Greece. Whether all these were the result of the intrigues of the Central Powers they played the game of those powers. Long negotiations were needed to settle the railroad question in Bulgaria; the return of Novi Bazar did not prevent a boycott of Austrian goods by the Turks; the questions remained for long irritating. The new Parliament assembled December 17, not without frauds and the stirring up of racial hatreds, with the possibility of foreign troubles. Against the party supported by the Committee of Union and Progress, devoted to centralization, Ottomanization, and destruction of special privileges for national, religious, or foreign interests, was the liberal party, in touch with Greek, Armenian, Bulgarian, Arab, and Albanian nationalists, suspected of alliance with the Sultan and reaction. Kiamil Pasha, found his support here and was forced to resign. Himil Pasha was less strongly English. The capital was temporarily secured by the troops of the Sultan (April 13), but troops loyal to the revolution were called up from Macedonia, the city was retaken on the 24th, and three days later Abdul Hamid was deposed and Mehmet V ascended the throne. The Young Turks had been greatly aided in their march on Constantinople, by the expert advice of the Central Powers and especially of the Neue Freie Presse of Vienna. The military party had been pro-German because of their German training, in Germany or under Von der Goltz. As the revolution became more military, those who remembered Paris played less part. The Adana massacres and the failure to adequately punish those responsible, caused a corresponding coolness of the English and French toward the Young Turk. The growing power of Enver Pasha, the "hero of the revolution," was also thrown toward Germany. In spite of all this, it is probable that at the beginning of the World War the majority of responsible officials and thinkers in Turkey were not pro-German.

NOTES

3.14 AUSTRIAN DECLARATION OF WAR UPON SERBIA (WORLD WAR I, JULY 1914)

The period before the First World War was one of increasing tension between the European powers. The decay of the Turkish Empire had been the cause of many, with various parts of the Empire snapped up by the major powers, while in the Balkans the Turks had been forced back almost to the gates of Constantinople. A second cause of friction was the perceived decay of the Hapsburg Dual Monarchy of Austria and Hungary, when the majority of Slavs agitated for either independence, or a greater role in government, while the Austrian and Hungarian elites held out for the statue-quo, led by the elderly Emperor, Franz-Joseph, a force for autocracy and tradition. Austria's main ally was the recently unified Germany, always worried about potential Russian gains as Austria weakened, especially in the Balkans. The Germans were also engaged in a naval arms race with Great Britain, which in turn moved Britain closer to France, and thus to her ally Russia. Despite all of the potential causes of tension, Europe in 1914 looked to be more peaceful than for some years. However, on 28 June 1914, the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, heir to the Austrian throne, was shot and killed by Gavrilo Princip, a Serb terrorist, while visiting Sarajevo.

The mood in Austria was already hostile towards Serbia, and now it turned towards war. The Austrians were certain that the Serbian government had been in some way involved in the murder, and while it is not certain how far that was true, the leader of the terrorists was also head of Serbian Intelligence. On 23 July, Austria delivered a note to the Serbia government that, if agreed to, would have almost ended Serbian independence. This was clearly intended to be refused, and in the most it was. On 28 July 1914, Austria declared war on Serbia. Now the alliance system swung into play. On 30 July, Russia started mobilisation. In reaction, Germany declared war against Russia on 1 August. On the next day, Germany invaded Luxembourg, and demanded free passage across Belgium. On 3 August, Belgium refused the German demand, Germany declared war on France, and Britain pledged to support Belgium. On 4 August, a British ultimatum to Germany was refused, and Britain declared war on Germany, while Germany declared war on Belgium, and launched an invasion of Belgium. Finally, on 5 August Austria declared war on Russia, and the First World War had begun.

The Western Front

1914

German plans for a two front war against France and Russia were based on the Schlieffen Plan, which, relying on the French to attack Germany at once via Alsace and Lorraine, called for a massive German attack through Belgium into northern France, taking Paris and cutting off the French armies, thus winning the

NOTES

war in the west before turning to deal with the slower Russian mobilization. However, General von Moltke, the German commander, had tinkered with the plan, weakening the strength of the blow on the right wing, and reducing the distance into Germany that the French attack would be allowed to progress. Thus, when the French, as expected, launched their attack (Battle of Lorraine, 14-22 August 1914), they were unable to make any progress, and were even soon in danger themselves. Thus, the French armies were further west than the German plan required. Another factor not properly considered in the plan was that Britain would join the war on the violation of Belgium neutrality. The advancing German troops were the first to discover the British Expeditionary Force, a small but professional army, who they encountered at the battle of Mons (23 August 1914), where the British troops took a heavy toll of the Germans before the British were forced to retreat. Nevertheless, the German advance was still going well. However, the French commander, General Joseph Joffre, managed his battle better than Moltke managed his. Reacting to the unexpected German attacks, Joffre adjusted his armies to resist the onrushing Germans, and by the end of August the Schlieffen plan, with its aim of passing west of Paris, had already been abandoned in practice, as the German armies prepared to pass east of the city.

This left the German right flank exposed to any troops that could come out from Paris. From 5-10 September, the French launched their counterattack - the battle of the Marne. By the end of this battle, which included some troops carried to the battlefield by taxi from Paris, the German attack had failed, and they withdrew towards what would become the stable line of trench warfare for most of the war. For the next month, both sides took part in the Race to the Sea (15 September-24 November), each hoping to outflank the other before the line of trenches reached the sea. The final German drive against the Channel Ports was halted by the BEF in the First Battle of Ypres (30 October-24 November 1914), which almost destroyed the BEF, but also prevented the Germans reaching the ports. The trenches now marched from the North Sea to the Swiss border. All mobility was gone from the war on the western Front until 1918.

1915

The second year of the war saw both sides desperate to break through the line of trenches and resume manoeuvre warfare. As the year began, the French were engaged in the First Battle of Champagne (20 December 1914-30 March 1915), a determined attempt to regain the French territory held by the Germans. At the second battle of Ypres (22 April-25 May), the Germans introduced poisoned gas into the war, but despite the initial, horrific, impact of the gas, made very little progress, having failed to provide sufficient support for their new weapon, and for the rest of the year a series of failed attacks followed one after one. On 17

December Field Marshal French was replaced by General Sir Douglas Haig as commander of the BEF.

1916

NOTES

This year was dominated by two big battles on the Western Front. The town and fortress of Verdun, in French hands, formed a salient into the German lines. Falkenhayn, now German commander, decided to use Verdun to bleed the French dry, and on 21 February began his assault on the fortress (battle of Verdun, 21 February-18 December 1916). For the first few days of the battle, it looked as if Verdun would fall, but Joffre decreed that the city would not fall, and sent General Henri Petain to hold it. While the Germans paused at their first objectives, and Petain was able to move reinforcements of men and equipment into the city. Petain managed to organise a supply line that ran down a single minor road. The fighting was bitter and very costly, costing 542,000 French casualties and 434,000 German. By the time the battle ended, the French had regained almost all of the ground lost in the initial German attacks, while Falkenhayn had been replaced by the team of Hindenburg and Ludendorff, famous after victories in the east, who decided to go on to the defensive in the west.

While Verdun was eating at French strength, it fell to the British to launch the offensive that had been planned for 1916. Accordingly, after a week long artillery bombardment, the British infantry attacked the German lines (battle of the Somme, 24 June-13 November 1916). In the initial assault on 1 July, the British army suffered 19,000 killed and 41,000 wounded, still the greatest one day loss in the history of the British army. The battle continued for four months, and did make some advances, including breaking the second German line of defences on 13 July, which allowed the last use of cavalry on the Western Front, and also diverted some German troops from Verdun, but the human cost was appalling. The British took 420,000 casualties, the French 195,000 and the Germans 650,000, mostly in futile counter attacks of their own. While the allies only advanced eight miles during the entire battle, the Germans lost the cream of their experienced small unit officers - the non-commissioned officers, an irreplaceable loss.

1917

The Germans began 1917 by falling back to a new defensive line (known to the allies as the Hindenburg Line), where the front stabilized by 5 April, destroying the territory they were abandoning. The allies gained a boost, with the US declaration of war (6 April 1917), but that would take time to have any effect. In the meantime, the new French commander, General Nivelle, planned a general offensive that, he claimed, would win the war. This started with the Battle of Arras (9–15 April), a minor British victory, best known for the battle of Vimy Ridge

NOTES

(9–13 April), a well planned attack that saw the Canadian Corps fight together for the first time.

Nivelle then launched his main offensive (16-20 April). The Germans were totally aware of Nivelle's plans, indeed he had been boasting about them for some time, and the French attacks were a total failure, and cost 120,000 casualties. The French armies had had enough, and between 29 April and 30 May widespread mutinies broke out in the French army, who refused to take part in any more offensive operations. For two weeks, the French parts of the line were almost without defenders, but a combination of amazing censorship and British attacks in the north stopped the Germans hearing about the weakness until it had passed. Now Haig decided on an attack of his own. On 7 June, after exploding a mine that could be heard in London, the British took the Messines Ridge (battle of Messines, 7 June 1917). This allowed the launch of the Third Battle of Ypres (Passchendaele), 31 July-10 November 1917. This floundered for two reasons. First, the long preparations and bombardment had given the Germans time to build up their defences in great depth. Second was the terrain of Flanders, low lying, and wet at the best of times, days of rain combined with the bombardment had turned the battlefield into a swamp. Men who fell off the paths made above the mud frequently drowned in the mud under the weight of their own kit. Eventually, after capturing Passchendeale the battle was ended, having gained 5 miles at a cost of 300,000 casualties. However, the year ended with the first signs of change. At the battle of Cambrai (20 November-3 December), Haig launched the first major tank assault of the war, with 200 tanks. There was no preliminary bombardment, and surprise was achieved. The tanks made a five mile deep breakthrough along a six mile front, but there was inadequate support, and the Germans were able to seal the breach before any serious damage could be done.

1918

When 1918 opened, change was in the air. The defeat of Russia meant that large numbers of experienced German soldiers were now free to move to the western front, while for the allies an increasing number of American troops were arriving in Europe. The allied plan for the year was to stay on the defensive until American numbers allowed an attack. Ludendorff could see this, and saw Germanys only hope to be a knockout block early in 1918, before the Americans could play a part. Between March and July, Ludendorff launched five great offensives, that threatened to break the allied lines, but never did (Somme, Lys, Aisne, Noyon-Montdidier and Champagne-Marne). The Germans soon found themselves launching attacks with no overall purpose, and struggling to advance over land they had themselves devastated in 1917. By July, the German attacks had ground to a halt, and the mood in the German command was one of great despondency. Meanwhile, the allies had finally put a combined command in place,

NOTES

under Ferdinand Foch, allowing for a much more coordinated war. The allies now took the offensive (the Hundred Days). On 8 August, the Amiens Offensive was started, with a short bombardment followed by a combined tank and infantry attack, which forced the Germans back eight miles, in what Ludendorff called the 'black day' of the German Army. In the fighting that followed, the Germans were forced back to the Hindenburg line. In early October, the allies were able to maintain pressure all along the line, taking the Hindenburg line, and forcing the Germans onto the retreat. Although this final stage of the war saw the greatest advances, it also saw some of the fiercest fighting. Now, Germany started to crumble. At home revolution sparked across the country, while at the front resistance crumbled. The first requests for an Armistice came on 6 October, and after negotiations from 7 November, the Armistice was signed on the morning of 11 November, with the fighting to stop at 11 A.M. The war was over.

The Eastern Front

1914

At the outbreak of war, the Germans planned a defensive war against the Russians, with a slow defensive retreat until the French were defeated, and the Germans could turn to deal with the Russians. In contrast, the Austrians began with an offensive plan based on attacks into Russian Poland. The results were very different. In East Prussia, the Russian First and Second armies made initial progress, although the First Army was temporarily halted at the Battle of Stalluponen (17 August 1914). After a drawn battle (Gumbinnen, 20 August 1914), the German commanders were replaced by General Paul von Hindenburg, with General Erich Ludendorff as his chief of staff. First, they moved against the Russian Second Army. At the battle of Orlau-Frankenau (24 August), the Russians were stopped for a day, after which the Germans withdrew, and the Russians advanced to Tannenberg. Two days later, at the battle of Tannenberg (26-31 August 1914), the Russians were encircled, and the entire Second Army surrendered. Now, the Germans moved against the Russian First Army, catching them on 9-14 September at the battle of the Masurian Lakes, although this time the Russians were not encircled, and some of the army escaped.

The Austrian campaign was less successful. The Austrians crossed into Russian Poland on 23 August, but after a series of battles were defeated at Rava Ruska (3-11 September 1914), a decisive Russian victory, which forced the Austrians back some hundred miles, to the Carpathian mountains, well inside the pre-war borders. Alarmed, the Germans moved an army to the Austrian flank, where they campaigned in south west Poland, and after the battle of Lodz (11-25 September) stopped Russian plans to invade German Silesia, the main German source of minerals.

NOTES

1915

Hindenburg started 1915 with a great winter offensive (January-March), which had limited success. However, the German Spring-Summer Offensive (May-August) was much more successful. Between 2 May and 27 June, the Gorlice-Tarnow breakthrough saw the Russian salient in Poland crumble. Warsaw fell in early August, and by the end of the advance, the Russians had been forced back some three hundred miles, although Grand Duke Nicholas was able to hold his armies together, in return for which he was sacked, and replaced by Tsar Nicholas II in person. At the end of the year, the line had stabilised again, with the winter stopping all fighting.

1916

The main feature of fighting on the eastern front in 1916 was the Brusilov Offensive (4 June-20 September 1916). A planned general Russian offensive failed to take place, but the southern most part, intended as a support attack, did take place. General Brusilov, one of the most capable Russian generals, launched what by the standards of 1916 was a most unorthodox campaign, launched along his entire line, and without the normal massive bombardment. The Austrian troops he was facing were taken totally by surprise, and for a moment it looked as if he could eliminate Austria from the war, but the offensive soon bogged down. His wide front and limited resources meant that Brusilov had nothing with which to follow up his successes, while an increasing number of German troops came to the Austrians aid, and eventually Brusilov was forced backed to his original lines for the loss of 1.4 million casualties.

1917

The eastern front in 1917 was dominated by the Russian Revolution and its aftermath. After the 12 March revolution, the new government pledged to support the allies, but 2 million desertions in March and April alone, combined with the efforts of the Communists to destroy the effectiveness of the army meant that a final midsummer offensive failed. The most important military development of the year was the Riga Offensive of 1 September 1917. This was commanded by General Oscar von Hutier, and saw the first appearance of what became known at Hutier Tactics. These involved abandoning the massive bombardment, replacing it with a short sharp burst of fire followed quickly by infantry attacks, masked by smoke and gas, which stopped enemy strong points being effective. The infantry bypassed any strong points, leaving them for follow up troops, and kept moving, preventing the enemy from reforming. These tactics were used during the 1918 offensives. Meanwhile, events in Russia moved on, and on 7 November the Bolshevik Revolution brought Lenin to power. They immediately sued for peace, and on 15 December signed the Armistice of Brest Litovsk, surrendering vast

NOTES

areas of land to the Germans, and ending the war in the east, although during the negotiations following the Armistice the Germans started an advance east on 18 February, followed rapidly by the peace of Brest Litovsk, which confirmed the terms of Russian surrender.

The Balkans

The war in the Balkans was different in character to most of the rest of the war. Here, instead of long battles of attrition, there were a series of shorter, and normally decisive campaigns with clear results. The whole war had begun with the Austro-Hungarian declaration of war against Serbia on 28 July 1914. Two weeks later, the Austrians launched an invasion of Serbia further west than the Serbs had expected, and caught them by surprise. Even so, the Serb response was so fierce (battle of the Jadar, 12-21 August 1914), that the Austrians were forced to withdraw back into Austria. The Austrians launched another attack on 7 September, and after the Serbs were unable to push them back (battle of the Drina, 8-17 September 1914), were able to take Belgrade (2 December). That was the high point of Austrian success for 1914, and on 3-9 December (battle of Kolubra), the Austrians, trapped against a flooded river, were once again forced out of Serbia. However, a typhus epidemic now swept Serbia, weakening the army, and stopping any new supplies reaching them.

However, little happened for nearly a year. It was only when Bulgaria finally joined the war, on the side of the Central Powers, on 14 October 1915, that a new attack of Serbia was launched. In anticipation of this, the Central Powers had launched their attack on 6 October. With Bulgaria in, they had 600,000 men involved, twice as many as Serbia could muster, and by the end of November Serbia was overrun, and the Serbian army engaged in a hazardous retreat over the Albanian mountains towards Salonika, where still neutral Greece had allowed the allies to land an army to aid Serbia. Eventually, the Serbs were taken off the coast by ship to Corfu, while the allied troops in Salonika settled down for a long period of inactivity. Next to get involved was Romania, finally tempted to join the allied side on 27 August 1916, by promises of large territorial gains at Austrian expense. After initial attacks into Transylvania, they found themselves being invaded by German and Bulgarian armies. Bucharest fell on 6 December, and by the end of 1916 the Romanian army found itself in exile in Russia. 1917 saw little fighting, but did see the entry of Greece into the war on the allied side on 27 June 1917, this time with less disastrous effects. Indeed, the entire front stayed quiet until late in 1918. By this time, Bulgaria was in dire trouble, with food shortages affecting even the front line troops facing Salonika, and when the allies launched their attack in September (Battle of the Vardar, 15-29 September 1918), the Bulgarian army collapsed. On 29 September 1918, Bulgaria signed an Armistice,

and by the time Austria surrendered, the allies had freed the Balkans and were preparing to invade Hungary.

NOTES

THE ITALIAN FRONT

Before the war, Italy had been part of the Triple Alliance with Germany and Austria. However, in 1914 Italy remained neutral, claiming that their alliance was only valid if Austria had been attacked, and as Austria had herself started the war this did not count. Both sides then took part in frantic diplomacy in an attempt to gain Italian support. Here the allies had a great advantage, in that all of Italy's demands were at the expense of the Austrians, and so the allies could happily go along with them. The main cause of dispute between Italy and Austria was over the Trentino, a large area populated by Italians, centred on the city of Trent, which butted deep into northern Italy. Thus, on 23 May 1915 Italy joined the war on the side of the allies. The entire Austro-Italian border was mountainous. The only possible areas for fighting were around the Trentino salient, or to the east over the valley of the Izuno. With the Austrians happy to remain on the defensive, the Italians launched an attack on the Trentino as soon as war was declared, but soon came up against Austrian defences that stopped any further advance until very late in the war. The main Italian attacks thus came in the east, where a series of battles of the Izuno gained little ground for great cost (1st-4th Izuno in 1915, 5th-9th in 1916 and 10th Izuno early in 1917. Finally, in 1917 11th Izuno (18 August-15 September 1917) saw the Italians finally make a great advance, causing the Austrians to call on Germany for help. With the aid of German troops, the Austrians launched the battle of Caporetto (12th Izuno) (24 October-12 November), which swept the Italians back for miles, right back to the Trentino salient, before running out of steam. The battle was a disaster for Italy, but the new line soon stabilised, and in 1918 the Germans pulled their troops out of the front, expecting the Austrians to be able to deal with Italy on their own now that the Russian front was won. An Austrian summer offensive failed(Battle of Piave), and Italy launched her own attack (aided by British and French troops) in October (battle of Vittorio Veneto, 24 October-4 November 1918). After initial resistance, the Austrian army collapsed, and the Italians made great progress, before Austria signed an armistice (3 November), ending the fighting on the following day. Despite some apparent successes, the Italian front had bled the Austro-Hungarian Empire dry, and within months the entire edifice had collapsed.

WAR AGAINST TURKEY

Turkey joined the war on the side of the Central Powers on 29 October 1914, with a naval bombardment of Russian ports on the Black Sea. This had the immediate effect of denying the allies any access to Russia via the Dardanelles, preventing them from providing serious material aid to their ally. The allies did

NOTES

not take Turkey seriously as a military power, and expected a quick collapse of the 'sick man of Europe'. They were to be disappointed. The Turkish war effort was commanded by Enver Pasha, war minister and vice-generalissimo (under the figurehead of Sultan Mehmet V), only 32 in 1914. The Turkish part of the war was fought on several fronts.

Caucasus

Fighting in the Caucasus was started by the Russians, who crossed the Turkish border and made good progress, before a Turkish counter attack in mid December pushed them back across the border, and then under the personal control of Enver Pasha, further back, before themselves being thrown back by the Russians in the battle of Sarikamish (29 December 1914-3 January 1915), which allowed the Russians to advance into Turkey, although failure to take full advantage led to the appointment of General Nikolai Yudenich, one of the best Russian generals of the entire war. Little significant fighting occurring during 1915, but this period saw the start of the Armenian Deportations which led to the genocide of the Armenians still causing controversy to the present day. It also saw the Russians prepare for their 1916 offensive, which lasted from January-April 1916, and saw the Russians make great advances, moving over one hundred miles inside the Turkish border all along the front, and capturing the port of Trebizond, a great aid to their campaign. A Turkish counterattack in June-August 1916 failed, and fighting ended for the year. In March 1917, the Russian Revolution completely changed the situation, and the Turks were able to divert troops away to deal with other threats. After the November revolution, an armistice was signed between Turkey and Russia, but when the Turks saw the Caucasus throw off Russian rule, they decided to try and regain those areas lost to the Russians in previous wars, and by the middle of September had captured Baku, on the Caspian Sea, giving them control of a great oil producing area. Sadly for the Turks this came just before the Allied victory, and in November 1918 they were forced to withdraw to their original borders.

Mesopotamia (Iraq)

One danger presented by the Turks was that they could disrupt Britain's oil supply from Persia. To prevent this, The India Office sent a force under General John Nixon to secure the head of the Persian gulf, and by the end of November 1914 they had captured Basra. This secured the pipeline, and should perhaps have been the end of this campaign, but Nixon and his subordinate, Major General Charles Townshend, wanted to advance further up the Tigris towards Baghdad. They gained permission to do so, and Townshend was sent up the river, advancing to Kut-el-Amara, well over half way to Baghdad, where he defeated a Turkish army (battle of Kut, 27-28 September 1915) and occupied the city. Townshend

wanted to stop here, but now the India office decided on an attack on Baghdad, and from 11-22 November Townshend marched up the river before reaching Ctesiphon, where he was turned back by the Turks (battle of Ctesiphon, 22-26 November 1915), and forced to retreat to Kut, where he was soon besieged by the Turks (7 December 1915-29 April 1916). After three attempts to relief him failed, Townshend was forced to surrender, along with some 8,000 men, remaining in Turkish captivity for the rest of the war. In August, Nixon was replaced by General Frederick Maude. By the end of 1916, he had rebuilt his force, and with 166,000 men started another advance up the Tigris. On 22-23 February 1917, he won the second battle of Kut, on 11 March captured Baghdad and on 27-28 September 1917 after an advance up the Euphrates won the battle of Ramadi (27-28 September 1917), but before he could continue north up the Tigris towards the oilfields of Mosul died of Cholera (18 November 1917). He was replaced by General William Marshall, but no more significant campaigning happened until October 1918, when a successful attempt was made to capture the Mosul oilfields before the war ended, with Mosul itself captured on 14 November 1918, after the end of the war.

Arabia

Perhaps the most famous individual to emerge from this part of the war of T.E. Lawrence (Lawrence of Arabia), the British officer who helped the Arab revolt. In June 1916, Hussein, grand sherif of Mecca, proclaimed the revolt. An attack on Mecca was quickly successful, but the Turkish Garrison of Medina held out until the end of the war. Aided by Lawrence, the Arabs then harassed the Turks in Arabian. By 1918, the Arabs had cut off Medina, and were able to play a major part in General Allenby's final campaigns in Palestine and Syria, taking Damascus themselves. Lawrence resigned at the end of the campaign, in rightful indignation over the mistreatment of the Arabs by the British, who had promised the kingdom of Arabian to a series of candidates. Hussein himself had at one point declared himself King of the Arabs, and been promised the Hejaz (The Red Sea coast of Arabia), but eventually ended up as king of Transjordan.

Egypt and Palestine

The campaign in Palestine developed out of a desire to protect the Suez Canal, the vital artery of the British Empire. In January-February 1915 a Turkish army crossed the Sinai, and even managed to cross the canal before being driven back, and the threat of future attack tied down large numbers of troops. In the first half of 1916, the British extended their defences into the Sinai, and repulsed a major attack on their railhead (Battle of Rumani, 3 August 1916), and by the end of the year had reached El Arish, almost across the desert. On 8-9 January 1917. the battle of Magruntein or Rafa ended the Turkish presence in the Sinai, and left the British free to concentrate on Palestine. After two failed attacks on Gaza

NOTES

(1st Battle of Gaza, 26 March 1917 and 2nd Battle of Gaza, 17-19 April 1917), General Allenby was placed in command and ordered to take Jerusalem by Christmas. After reorganising the command structure, he won the 3rd Battle of Gaza (31 October 1917), forcing the Turks to retreat. Despite a strong Turkish defence, organised by General von Falkenhayn, Jerusalem fell on 9 December 1917. There he was forced to stop, as his force was weakened to reinforce the Western Front, but in September 1918 he was able to launch another attack. By this point the Turks had put in place a strong defended line, from Jaffa on the coast to the River Jordan, although the British outnumbered them.

Keeping his plans secret, Allenby launched a concentrated attack on the coast, burst through the Turkish line, sent his cavalry into the hinterland, and used his infantry to sweep up the remains of the Turkish line (battle of Megiddo, 19-21 September 1918). The resulting pursuit northwards was only ended by the Turkish surrender (30 October 1918).

Gallipoli

The Gallipoli campaign was one of the great military disasters of the war. Control of the Dardanelles, the narrow sea lane connecting the Black Sea to the Mediterranean, was essential if the allies were to get any aid to Russia. With Turkish entry on the side of the Central Powers that access was cut. The initial allied plan was to run a fleet up the Dardanelles to Constantinople and force the passage at gunpoint. This was attempted early in 1915, but the attempt was abandoned on March 18 after three old battleships were sunk by mines, and when probably close to success.

A new plan was hatched, this time a landing on the Gallipoli peninsular. The first landings were made on 25 April 1915; but by this time the Turks had had time to improve the defences of the area, and it soon turned into a smaller version of the Western Front. By the end of the year, it was clear that the plan had failed, and from November the evacuation began, ending with a perfect evacuation of the last 35,000 men on 8-9 January 1916 without any losses, one of the few well executed elements of the campaign.

The War at Sea

At the start of the war, the public on both sides expected a major naval battle to follow quickly. However, neither navy was overeager for the test. The Germans knew that they had the smaller navy, and would probably lose any test of strength, leaving their coast vulnerable to British bombardment. Meanwhile, the British were aware that a naval defeat would be a disaster with the potential to lose them the war, while a victory would be unlikely to give them victory. The two great battle fleets thus spent most of the war facing each other across the north sea, tensely waiting for a battle.

NOTES

THE BATTLES

Those battles that did occur tended to confirm the German in their inaction. First was the battle of Heligoland Bight (28 August 1914), which began as an British attempt to stop German patrols, and escalated when the Admiralty sent in Cruisers from the Grand Fleet, and the Germans sent out some of their own Cruisers. The tide stopped any heavier German ships leaving harbour, and they lost three cruisers while the British lost none. This defeat, just off their coast, with the High Seas Fleet powerless, had a significant impact on German thinking, and the Kaiser decided to take a personal veto over any fleet actions. They were lucky to escape without greater loss at Dogger Bank (24 January 1915), where a German raid against British patrols was intercepted after naval intelligence learnt of it, and only escaped after British errors. Finally came the battle of Jutland (31 May-1 June 1916), the end of an era in Naval warfare as the last battle where the two battlefleets fought within eyesight of each other and with no airpower intervening. The battle was drawn, further proving to the Germans that they could not hope to defeat the Royal Navy, and maintaining British control of the North Sea, and thus maintaining the naval blockade of Germany.

BLOCKADE OF GERMANY

That Blockade was the most important aspect of allied naval strategy. Starting initial just against Germany, but soon expanded to include all neutral nations known to deal with the Germans, the allied blockade soon caused friction with the United States, who when it suited them could get very annoyed about any restrictions on the actions of neutrals, but that tension faded as trade with the allies made many Americans dependant on an allied victory for financial security. In Germany, the blockade had a slow, but eventually decisive impact within Germany, resulting in shortages of many basic goods, including, by the end of the war, essentials such as coal. One of the factors in the decline of the German army in 1918 was the presence of luxuries long gone from Germany in allies trenches captured in their great 1918 offensives.

SUBMARINE WARFARE

The main German answer to the Blockade was Submarine Warfare. From early 1915, German submarines engaged in a blockade of their own against ships in British waters, although with limited effect, and after the sinking of the Lusitania on 7 May 1915, Germany agreed not to attack passenger liners or neutral merchant ships, effectively removing the Submarine from the war. By 1917, Germany was becoming increasing convinced that the U.S. was already supporting the allies, and believing that the Submarine could bring Britain to her knees within months, Germany resumed full, unrestricted Submarine warfare on 2 February 1917. Two

NOTES

months later, provoked by this and the Zimmermann Note, American declared war on Germany. In the meanwhile, the Submarine came close to starving Britain out of the war. Stubbornly refusing to form convoys, the Admiralty left British and allied shipping scattered across the Atlantic, an easy target for the submarines, and losses were horrific, half a million tons sunk in February and 875,000 in April. Eventually, under the pressure of these losses, the allies were forced to use convoys, and they proved to be effective against the Submarine, with their escorts hunting down the submarines, combined with a huge campaign of mining that closed off the channel and also the gap from Scotland to Norway. By the end of 1917, the Submarine menace was over.

The Peace

The peace was never going to be a mild one. Years of devastation, and the huge losses of life saw to that. The Armistice agreement set the tone, and was in all but name a German surrender, with the Germans agreeing to evacuate all occupied territory and Alsace Lorraine, disarm, surrender their navy, and allow three occupied bridgeheads over the Rhine. When the Paris Peace Conference finally started on 18 January 1919, the mood was savage. Even President Wilson, who had been seen as the voice of reason, had been hardened by American losses. The French leader, Clemenceau, wanted to make sure Germany could never again threaten France. Lloyd George, who had already gained Britains pre-war aims before the conference, wanted to ensure a stable and prosperous Europe to aid British recovery after the war. It was Clemenceau who was came clossest to his aims. The Treaty of Versailles (28 June 1919), has ever since been seen as overly harsh, but the German demands if they had won would have been more severe, and included the annexation of Belgium and Holland, as well as large chunks of Eastern Europe. The main clauses of the treaty were German admission of war guilt; the loss of her overseas colonies; the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France, the Saar to be held by France until a 1935 referendum (when the overwhelming vote was to return to Germany), Schleswig to go Denmark, and most of Silesia to go to the newly reformed Poland; reparations of $56 billion (totally unrealistic), and finally that Germany would be disarmed, with an army of 100,000 men, the navy reduced to a coastal defence force, and no airforce at all. This was a war that saw over eight million military dead, and it is hardly surprising that the victors wished to make sure that Germany could never again threaten the peace of Europe.

3.15 PARTITION OF AFRICA

There is no more interesting page in the recent history of the world than that which tells of the marvelous development of Africa. Each successive map of the continent shows more of the country opened up and colonized by Europeans.

NOTES

How rapid this progress has been and how different is a map of Africa now from those which called forth those skeptical lines of Swift's :

"So geographers, Afric maps
With savage pictures fill their gaps,
And o'er uninhabitable downs
Place elephants for want of towns."

Today out of eleven and a half million square miles that Africa contains, there are only about one and a half still unappropriated by Europeans. It will be of interest to trace briefly the history of the colonization of Africa. Passing over the invasion of the Phoenicians, Carthaginians, Greeks, and Romans, and later on the Arabs (see Ancient History), we find that the Portuguese were the first to institute the European colonization of the continent. Cape after cape was rounded by the Portuguese on the west coast until Diaz discovered the Cape of Good Hope in 1487. Ten years later Vasco da Gama doubled the Cape and landed at and named Natal, and proceeded up the coast to Mombasa. The Portuguese founded settlements in various parts and made several discoveries in the interior. It was not until 1553 that the first British ships were fitted out for an expedition to Africa. France also, about this time, began to send vessels to Guinea, and by the middle of the Fifteenth Century there was quite a busy trade going on with Africa.

In 1588, Queen Elizabeth granted a patent for the first English chartered African Company. It is singular to note how large a part chartered companies have played in English colonization. Then in 1581, the Dutch began to look for new fields for commerce, and turned their eyes toward Africa. They rapidly excluded Spain and Portugal for by this time Spain had dispossessed Portugal and France and England, too, from the coast of Guinea: Fort Elmina was taken by the Dutch in 1637. An effort was made to arrest the advance of the Dutch in 1662, when another British company was chartered by Charles II. This caused a war, and the English captured Fort Seconda, and Cape Coast Castle. Then we find other countries founding settlements, but France was the only one to make headway. Late in the Seventeenth Century France was undoubtedly the most powerful European power in Africa. Not much was done during the Eighteenth Century, possibly because of war in Europe, but it must not be forgotten that in 1795 the English took the Cape of Good Hope from the Dutch. The beginning of the Nineteenth Century saw a great struggle between France and England in Africa as well as in Europe. In 1815 Cape Colony was finally made over to England. The French in 1830 seized Algeria, and both Nations steadily increased their possessions. For the last thirty years various European explorers, and the American Stanley, have been penetrating deep into the heart of Africa. (See volume "Achievements of the Nineteenth Century.") It was after Germany had become a United Empire

NOTES

that she, too, began to cast longing eyes on all possible colonies in Africa. In 1876 the famous Brussels Conference was held to discuss the question of exploring and civilizing the continent. The action of the King of the Belgians in his desire to form an African state on the Congo excited the ambition of other European powers and soon there began early in the eighties, the first signs of what has been termed "the scramble for Africa." So the struggle, which seemed to reach a climax about five or six years ago, has gone on until now, when there is but little worth fighting for left, though that little is sometimes a source of trouble, as, for instance, the Fashoda incident between France and England in 1898. Out of the scramble France has come with a larger slice of territory than any other power. She possesses all the country from Algeria and Tunis to the Guinea coast, the bulk of the Sahara, the territory watered by the Senegal, and the best of that watered by the upper Niger. Then she also owns a great Nock between the Cameroons and the Congo. She has besides, Madagascar and Obok. Germany has fared badly, her possessions being of no great value. Portugal, the pioneer, has only 900,000 sq. miles left. Italy, after a war with Abyssinia, now possesses a long stretch of territory on the Red Sea. Spain possesses a large tract of desert in the Western Sahara, Fernando Po, and about 800 square miles in Guinea. The Congo Free State, an appanage of Belgium, covers 900,000 square miles and is a country capable of development. Great Britain holds the second largest share of territory in Africa. Her possessions in the South have proved more and more valuable, and British South Africa seems likely easily to surpass the rest of the continent in proportion to population and products. Thus Africa has played a large part in the politics of Europe in recent years.

The story of the acquisition of these colonies is one of constant little wars which are not at present worth a place in history except in connection with the history of the mother country, where, mention has been made of them when essential. More interesting is the story of the efforts of the independent states to preserve their integrity.

The position and condition of Egypt are unparalleled. Nominally a province of the Ottoman Empire, it is also autonomous, and under the rule of the Khedive by firmans of the Sultan in 1841, 1866, 1867, 1879, and 1892, subject to the annual payment of a tribute of £682,092.

It is at the same time entirely dependent for its existence as a sovereign state upon the will of stronger powers, England at the present moment being dominant. The title of Khedive was given by firman of May 14, 1867, and is hereditary. In consequence of a military revolt, headed by Arabi Pasha, which the Khedive was powerless to subdue, England was most unwillingly compelled to interfere, and is now in occupation of Egypt, and for many years must continue to exercise a very powerful influence over the fortunes of the country. While British troops were reëstablishing the authority of the Khedive in Egypt, a revolution, headed

NOTES

by Mohammed Ahmed, proclaimed himself a Mandi, broke out in the Egyptian territories in the Soudan. The Egyptian troops having been beaten in the field, General Gordon volunteered to proceed to Khartoum to withdraw the garrisons. He fell, dying nobly at his post January 26, 1885, before an English expedition, sent somewhat tardily to his relief, could reach him. Since then the whole of the upper valley of the Nile and the vast territory which had been brought under Egyptian rule, almost as far as the equator, had been abandoned until the year 1896, when a military expedition, under the Sirdar, started for the south. The province of Dongola was recovered in that year, and Berber, in 1897, and Khartoum, in 1898—a series of brilliant victories that covered General Kitchener with glory. There is a railroad from Cairo to Dongola, which is now being extended to Berber.

The most powerful state in Africa is Abyssinia, which has been able to resist all efforts for its annexation. The Abyssinians are Christians, and their Kings claim descent from Menelek, the son of Solomon, by the Queen of Sheba. They themselves were converted to Christianity probably about 600 A. D. by monks from Egypt, but have long been isolated from the rest of the Christian world. At the end of the Fifteenth Century, an attempt was made by the Jesuits, under the Portuguese power, to bring the Abyssinian church under the papacy. For a time this event seemed likely; but, before the middle of the Seventeenth Century, the Jesuit influence was over-thrown and expelled, and the Abyssinian church reverted to its eastern forms, and no trace of Jesuit influence remained. There is no popular literature, and no education; there is a legal code said to be derived from Constantine, but practically government is autocratic, qualified by the power of revolt. There is no standing army, but all are soldiers, and in the struggle against Italy, the Emperor's army probably numbered 100,000, there being certainly that number of modern rifles in the country. England came into conflict with Abyssinia in 1867-68, when the then capital, Magdala, was occupied by a British army under General Napier (Lord Napier, of Magdala). In 1889, the Italians made a treaty with King Menelek, under which they claimed a protectorate over Abyssinia; this was repudiated by Menelek in 1893, and finally given up after the Italian defeat at Adowa (March, 1896). The subsequent treaty with Italy confined the Italian protectorate to a mere strip along the coast. Since that date, Russian, French, and English missions have visited King Menelek at his new capital, Abdis Abba; the French mission, under Lagarde, and the English mission, under Rennell Rodd.

The Transvaal, or South African Republic, was founded in 1840 by Boers, who, dissatisfied with British rule, had migrated from Cape Colony, and its independence was recognized by the British crown in 1852. In 1877, when Sekukuni had defeated the Boers, and it was feared that the whole of South Africa might become involved in a disastrous native war, Sir Theophilus Shepstone was dispatched to the Transvaal. He found the public treasury empty, and the country

NOTES

in a state of anarchy; to save it from further disaster, he proclaimed it British territory. Protests against this usurpation were unheeded, and on December 16, 1880, at Heidelberg, the flag of the Republic was once more hoisted, and after the battle of Majuba Hill (February 27, 1881), Britain once more recognized its independence. By the Convention of February 27, 1884, Britain merely retained the power of vetoing any treaty which the Republic might make with all foreign powers, except the Orange Free State. Swaziland was placed under the administration of the Republic in 1894, the rights of the natives (who retain their king), being safeguarded. Dr. Jameson's invasion of the Republic, in support of an expected rising of a portion of the foreign population at Johannesburg speedily came to an end with a surrender of the invaders on January 1, 1896. But the discovery of gold and the increasing immigration, combined to put a new face on the situation. The Boers foresaw that they would be eventually outnumbered by the "Uitlanders" (as they termed all foreigners) and they dreaded interference with their privileges. Relying on their prowess, their isolation and the peculiar topography of their country, they began to arm for the conflict with the British, which they felt was inevitable. When the strain could no longer be borne, they addressed in October, 1899, an ultimatum to Great Britain, and upon its rejection, invaded British territory, proclaiming it annexed to the Transvaal. At first they bore down all opposition, investing Ladysmith, Mafeking and other strategic points, and inflicting severe defeats on the British forces in the field. But the tide of their success turned on the arrival of heavy reinforcements commanded by the veterans Roberts and Kitchener. Forced to retreat, they saw their country overrun, their capitals and strongholds seized, and finally their presidents in exile. The Boer states were proclaimed annexed to the British possessions in 1900 and since that time have experienced all the horrors growing out of Lord Kitchener's vigorous measures to subdue the scattered bands still in arms against the invaders.

South of the Transvaal was the Orange Free State, which was founded by Dutch emigrants from Cape Colony. The country was proclaimed British territory by Sir Harry Smith, in 1848, but, by the convention entered into on the 23d of February, 1854, between the British commissioner and the representatives of the people, the inhabitants were declared a free and independent people. They immediately formed a republic and had led a quiet existence free from the internal disorders that marked the history of their northern neighbor. But when danger confronted their kinsmen, they made common cause with them and bore their share in the successes and re-verses described in the preceding section on the Transvaal.

Liberia was founded by the American Colonization Society in 1820, and has been recognized by the European powers as an independent state since 1847.

During the last fifty years it has, however, lost much territory to the adjacent British and French colonies.

One absolute monarchy survives in Africa Morocco, ruled by a Sultan, who is, however, in constant conflict with his warrior chiefs. The ancient home of the Moors, whose exploits have been told in the first volume of this work, has sunk into a state of barbarism and its 314,000 square miles of territory will sooner or later fall prey to a European Nation. Constant intrigues with that end in view are conducted by the French and the English.

3.16 EUROPE BETWEEN THE WARS

This period of history was marked by turmoil, as Europe struggled to recover from the devastation of the First World War. In North America especially the first half of this period was one of considerable prosperity (the Roaring Twenties), but this changed dramatically with the onset of the Great Depression in 1929. It was during this time that the Weimar Republic in Germany gave way to two episodes of political and economic turmoil, the first culminated in the German hyperinflation of 1923 and the failed Beer Hall Putsch of that same year. The second convulsion, brought on by the worldwide depression, resulted in the rise of Nazism. In Asia, Japan became an ever more assertive power, especially with regards to China.

The interwar period was marked by a radical change in the international order, away from the balance of power that had dominated pre–World War I Europe. One main institution intended to bring stability was the League of Nations, created after the First World War with the intention of maintaining world security and peace and encouraging economic growth between member countries. The League was undermined from the start by the non-participation of the United States and the Soviet Union, and subsequently by the bellicosity of Mussolini's Italy, Nazi Germany, and Imperial Japan - leading many to question its legitimacy and effectiveness.

A series of international crises strained the League to its limits, the earliest being the invasion of Manchuria by Japan and the Abyssinian crisis of 1935/36 in which Italy invaded Abyssinia, one of the only free African nations at that time. The League tried to enforce economic sanctions upon Italy, but to no avail. The incident highlighted French and British weakness, exemplified by their reluctance to alienate Italy and lose her as their ally. The limited actions taken by the Western powers pushed Mussolini's Italy towards alliance with Hitler's Germany anyway. The Abyssinian war showed Hitler how weak the League was and encouraged his participation in the Spanish Civil War. He also remilitarized the Rhineland in flagrant disregard of the Treaty of Versailles. This was the first in a series of

NOTES

provocative acts culminating in the invasion of Poland in September 1939 and the beginning of the Second World War.

Economics During the Inter-War Years (1919-1938)

During World War I, some 10 million Europeans were killed, about 7 million were permanently disabled, and 15 million seriously wounded, mostly young men of working age and middle class backgrounds. This loss, combined with the destruction of land and property, led to a European situation of grave pessimism and poverty for many. Living conditions declined dramatically at the close of the war, the infant mortality rate skyrocketed, and life was quite difficult for Europeans of the period. The widespread material destruction totaled billions of dollars of damage in Europe. The war's prosecution had cost the nations of Europe six and one-half times as much as the total national debt of the entire world during the years from 1800 to 1914.

The Allies bore the brunt of the debt, and material damages, France especially. But the Central Powers were punished severely by the war's concluding treaties. Germany lost 15 percent of its pre-war capacity, all of its foreign investments, and 90 percent of its mercantile fleet. The Treaty of Versailles imposed reparations payments which were generally considered intolerable and impossible. In Austria, agricultural production fell 53 percent from pre-war levels, and starvation was a persistent problem. Inflation hit all of Europe in the first years after the war, as pent up demand was released and production fell off due to a shortage of raw materials. By 1920, prices in Hungary were 23,000 times what they had been before the war, and in Russia the multiplier was 4 million. A sharp depression in 1920 and 1921 corrected prices to some extent.

This depression, however, meant that the debtor countries increasingly found it impossible to pay their war debts. Germany pleaded with Britain and France for a moratorium on reparations payments, but France would not agree, and in fact, sent troops into the Ruhr in 1923, when Germany defaulted on its payments. In 1924, a solution was presented in the form of the Dawes Plan, presented by the American, Charles Dawes. Under this plan the total sum owed by Germany would remain the same, but the yearly payments were reduced, and Germany was granted a loan. The German Chamber of Deputies accepted the plan on August 27, 1924. As a result, the German mark began to stabilize, and Germany was able to pay on time for a short while.

Meanwhile, the European Allies had their own financial problems. They ended the war deeply indebted to the United States. The United States demanded payment in gold and dollars, which the Allies borrowed from creditor nations, creating even greater debt elsewhere.

NOTES

From 1925 to 1929, Europe entered a period of relative prosperity and stability. However, unemployment remained high, and population growth outstripped economic growth. During this time, world trade increased and speculative investment increased as the result of better economic times. US creditors, flush with capital coming in from Europe, led this speculative movement.

Germany continued to struggle with reparations payments, and in 1930, the Young Plan replaced the Dawes Plan, lowering annual payments yet again, but to no avail. In attempts to maintain benefits for the unemployed and drive prices down, taxes were hiked, and unemployment shot up again. As the Great Depression that had struck the United States in 1929 began to set in throughout Europe in the early 30s, banks began to collapse. Despite international loans, Germany, and Europe as a whole, plunged into depression, during which currencies collapsed and all hope of stability was dashed. Despite efforts to stabilize world prices and European employment, Europe remained mired in depression until the outbreak of World War II.

Commentary

Most of the financial costs incurred by that nations fighting in WWI were covered by deficit spending. As a result, the money supply increased without any regard to the actual gold and silver reserves of the European nations. Most nations were forced to abandon the gold standard, causing their currencies to depreciate rapidly and creating rampant inflation. However, many analysts argue that strict government policies, implemented at the correct times, could have kept this inflation in check. Regardless, these measures were not taken, currencies remained wildly unstable, and world trade could not be resumed. The widespread borrowing of money to make debt payments only served to worsen the situation. Reliance on short-term loans at high rates, and the foolish extension of credit to the struggling powers by speculating creditor nations only served to drive up national debts even farther, and generally overextend the nations of Europe financially.

Germany was no exception to this rule. Most of the money paid by Germany to Britain and France under the Dawes Plan came in the form of borrowed money. Between 1924 and 1929, Germany borrowed 28 billion marks, and paid some 10 million in reparations. Even without a depression in the early 1930s, this situation was likely to collapse on the Germans' heads. When the depression did hit, it was magnified in Germany by this overwhelming dependence on short-term capital.

While Europe struggled to rebuild during the 1920s, the United States prospered as the major creditor of the Allied nations. The United States feared the depreciation and collapse of foreign currencies, so demanded payment in dollars and gold, a situation which put a great deal of pressure on European treasuries.

NOTES

However, US financial institutions benefited greatly from this influx of capital, and sought ways in which to invest it, driving up the US stock market by speculation, and often sending capital back to Europe in the form of loans. American financial experts favored massive international loans as a means of increasing American exports, increasing employment, and strengthening the already mighty dollar. American enthusiasm for speculation raised the economic tide both at home and in Europe from 1925 to 1929, but in the end, the situation proved unsustainable.

This period of outward prosperity belied the problems beneath. There was no international agreement on currency stabilization, so it was carried out haphazardly, in a varied, unsynchronized fashion by the nations of Europe. Currencies responded to speculation during the period of prosperity, rather than to realistic economic indicators. Additionally, the prosperity achieved during the late 1920s was distributed unevenly throughout Europe. All of this meant that the situation was primed for a sharp correction. That correction came in the early 1930s, plunging Europe into economic hard times once again.

The Soviet Union During the Inter-War Years (1924-1935)

The Soviet Union was the first totalitarian state to establish itself after World War One. In 1917, Vladimir Lenin seized power in the Russian Revolution, establishing a single-party dictatorship under the Bolsheviks. After suffering a series of strokes, Lenin died on January 21, 1924, with no clear path of succession. The obvious choice, to many, was Leon Trotsky, who had headed the Military Revolutionary Committee that had carried out the Bolshevik Revolution. He had been a high-ranking member of the party throughout Lenin's time in power, and was considered by many to be the Communist Party's foremost Marxist theorist, but was also considered aloof and cold by many party members.

Trotsky's main competition for power was Joseph Stalin. Stalin had been involved in the Communist Party since before the Revolution. He served under Lenin as commissar for nationalities, and in 1923 became general secretary of the party. Lenin supported Trotsky over Stalin as his successor, claiming Stalin was "too rude" to lead the government. However, Stalin's position as general secretary allowed him to manipulate the party structure and place his supporters in crucial positions throughout the party, ultimately insuring his victory.

During the struggle for power an ideological rift began to open between Trotsky and Stalin. Trotsky advocated 'permanent world revolution,' claiming that the Soviet Union should strive continuously to encourage proletarian revolutions throughout the world. Stalin contrasted Trotsky's view with a 'socialism in one country' message, which stressed the consolidation of the communist regime within the Soviet Union, and concentration on domestic developments and improvements before looking to world revolution. This rift, combined with Stalin's

rise to power as party leader, sealed Trotsky's fate. By 1927, Trotsky had lost his position on the Central Committee, and was expelled from the party. He fled to Turkey, and eventually to Mexico, where he was killed in 1940 by a Stalinist agent.

NOTES

His main opposition gone, Stalin consolidated power, demonstrating his independence. In 1928, he abandoned Lenin's economic policy and installed a system of central planning, which dictated everything from where factories should be built to how farmers should plant their crops. He allocated natural resources for heavy industrial development, at the expense of consumer products, believing that heavy industry would be the foundation of the profitable state. Simultaneously, Stalin introduced a policy of collectivization, under which were created governmentally owned and operated farms in which peasants pooled their lands. The more well off peasant class, the kulaks, rebelled against collectivization. Stalin would accept no resistance, and initiated a reign of terror during 1929 and 1930, during which as many as 3 million were killed.

During the 1930s, Stalin sought to eliminate all barriers to his complete and total exercise of power. In 1933, he created the Central Purge Commission, which publicly investigated and tried members of the Communist Party for treason. In 1933 and 1934, 1,140,000 members were expelled from the party. Between 1933 and 1938, thousands were arrested and expelled, or shot, including about 25 percent of the army officer corps. 1108 of the 1966 delegates attending the 1934 Communist Party Congress were arrested, and of the 139 members of the Central Committee, 98 were shot. Many longstanding and prominent party members were tried. In all cases, the defendants were forced to confess publicly, and then were shot.

Commentary

Historians disagree over whether or not totalitarianism is an inherent aspect of Marxist-Leninist theory, or whether Joseph Stalin, as many claim, deviated from the true tenets of Marxism-Leninism in constructing his government. Most can agree, however, that the Marxist idea of "dictatorship of the proletariat" enabled the rise of the totalitarian state. Whether or not there was an aspect of totalitarianism inherent in Lenin's philosophy, he never consolidated power to the same extent as Stalin did. Indeed, upon his deathbed, dictating his last testament, Lenin decried the dictatorial nature of his government and expressed the fear that in the wrong hands, totalitarianism could be used in a manner antagonistic to the masses, for which the government was intended to work.

Despite these misgivings, Lenin's rule no doubt set the stage for Stalin's complete totalitarianism. Though his publicly stated philosophy was government by local councils, called soviets, true power rested securely in the hands of the Central Committee alone. The party controlled the police (official and secret), the

army, and the bureaucracy. Stalin capitalized on this power to a much greater extent after coming to power.

NOTES

Lenin had some sense that this might happen, and expressed his doubts in his 'political testament.' Both candidates to succeed him had impressive histories and credentials. However, Lenin expressed doubts about Stalin, fearing he would abuse the power concentrated in his hands. Though he clearly preferred Trotsky, and praised him as "the most able man in the present Central Committee," he expressed reservations about Trotsky's overconfident nature, and thought that perhaps Trotsky was too interested in the administrative side of government to be an effective practical leader.

The success of Stalin's 'communism in one country' philosophy was both the result of, and a cause for, the spirit of nationalism, which was prominent in many of the nations of Europe following the First World War. Destroyed through interactions with the other nations of the continent, many nations chose to recede from international affairs and concentrate on reversing the demoralizing effects of the war. Though Stalin would have been hard-pressed to convince the Soviet people that he could lead communism in the eradication of all of the problems of the world, he did a fair job of convincing them that under his leadership, communism could address the problems of his country, which when it had grown in strength, could then effect global change. This type of moral argument for nationalism was typical of the political leaders of the inter-war period. This nationalism translated easily into many facets of totalitarianism, including the elimination of dissent, the demand for uniformity, and the destruction of individualism as the individual was overshadowed by the united nation.

Stalin's economic policies enjoyed only limited success. Industrialization proved to be a somewhat effective policy, though it proceeded along a different path and schedule than Stalin had planned. In any case, under Stalin the Soviet Union made many advances in technology and heavy industry, and the country benefited from these. However, agricultural policies never achieved the goal of self-sufficiency, and the Soviet Union continued to import crops and heavily subsidize agriculture. Doubtless, the slaughter of 3 million kulaks helped the situation very little. However, Stalin's main focus during the 1930s was consolidating power and eliminating rivals, two tasks at which he proved greatly successful.

Eastern Europe During the Inter-War Years (1919-1938)

The nations of Eastern Europe, which were dominated to a large extent by the major powers before World War I, found themselves in a period of unprecedented self-determination between the wars. Notable among this group were the Baltic States—Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. All of these states

NOTES

had formerly been dominated by Germany to the west and Russia to the east. Once freed from this domination, Finland went on to bind its fate with that of the other Scandinavian countries, and was able to maintain economic and political stability to a significant extent. Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania all struggled with democracy, and became ruled by dictatorships. In September 1934, the three states signed a ten-year pact to cooperate in foreign affairs.

Poland, similarly freed from domination, established a democratic government in 1922, but due to social and economic distress, Joseph Pilsudski took power as virtual dictator in 1926. In 1934, a new, conservative constitution was drawn up, granting extraordinary authority to the president. However, uncertainty about this constitution grew, culminating in May 1935, when Pilsudski died. The elite politicians in Poland consolidated power, and instituted a 'non-party' system, put in place after the 1935 elections. The Camp of National Unity (OZN) took control in 1937, a mass organization based on the principles of nationalism, social justice, and organization. All the while, Poland waged a difficult battle to balance the desires of Germany and the Soviet Union. Eventually however, the balance collapsed, and Poland fell prey to both nations in World War II.

Hungary experienced a great deal of instability during the inter-war years. Hungary had been tied to Austria since before World War One, due to the fact that the Hapsburg Emperor of Austria had also ruled as the King of Hungary. After the disintegration of the Hapsburg Empire, Hungary declared itself independent, and the government came under the control of the liberal National Council, which was overthrown by communist forces in 1919, quickly followed by their ousting and the onset of chaos. In January 1920, a National Constituent Assembly was elected to determine the future of Hungarian government. It decided on monarchy, and Hungary became, in effect, a dictatorship run by the landed aristocracy. In 1932, General Gyula Gombos came to power as prime minister, an office he used as a dictatorship. He was not a strong enough ruler to initiate a truly fascist state, but he was quite powerful, and quite conservative, as well as being openly anti-Semitic. Gombos set the tone for a string of conservative prime ministers who practiced open anti-Semitism, and eventually cooperated with Germany in its efforts at European domination. Due to general economic hardship and a large cession of land mandated by a peace treaty, Hungary floundered economically, and was unstable politically for most of the inter-war period. The chief beneficiaries of the land cession were Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia.

Czechoslovakia proved the only nation in Eastern Europe able to function reasonably well as a democracy during the inter-war period. On October 18, 1918, Czechoslovakia declared its independence from Hungary and established the National Assembly in Prague. The government attacked economic problems

NOTES

ferociously, undertaking reforms and land redistribution. Despite a number of rough patches, the parties within the Czechoslovakian government demonstrated marked unity, and between 1922 and 1929 proceeded in relative stability, ruled by Antonin Svehla, whose rule was broken up into several long stints. The depression hit Czechoslovakia hard, exacerbating ethnic tensions, and most notably convincing the nation's 3 million ethnic Germans, most of who lived near the German border, that they would be best off following the German Nazi Party. Despite efforts to enlist the support of France and the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia was not able to fend off German expansionism, and on September 18, 1938, under the Munich Pact, Britain and France officially recognized German Control of the Czechoslovakian Sudetenland.

Commentary

The reorganization of Europe after the Great War reached its greatest extent and had its greatest impact in Eastern and Central-Eastern Europe. The primary reason for turmoil was the organization of newly defined geographic regions under newly formed governments that were unaccustomed to deciding their own fate. The lands of Eastern Europe had been under the Domination of the German, Russian, and Austro-Hungarian governments until after World War One, at which point they became independent. These independent nations all tried democracy, hailed as the best system by which to introduce the principle of national self- determination to a fledgling nation. However, in a region where democracy was unfamiliar, the system had many problems.

The general public had no experience with democracy, and thus was ignorant of the structures and philosophy that supported a democratic government. Accustomed to following orders and living a life without political impact, the masses proved to be a non-entity in politics in many places, or a disorganized entity, or an easily misguided entity. Additionally, the politicians of Eastern Europe had been handed their orders from the governments that had dominated them. They were not used to democratic deliberation and government within a democratic framework. Some proceeded tentatively, afraid that a wrong move would put them out of favor with the population or lead the government down a dangerous path. Indecision on many issues led to chaos and inaction on the part of many Eastern governments. This allowed others to usurp and abuse power, forming oppressive, fascistic dictatorships. Surprisingly few in the region objected to this development. To many it seemed that fascism was the only solution to the problem of an aimlessly drifting government.

A major source of distress and chaos in Eastern Europe was the interaction of different ethnic groups. Over the centuries, Eastern Europe had become a region populated by various and sundry ethnicities, some concentrated in small areas, others spread throughout large tracts. According to the principle of national

NOTES

self-determination, the redrawn borders of Eastern Europe attempted to grant as many ethnic groups as possible self-government. However, the interaction of politics and longstanding beliefs and resentments with the reorganizing process meant that these borders were often drawn without regard for the consequences. For instance, although Czechoslovakia was the most stable of the Eastern European states, in its government, its society was wracked by ethnic conflict. In the newly drawn state, only 65 percent of the inhabitants were Czechs or Slovaks, two groups that had bonded together more out of necessity than mutual affection. The major minorities in Czechoslovakia consisted of 3 million Germans, almost 20 percent of the population, and 700,000 Hungarians. Both of these groups resented being lumped together with the majority groups, and maintained close ties to their original nations. The Hungarians actively sought independence, and the Germans, most of which lived near the German border, formed their own political parties and imported much German ideology. There was no spirit of cooperation, making effective democracy nearly difficult, and eventually, resistance to German aggression impossible.

Italian Fascism during the Inter-War Years (1919-1938)

In 1915, the French, British, and Russians had promised territory to Italy in exchange for joining the Allied cause. However, when the war ended, the principle of national self determination stood in the way of Italian efforts to collect on this promise. Under this widely accepted philosophy, the Allies could not grant Italy the territory it had been promised because it was not theirs to give, since most of the territory promised to Italy was populated by non-Italians. The Italian Prime Minister Vittorio Orlando returned from the Paris Peace Conference at the close of World War I embarrassed and empty-handed, with nothing to show for the sacrifices of the Italian war effort. The Italian people naturally turned against Orlando's government, as well as the returning veterans, and both were widely despised. Veterans were often physically and verbally abused if they appeared publicly in uniform, adding to the misery of returning home from the war to widespread unemployment and poverty.

Like the other warring nations, Italy had borrowed extensively to finance its war effort. In 1919, the Italian national debt was six times its pre-war level, and the lira had depreciated to one-third its pre-war value. To make matters worse, the democratically elected Chamber of Deputies, Italy's primary governing body, was unpaid, and thus prone to corruption and bribery. Amid the chaos of the early inter-war years, Benito Mussolini founded the Fascist Party, the Fascio di Combattimento, in March 1919. The Fascist Party, composed largely of war veterans, was vehemently anti-communist, and advocated the glorification of war,

NOTES

which they claimed displayed the nobility of the Italian soul. The Fascists thought Italy was destined to recapture the glory of Rome.

In the elections of May 1921, 35 fascists, including Mussolini, were elected to the Chamber of Deputies, representing about 250,000 official party members drawn mostly from the lower middle class. Political tensions between the Fascists and the Communists mounted in Italy almost to the point of civil war. Fascist 'black shirts' and communist 'red shirts' were often seen brawling in the streets. By the summer of 1922, the Fascist army marched from Naples to Rome, declaring their loyalty to the king, Victor Emmanuel, and to the Roman Catholic Church, and claiming its purpose was to free Italy from the liberal left. The Communists also possessed their own army, and the king feared open violence. In an effort to avoid this he named Mussolini premier on October 30, 1922. Mussolini used his private army, now turned into a militia, to purge local governments of any opposition to fascism. He consolidated his power under the motto: "All in the state, nothing outside the state, nothing against the state." Under this doctrine he ruled Italy with a tight fist during the war years, instituting economic and social reforms, some successful, others unsuccessful. He was sympathetic to Adolf Hitler's desire to regain glory for Germany and Europe, and proved Hitler's most important ally.

Commentary

Democracy as an institution was unstable and novel to the Italians, with universal male suffrage only having been granted in 1912. This made it easier for Mussolini to capitalize on the reaction to chaos and bring his party, representing rigid order, to power. Mussolini's strength lay in his ability to harness the anger and disillusionment of the returning soldiers and the lower middle class. Soldiers returned to a broken homeland after World War One, filled with misery and poverty. Moreover, they were not thanked for their sacrifices but jeered as the cause of Italy's hard times. These jeers seemed to be coming from more than anywhere else, the liberal left, which was in control of the Chamber of Deputies early in the inter-war years. Under their rule, conditions only worsened, and in many instances it seemed like they were doing nothing as Italy collapsed. The Fascist party appealed to the frustrations of these soldiers, and to the culturally instilled conservatism of the middle class. Rather than preaching liberalism and newly emerging liberal values, the Fascists offered a return to traditional politics and traditional values, promising to undo the changes made by the liberals and lift poor, crippled Italy to a position of glory once more. Most importantly, they offered the masses a type of government in which the leaders could and would do something about deteriorating conditions. To many, it did not matter what exactly the Fascists did, but only that they acted, and acted within the framework of a stable and strong government.

NOTES

Mussolini was a likely leader of the Fascist movement. Born into a lower middle-class family, Mussolini had watched his father in action as the socialist mayor of his small village. As a youth, Benito was a bully, engaging in frequent back-alley fights and other cruel-intentioned activities. At the age of ten, Mussolini was expelled from boarding school after stabbing another student, an incident repeated at a second school. As a political leader, he marshaled a group of bullies in black shirts, which he used to beat up on opposition political parties. When he rose to dictatorship, this bullying became institutionalized as a means of intimidating and silencing his opponents. It is known that he resorted to murder in at least one instance.

Mussolini's rule as dictator fell nicely into the established totalitarian mold of an omnipotent state apparatus that controlled thought and suppressed dissent, demanding obedience and uniformity. Mussolini's ascent to power is also a perfect example of the means by which dictators during the inter-war years commonly rose to power, by literally beating the legal state apparatus down through brutality and intimidation until it had no choice but to legally accept the imposed government. Though Mussolini's means of ascension to power were by no means legal, in the end, he was granted control of the government by the king himself. This legitimization of totalitarian government was seen commonly throughout the twentieth century.

Britain During the Inter-War Years (1919-1938)

The British government had a great deal of difficulty in adjusting to post-war politics. David Lloyd George, the talentedd Liberal prime minister, was permitted to retain his office by the Conservative majority. At first he continued to run the government as he had during the war, using only his closest advisors to discuss and execute policy decisions. He often worked behind closed doors. Though he had returned from the Paris Peace Conference to general approval, things gradually began to look less rosy. Demobilization caused much difficulty in England. Overseen by the Ministry of Reconstruction, the British government called back from Europe those men deemed most necessary at home; these men were often those who had been most recently sent over the channel. Long-term military personnel grew angry, and, after a number of demonstrations, the policy of 'first in, first out' was set to appease the military.

Immediately after World War I, workers in many key industries began to strike, demanding higher wages, better working conditions, and shorter hours now that the war was ended. Workers in the mining and railway industries were especially adamant, and troops were called in on a number of occasions. However, the spirit of the labor movements did not blossom in Britain as it did elsewhere, and the socialist goal of nationalization of industry was put on hold. Factories

NOTES

owned by the government were sold off, and soon practically no businesses remained in government hands. During the early years after the war, Britain stayed out of foreign affairs and hoped that laissez-faire economics would jump-start the post-war economy.

However, political stability could not be maintained. In 1922, David Lloyd George resigned, and the coalition of parties under him fragmented, ushering in a period of uncertainty. The next years found the British Conservative Party struggling to prevent power from falling into the hands of the leftist Labour Party, which in fact controlled the government for a short time in 1924. After this short spurt, Conservatives again controlled the government from 1925 to 1929. In March 1926, the Samuel Commission, at the behest of the government, released a report on the coal industry advocating wage reductions, setting off strikes all over the nation in May.

The Triple Alliance, made up of miners, rail workers, and other transport workers began the strike, and workers in other industries around the nation struck in sympathy. However, the spirit of Conservatism remained high and the government held out. The miners went back to work in December, forced by necessity, and the Trade Disputes Act of 1927 made sympathetic striking illegal. Amid this battle, however, the Conservative government lost direction and unity, and the Labour Party won the election of 1929. The Labour government attempted to exercise a greater deal of control over the domestic economy, but was often hesitant in its actions.

The onset of the depression in the early 1930s tore the British Parliament apart, as disagreement over recovery measures divided the nation. Labour advocated extremely leftist policies and unwise spending, while the Liberal and Conservative Parties were divided within themselves over just what to do. The election of 1931 was a marked success for the Conservatives, who emerged with a vast majority in Parliament. Despite the Party's protectionist efforts, the depression grew steadily worse. Unemployment benefits were cut in 1931, and adjusted again in 1934. The remainder of the peacetime years was spent dabbling in different potential solutions to the nation's economic problems.

In the realm of foreign relations, the only major issue was the resurgence of German aggression. In 1937, Stanley Baldwin, the experienced, level-headed prime minister and leader of the Conservative party during the past fifteen years, resigned his post, leaving Neville Chamberlain as his successor. Chamberlain pursued the failed policy of appeasement in regard to Adolf Hitler's aggression, signing the Munich Pact. His hopes for avoidance of war dashed, he presided over Britain's declaration of war on Germany on September 3, 1939. He clung to power until his death on November 9, 1940, when Winston Churchill took over.

NOTES

Britain suffered from a case of political confusion in the years following the First World War. For centuries, Britain had been widely successful economically and politically, always seemingly a step ahead of the other nations of the world. However, once the brutal war ended, Britain was cast into the mires of post-war rebuilding, just like the other nations of Europe. The nation responded to its newfound problems by dividing sharply between those who favored the solutions of the far left and those who favored the solutions of the far right. The centrist Liberal party basically disappeared, and the political battles of the inter-war years were pitched between the rightist Conservatives and the leftist Labour Party. The attitude of the Conservative Party may be seen in the early years following the war. They favored a fairly closed, powerful central government that, while it would pass some social legislature, would concern itself primarily with maintaining laissez-faire economics as if nothing had happened, allowing economic cycles to bring back prosperity.

This attitude was constantly challenged and forced to modify itself by the Labour party and Britain's workers. They made their goals clear with strikes early on, but lack of organization, and the necessity of working, due to hard times, gave them little to bargain with. Despite the absence of broad gains, the Labour party's pressure did push the Conservative government to institute social programs, and steps were taken early on toward the construction of a social safety net, most notably with the passage of the Unemployment Insurance Act of 1920. Labour continued to grow stronger as it grew more and more dissatisfied with Conservative policies, and even got a chance at governmental control in 1924, working toward greater government spending on social programs, especially regarding the problem of housing. The Labour Party again got a chance to govern between 1929 and 1931, but got little accomplished with a small majority.

The left failed to become a significant force in British politics for a number of reasons. The early strikes demonstrated that while the spirit of socialism was in the air, the leftists themselves were hopelessly divided among themselves based upon differing degrees ofleftism, ranging from moderate socialism to communism, and devoted much of their energy to internecine quarrels. In 1921, the Communist Party in Britain contained only 5,000 members, and hardly posed a threat to the establishment. By 1929, the leftist forces had combined their strength in a more organized fashion, and had long abandoned radical socialism and decided to work within the capitalist system to regulate and control it. However, the Labour government was far too cautious, fearing it would be ousted by the only slightly overmatched (in parliamentary seats) Conservatives. Such a cautious government was incapable of tackling the problem of mounting unemployment. In fact, Labour Prime Minister MacDonald tried to avoid the issue by repeating the socialist

NOTES

argument that the capitalist system was the problem, and that as such, he could not be expected to do anything about unemployment within the capitalist system. This statement was followed not long after by the dissolution of the Labour government, and the beginning of the long years of the depression.

Focusing on its own problems, Britain had attempted to stay relatively removed from European power politics during the inter-war years, a project which enjoyed fair success until Nazi Germany began to rear it's ugly head. Chamberlain, who proved throughout his time in office that international relations were not his forte, agreed to sign the Munich Pact in 1938, granting Hitler the Czech Sudetenland in an attempt to appease the ambitious dictator. The move was a failure, and Hitler soon demonstrated his desire for total European domination, to which the British responded with a declaration of war. Though Chamberlain's policies in office were questionable, he did prove that he had learned one thing from the interwar years. He accepted his rival, Winston Churchill, as his successor, preparing his party for the transition, thereby avoiding the internecine divisions that had doomed previous transitions of power and caused drastic political realignments.

France During the Inter-War Years (1919-1938)

Though victorious, France lost 1.5 million men in World War I, and had 3.5 million wounded. After the war, France faced an increased death rate was up and falling birth rate. The workforce accordingly declined, and France never fully recovered during the inter-war period. Steel production, a good indication of the status of heavy industry, was more than cut in half, and both agriculture and industry fell into serious decline after the war. The value of the franc fell by about 50 percent during 1919, the first year of peace. To pay off bondholders, France was forced to borrow at extremely high short-term rates.

The French government took little action to rectify the economic situation, relying on laissez-faire economics instead. The advocates of socialism began to align themselves in protest of government inaction during the early years of the inter-war period, but the threat from the left was quickly quashed by a coalition of the petite bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy. The fears of the petite bourgeoisie were represented by the Bloc National, a coalition of rightist forces. The Bloc national was determined not to bow to the needs of the lower classes. Under the leadership of this conservative coalition, the French government became totally committed to the belief that Germany should be severely punished for its actions during the war, and should be made to foot the bill for France's war debt. The left put up only slight, disorganized protest to these decisions.

Under Raymond Poincare as prime minister between 1922 and 1924, the French Chamber of Deputies demanded full payment of reparations by Germany.

NOTES

When the Germans asked for a moratorium on payment, and subsequently defaulted on their reparations, Poincare sent 40,000 troops to occupy the Ruhr in Germany. This action cost France considerable funding, and failed to force the Germans to pay, but rather led to the drafting of the Dawes Plan, under which annual payments of reparations were decreased. Due largely to this failure, the Bloc National was replaced by the Cartel des Gauches, a moderate socialistic coalition elected on May 11, 1924. However, the socialists proved themselves disorganized, disunited, and generally unfit for government. They could not agree on how to approach the problem of Germany, and could not make headway on economic issues. Thus in 1926, Poincare was asked to return to the position of prime minister and granted extreme powers. In 1928, Poincare decreed that the franc was to be devalued, a bold move which paid off brilliantly in the short- run.

In July 1929, Poincare resigned from political life, and France was thrown into disarray for a number of years, without stability or a clear ideology. After the onset of the depression in the early 1930s, support for extremist groups began to expand. As the government floundered, support for both fascism and communism grew, climaxing in February 1934 with a series of riots and police confrontations resulting in a number of deaths and the barricading of the main square in Paris. The coming years held much turmoil for the French government, and in the elections of the spring of 1936, the radical leftist Popular Front emerged victorious, and a Jew, Leon Blum, became prime minister on June 3, 1936. Though the concessionary attitude of Blum's government toward the workers earned him popular support, it also strengthened the resolve of Blum's enemies and increased the deficit. Blum proved unable to curtail the rapidly depreciating economy, and a year after its inception, the Popular Front government fell apart.

The rightist government that ensued restored a degree of economic stability with a program that included an increase of armaments manufactures. France would need these armaments soon, since it was not long before France declared war on Germany, on September 3, 1939.

Commentary

France ended the war on sounder footing than many other nations. Its economic problems were not insurmountable, but the political will was lacking to tackle the fairly major adjustments that did need to be made, and there was little willingness in French society to adopt new attitudes commensurate with significant change. The French government was predominantly bourgeoisie and complacent. The challenge from the left was strong enough to bring the petite bourgeoisie into cahoots with the bureaucracy, but never strong enough to present a real threat during the early years of the inter-war period. Socialists were severely divided among themselves between moderates and zealots, those who advocated political action and those who advocated outright revolution. Many traditional

NOTES

socialist sympathizers were concerned that the movement was far to accepting of communism. Thus, the socialist movement grew only slowly. Finally, with the creation of the Cartel des Gauches, the socialists presented a workable alliance, in which the communists weren't powerful enough to threaten the moderate balance.

The Cartel was aided in its quest for power by the failure of the occupation of the Ruhr. Poincare's decision to occupy the Ruhr was a gesture of frustration that gained nothing for France. France had no backing from its allies, the operation was very costly, and it soured relations even further between France and Germany. Germany had not been made to pay, and demonstrably could not be made to do so. Due to this embarrassing failure, and the fact that demanding German reparations was one of the cornerstones of the Bloc National's platform, the Cartel took over, unfortunately proving to be better campaigners than governors.

When all else failed in France during the first decade of the inter-war period, the government called on Raymond Poincare. Poincare was a remarkable figure, providing passion, aptitude, and stability for france.

Although between 1920 and 1940, the average government in France lasted only seven months, Poincare was prime minister from 1922 to 1924, and from 1926 to 1929. Many other political figures held office under Poincare for long periods, and in many ways the government benefited from this stability, which few other European nations could match. Poincare's stability was a dramatic contrast to the instability of the 1930s, during which period the appeal of extreme solutions grew as the problems of the nation became more and more extreme.

Many believed that the Popular Front government would put an end to the chaotic era of the depression. The victory of the Popular front seemingly broke the stalemate between the socialists and the fascist radicals, putting the socialists in power. However, the government proved unable to control the domestic economy. Workers struck in celebration of the socialist victory, and Blum was forced to make many concessions in order to persuade them to go back to work. These concessions only sharpened the hatred of the right toward Blum. They hated him for his socialism, his intelligence, and for being a Jew. The right united in their loathing for Blum, and this, combined with continued striking and rioting, was enough to force the Popular Front government to collapse. It would be a mistake to write the Popular Front off entirely as a failure. If nothing else, in a Europe of dictators and appeasers, the Popular Front was a genuine expression of republican democracy, and allowed a great deal of public participation.

Under the rightist government, France headed into war, with well-equipped armed forces, but was politically and psychologically unprepared to withstand the fundamental test of unity and common purpose that was to come.

NOTES

On April 14, 1931 the Spanish monarchy was declared overthrown and a provisional government took power. In the ensuing years, the government became increasingly divided between the socialists of the extreme left and the monarchists of the extreme right. In the elections of February 1936, the left won a clear majority. The right reacted with fervor. Generals Goded, Mola, and Francisco Franco disagreed with the leftist efforts at army reform, and viewed with distaste the violence and anarchy which reigned in the streets of Spain. They decided to overthrow the government.

Mola organized for military action in Pamplona, while Franco traveled to Morocco to lead the African installment of the Spanish army against the republic. The military Nationalists pronounced their intentions on July 17, 1936. The rebels stirred by the Nationalists were easily defeated in many cities where the loyal Civil Guard was present. However, in cities unprotected by the Civil Guard, the Nationalists took control quickly, in many cases aided by supplies from Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler. The Republicans, aided by the Soviet Union, consolidated support for the republic, and by May 1937 were entrenched in defensive positions in a triangle of cities with the points in Madrid, Valencia, and Barcelona.

The Republicans tried to turn their rag-tag militia into an effective fighting force, beginning in October 1936 with the creation of the Popular Army, which, while better organized than the militias, was chronically short of arms and ammunition, and was beset by incompetent junior officers and political factions within the ranks. With only limited support from France, and none at all from Britain, The Spanish Republicans turned to the Soviet Union for support. Soviet tanks, superior to the German Mark IIs, arrived in October, along with advanced aircraft and Soviet military advisors. One source of support for the Republicans was the presence of the International Brigades. These groups of leftist volunteers were made up mostly of workers, who volunteered out of boredom, disillusionment, or a desire for adventure as often as genuine political idealism. The protagonist of Ernest Hemingway's For Whom the Bell Tolls is such an international brigadier. However, this support was not enough.

On April 25, 1937, the small northern town of Guernica was bombed by the Nationalists, and civilians were gunned down as they fled the scene. In this brutal massacre 1500 died and 800 were wounded, but the military targets in the town remained intact. As the bloody conflict escalated, the Republican government fell prey to corruption and faction, and support and organization steadily waned. Under the barrage of nationalist attack Barcelona fell, during January 1939. Catalonia fell during February, and Valencia and Madrid collapsed by the end of March. Franco's ensuing rein was one of oppression and tradition. He imprisoned

NOTES

and many upon coming to power—up to a million according to some estimates. Many fled Spain, becoming refugees and awaiting the toppling of the Franco government. They would wait for 36 years, for Franco remained in power until his death in 1975.

Commentary

One major difference setting the Nationalists apart from the Republicans was leadership. Nationalist, fascist leadership proved more effective at carrying out the war than the clumsy democratic government of the Republicans. The Republican government in Madrid under Largo Cabellero was divided within itself, confused about its identity and ideology. The Nationalists had no such difficulties. When Franco was proclaimed head of the Nationalist government on September 29, 1936, there was no one to challenge his authority. Franco's wing of the army was the most successful of the nationalist forces, and he was a respected and very professional soldier. The Nationalists did experience some military problems similar to those of the Republicans. The command structure of the army had been destroyed by the division of the nation. Thus, the Nationalists suffered from incompetent junior officers, but not to the same extent as the Republicans.

Mussolini had been involved to some extent in Spanish affairs before the revolt, but he knew nothing of the generals' plans. He supported the rebels against the judgment of his military advisors, sending bombers and soldiers to Spain in great quantity. There were 50,000 Italian soldiers in Spain at the height of their involvement, and hundreds of airplanes were sent, along with tanks and artillery. The Germans were far less generous, but sent the famous Condor Legion of about 100 planes, which was largely responsible for the Guernica bombing. Germany also made a great contribution in the form of specialists and instructors.

Comparatively, the Republicans received inadequate support. The French Popular Front was sympathetic to the republic, but Leon Blum's hands were tied by conservatives in the government, who did not want to get involved in a foreign war. Most important was the stance taken by Britain, which was more concerned about the spread of communism than fascism. The British urged the French not to get involved, and remained detached from the situation themselves. This attitude amounted to tacit support for Franco, and forced the Republicans into the arms of the Soviets. Stalin aided Spain in efforts to strengthen his position against Germany, to appear as the defender of legitimate government, and to divert attention away from the purge trials in Moscow. Soviet intervention gave the Republicans superior technology early in the conflict, but the republicans never capitalized on this advantage.

Added to unbalanced sources of support was the unbalanced zeal of the two contending groups. As the Cabellero government slipped further and further

NOTES

into uncertainty, many begun to question if it was worth fighting for. Morale was low throughout the republican forces, while it remained fairly high in the Nationalist ranks. The bombing of Guernica, while the casualty figures pale in comparison to later numbers, was crucial in crushing the spirit of the Republicans and convincing many that to resist the Nationalists was to open the doors to bloodbath. Morally crushed, the Republicans collapsed in front of the Nationalist effort.

The Spanish Civil War is sometimes referred to as a dress rehearsal for World War II. In military terms, this was far from true. Both sides were starved for material, fighting with outdated weapons on flexible fronts with limited communication and little air support. Civilians were bombed, but the destruction in Spain did not compare to the assault unleashed upon all of Europe shortly after.

Nazi Germany (1919–1938)

The rise of Nazi Germany was the capstone of the inter-war period, and led to the outbreak of World War II, shattering the tenuous peace. The Nazi regime's progress was paralleled by the life of its leader, Adolf Hitler. Born in a small town in Austria, Hitler dreamed of being an artist. Unable to demonstrate sufficient artistic skill for entrance into the art academy in Vienna, he did odd jobs and developed an interest in politics. In 1914, Hitler joined the German army, and earned the iron cross for bravery as a message-carrier. He was immensely disturbed by the German defeat in World War I, and blamed the loss on the socialists and Jews, who he said had surrendered the nation.

In 1920, Hitler seized control in the German Workers Party, changing its name to the National Socialist German Workers Party, called the Nazi Party for short. On November 9, 1923, Hitler and World War I hero General Ludendorf attempted a small revolution known as the Beer Hall Putsch. Hitler had jumped onto a beer hall table and proclaimed the current Weimar government overthrown. He and Ludendorf led their supporters into the street, and were promptly arrested. Hitler spent two years in prison, where he wrote Mein Kampf (My Struggle), which outlined his future policies, centered on the theory of Aryan superiority and Jewish inferiority.

Released in 1925, Hitler honed his oratorical skills and worked for the advancement of the Nazi party. Such advancement was slow in coming through the years 1925 to 1929, a fairly stable period in Europe. However, as the world became mired in depression and unemployment rose, so did support for the Nazi Party, which promised employment and a return to glory for the nation. In 1932 the Nazis won 37.3 percent of the popular vote and occupied 230 seats in the German Reichstag. There was little stability in the German government at this time, and seeking a solution to this instability, President Paul von Hindenburg

NOTES

appointed Hitler chancellor on January 30, 1933. Once in office, Hitler dissolved the Reichstag and persuaded Hindenburg to issue a decree granting Hitler authority to prohibit public meetings, the wearing of political uniforms, and publication of dissenting opinions.

On February 27, 1933, the Reichstag building burned down and a retarded Dutch boy claiming he worked for the communists was arrested for arson. There is evidence to prove that the Nazis themselves had set the fire, but in any case, Hitler used the incident to persuade Hindenburg to restrict all individual rights and declare that the central government could oust any state government failing to maintain order. Hitler systematically took control of all of the state governments this way. Hitler's private army, the S.A., roamed the streets terrorizing political opponents. Even so, the Nazis only won 43.9 percent of the vote in 1933. To gain a two-thirds majority Hitler formed an alliance with the Nationalist party, and declared the communist party illegal.

On March 23, 1933, the Reichstag passed the Enabling Act, giving Hitler the power to make decrees with the status of law, and ending elections. When Hindenburg died in 1934, Hitler fused the positions of chancellor and president into one office: 'Der Fuhrer.' He took control as dictator. Hitler constructed the Third Reich under his dictatorship, using the Gestapo, the secret police, to stifle all dissent.

Hitler's vague policy included a planned economy in which the unemployed were put to work on government projects, working hours were shortened to open up jobs, and labor was forbidden to organize. The government oversaw all functions of the economy. All education and speech was controlled. Curricula and textbooks were rewritten to reflect Nazi ideology, and all movies, newspapers, radio, and art were regulated by the vigilant Ministry of Propaganda, under Joseph Goebbels. One of the Ministry's main tasks was to mobilize German anti-Semitism in support of Nazi persecution of German Jews, which would reach its climax in the Holocaust, begun in earnest in 1941. The persecution of the Jews was a major step in Hitler's plan to conquer all of Europe for the Aryan race, a plan that resulted in the outbreak of World War II.

Commentary

There are many explanations for why Hitler was able to come to power in Germany. The first focuses on the evil genius of Hitler himself. He was a master of demagoguery, practicing his oratorical skills in front of the mirror for hours at a time. A skilled manipulator, he played the masses, the government, and the media perfectly, creating a party that reached into every aspect of German life. A second explanation contends that the German people were in a situation that made totalitarianism possible. Germans were deeply ashamed of their loss in World War One, and the German state was devastated by the war and the Treaty of

NOTES

Versailles, which mandated vast reparations payments. Soldiers returned from the war to rampant unemployment and general misery. The German people, with a history of anti-Semitism, found it much easier to blame the defeat on the Jews and socialists than themselves. Hitler provided this scapegoat, and claimed that if only the Germans could expel the Jews, the state could return to its past glory. The German state had a long tradition of authoritarian government, and many Germans associated the liberalization of that government with the outbreak of war, and more importantly, the devastation of the post-war period. Many sought a return to the old ways, believing that modern, liberal beliefs had sacrificed German honor and allowed the state to depreciate in the name of freedom. Hitler offered not freedom, but rather security. He promised to take action to improve the economy, and return German national pride, and the masses, in most cases, were happy to grant him the ultimate power he needed to do so.

Hitler's political program was a vague collection of promises that led each societal group to believe it would be the primary beneficiary of the Nazi government. He promised relief for the unemployed, protection of private property against the communist threat, profits for large businesses, and survival for small businesses. These promises addressed the most important reason for Hitler's ascent to power: the economic depression that wracked Germany during the inter-war years. This is demonstrated most clearly by the lack of growth in the Nazi Party between 1925 and 1928, a period of relative prosperity during which the Party actually lost three seats in the Reichstag. Luckily for Hitler, the 1930s brought depression to Germany, and one out of every two German families was affected by unemployment. As the leader of the frustrated and disillusioned, Hitler reaped the political benefits.

Hitler's consolidation of power mirrored Benito Mussolini's in many ways, as Hitler manipulated President Hindenburg into granting him legal dictatorial power, one step at a time, so as to legitimize the rise of the Third Reich. Hitler had used corruption and intimidation to get what he wanted, and he had gotten away with it, due in part to the legality of many of his actions under concessions made by Hindenburg.

Hitler's government was the ultimate example of totalitarianism. The swastika, it's symbol, could be seen all over Germany. Its ideology could be read in pamphlets, or in the newspaper every day. The Ministry of Propaganda exerted total control over the media, playing a large role in the production and direction of movies, and monitoring every image and thought shown or expressed to the German people, all the while gauging their response and adjusting the propaganda attack accordingly. During the twelve-year reign of the Third Reich, Germany had one police officer for every 155 citizens, serving as enforcers of the system of

NOTES

total control. The Nazi Party controlled and defined Germany, and was in turn controlled and defined by Hitler.

3.17 THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS (1920–1935)

American President Woodrow Wilson intended the League of Nations to be the primary body of a new style of international relations based on the cooperation of all of the nations of the world. The League was to be centered in Geneva, Switzerland, a neutral location. Small nations as well as large nations were asked to join, dependent on their acceptance of the Covenant of the League. The League of Nations first met in November 1920. Forty-two nations were represented at this first meeting. Notably absent were German, Russia, and the United States. Germany, identified as the aggressor in World War I, was barred from admission at first, and admitted in 1926. Russia, now the Soviet Union, was not invited to join the League due to the radical policies of the new communist government. The Soviet Union finally became a member of the League in 1935. In November 1919, the US Senate voted against accepting membership to the League, and the nation never joined.

The League of Nations operated through three agencies: the Assembly, the Council, and the Secretariat. The Assembly met annually, and consisted of a delegation from each member nation. Each member had one vote. The Council was composed of four permanent members and four nonpermanent members, serving as a sort of cabinet, with some executive powers. The Council was responsible for the prevention of war through disarmament, resolving disputes, and supervising the mandates of the League. The Secretariat was the League's civil service, preparing the agenda for the Assembly and the Council, serving a clerical purpose, and preparing documents for publication.

The League of Nations succeeded in providing assistance to bankrupt nations, supervising its mandates, and resolving conflicts between minor powers. During the early 1920s, the League made two attempts to outline a mechanism by which international conflicts could be contained and resolved. Both methods aimed to identify the aggressor nation and pledge League support to the victim. The Treaty of Mutual Assistance, the first of these two efforts, was drafted in 1923. It proposed that the Council should declare which side of a conflict was the aggressor within four days of the outbreak of the conflict, at which point the League's members would automatically have to support the victim nation. The treaty failed, due to consensus that deciding which side of a conflict was the aggressor was far too difficult to do in just four days and without any concrete guidelines. The treaty also mandated military participation on the part of the member nations, a clause distasteful to many. In 1925, the League tried once again to outline a mechanism for the containment of war. The Geneva Protocol provided for compulsory

arbitration of international disputes by the League. Any nation unwilling to submit to the League's arbitration would be declared the aggressor. This proposal was brought down by the British delegation, whose overseas colonial leaders feared that they would be dragged into European affairs by the Geneva Protocol.

NOTES

Commentary

The League of Nations was at first heralded as the bastion of a new system of international relations in Europe. The so-called 'old diplomacy' is known as the Westphalian System, since it had been in place since the Treaty of Westphalia, signed at the end of the Thirty Years War in 1648 by the major European powers. Under the Westphalian system the elites of government often met in secret to determine the fate of Europe and the world. World War I shattered the old system along with the empires that had maintained it. American participation in the war was a major step toward a shift in the balance of world power, and the beginning of the end for European dominance. The brutality, and to some, apparent needlessness, of the war and the changing face of European geography led to new ideas about how international affairs should be managed. The secretive nature of the Westphalian system had led to petty resentments, the pursuit of narrow self-interest, and the division of Europe into warring camps. Many, including Woodrow Wilson, felt that a more open, all- inclusive system would be more fostering to cooperation, a concept of international justice, and peace. The League was seen as a way to institutionalize these goals and strive for peace as a collective world community.

The League of Nations was an organization wracked by contradictions and insufficiencies from the start. Membership was determined by the acceptance of the Covenant of the League, which stated the goals and philosophy upon which it was founded. The covenant, however, had been drafted by small committees behind closed doors, thus violating the spirit of "open covenants openly arrived at" expounded by the Covenant of the League itself. This contradiction foreshadowed similar crises of ideology in the future for the League. The United State's failure to join the League of Nations was a major blow to the hopes of its founders, and to Wilson's view on the character of the 'new diplomacy.' It also marked the beginning of a period of US isolationism, which kept the US effectively out of European political affairs for the majority of the inter-war period.

The founding and structure of the League of Nations was established primarily for the purpose of preventing future wars, a new concept for Europeans who traditionally believed that war was a necessary and inevitable outgrowth of international relations. However, the League could not come to a decision on how best to do this, without infringing on the sovereignty of the member countries, as would have been the case if the Treaty of Mutual Assistance or the Geneva Protocol had been passed. The failure of these two measures left the League with only the

NOTES

power to invoke economic sanctions against a nation determined to be the aggressor in a conflict, and greatly called into question the authority and ability of the League to mediate conflicts. The League of Nations thus exercised only limited powers, and did so clumsily. Most powerful nations preferred to manage their affairs outside of the League, only rarely deferring to the League's authority. Despite these shortcomings, the League of Nations did accomplish some of its unification and pacification goals, and perhaps most importantly, set the stage for the United Nations, which would take its place after World War II.

3.18 WORLD WAR II AND UNO

Many of the seeds of World War II in Europe were sown by the Treaty of Versailles that ended World War I. In its final form, the treaty placed full blame for the war on Germany and Austria-Hungary, as well as exacted harsh financial reparations and led to territorial dismemberment. For the German people, who had believed that the armistice had been agreed to based on US President Woodrow Wilson's lenient Fourteen Points, the treaty caused resentment and a deep mistrust of their new government, the Weimar Republic. The need to pay war reparations, coupled with the instability of the government, contributed to massive hyperinflation which crippled the German economy. This situation was made worse by the onset of the Great Depression.

In addition to the economic ramifications of the treaty, Germany was required to demilitarize the Rhineland and had severe limitations placed on the size of its military, including the abolishment of its air force. Territorially, Germany was stripped of its colonies and forfeited land for the formation the country of Poland. To ensure that Germany would not expand, the treaty forbade the annexation of Austria, Poland, and Czechoslovakia.

Rise of Fascism and the Nazi Party

In 1922, Benito Mussolini and the Fascist Party rose to power in Italy. Believing in a strong central government and strict control of industry and the people, Fascism was a reaction to the perceived failure of free market economics and a deep fear of communism. Highly militaristic, Fascism also was driven by a sense of belligerent nationalism that encouraged conflict as a means of social improvement. By 1935, Mussolini was able to make himself the dictator of Italy and transformed the country into a police state.

To the north in Germany, Fascism was embraced by the National Socialist German Workers Party, also known as the Nazis. Swiftly rising to power in the late 1920s, the Nazis and their charismatic leader, Adolf Hitler, followed the central tenets of Fascism while also advocating for the racial purity of the German people and additional German Lebensraum (living space). Playing on the economic distress

in Weimar Germany and backed by their "Brown Shirts" militia, the Nazis became a political force. On January 30, 1933, Hitler was placed in position to take power when he was appointed Reich Chancellor by President Paul von Hindenburg.

NOTES

The Nazis Assume Power

A month after Hitler assumed the Chancellorship, the Reichstag building burned. Blaming the fire on the Communist Party of Germany, Hitler used the incident as an excuse to ban those political parties that opposed Nazi policies. On March 23, 1933, the Nazis essentially took control of the government by passing the Enabling Acts. Meant to be an emergency measure, the acts gave the cabinet (and Hitler) the power to pass legislation without the approval of the Reichstag. Hitler next moved to consolidate his power and executed a purge of the party (The Night of the Long Knives) to eliminate those who could threaten his position. With his internal foes in check, Hitler began the persecution of those who were deemed racial enemies of the state. In September 1935, he passed the Nuremburg Laws which stripped Jews of their citizenship and forbade marriage or sexual relations between a Jew and an "Aryan." Three years later the first pogrom began (Night of Broken Glass) in which over one hundred Jews were killed and 30,000 arrested and sent to concentration camps.

Germany Remilitarizes

On March 16, 1935, in clear violation of the Treaty of Versailles, Hitler ordered the remilitarization of Germany, including the reactivation of the Luftwaffe (air force). As the German army grew through conscription, the other European powers voiced minimal protest as they were more concerned with enforcing the economic aspects of the treaty. In a move that tacitly endorsed Hitler's violation of the treaty, Great Britain signed the Anglo-German Naval Agreement in 1935, which allowed Germany to build a fleet one third the size of the Royal Navy and ended British naval operations in the Baltic.

Two years after beginning the expansion of the military, Hitler further violated the treaty by ordering the reoccupation of the Rhineland by the German Army. Proceeding cautiously, Hitler issued orders that the German troops should withdrawal if the French intervened. Not wanting to become involved in another major war, Britain and France avoided intervening and sought a resolution, with little success, through the League of Nations. After the war several German officers indicated that if the reoccupation of the Rhineland had been opposed, it would have meant the end of Hitler's regime.

The Anschluss

Emboldened by Great Britain and France's reaction to the Rhineland, Hitler began to move forward with a plan to unite all German-speaking peoples under

NOTES

one "Greater German" regime. Again operating in violation of the Treaty of Versailles, Hitler made overtures regarding the annexation of Austria. While these were generally rebuffed by the government in Vienna, Hitler was able to orchestrate a coup by the Austrian Nazi Party on March 11, 1938, one day before a planned plebiscite on the issue. The next day, German troops crossed the border to enforce the Anschluss (annexation). A month later the Nazis held a plebiscite on the issue and received 99.73% of the vote. International reaction was again mild, with Great Britain and France issuing protests, but still showing that they were unwilling to take military action.

The Munich Conference

With Austria in his grasp, Hitler turned towards the ethnically German Sudetenland region of Czechoslovakia. Since its formation at the end of World War I, Czechoslovakia had been wary of possible German advances. To counter this, they had built an elaborate system of fortifications throughout the mountains of the Sudetenland to block any incursion and formed military alliances with France and the Soviet Union. In 1938, Hitler began supporting paramilitary activity and extremist violence in the Sudetenland. Following the Czechoslovakia's declaration of martial law in the region, Germany immediately demanded that the land be turned over to them.

In response, Great Britain and France mobilized their armies for the first time since World War I. As Europe moved towards war, Mussolini suggested a conference to discuss the future of Czechoslovakia. This was agreed to and the meeting opened in September 1938, at Munich. In the negotiations, Great Britain and France, led by Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain and President Édouard Daladier respectively, followed a policy of appeasement and caved to Hitler's demands in order to avoid war. Signed on September 30, 1938, the Munich Agreement turned over the Sudetenland to Germany in exchange for Germany's promise to make no additional territorial demands.

The Czechs, who had not been invited to conference, were forced to accept the agreement and were warned that if they failed to comply, they would be responsible for any war that resulted. By signing the agreement, the French defaulted on their treaty obligations to Czechoslovakia. Returning to England, Chamberlain claimed to have achieved "peace for our time." The following March, German troops broke the agreement and seized the remainder of Czechoslovakia. Shortly thereafter, Germany entered into a military alliance with Mussolini's Italy.

The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact

Angered by what he saw as the Western Powers colluding to give Czechoslovakia to Hitler, Josef Stalin worried that a similar thing could occur

NOTES

with the Soviet Union. Though wary, Stalin entered into talks with Britain and France regarding a potential alliance. In the summer of 1939, with the talks stalling, the Soviets began discussions with Nazi Germany regarding the creation of a non-aggression pact. The final document, the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, was signed on August 23, and called for the sale of food and oil to Germany and mutual non-aggression. Also included in the pact were secret clauses dividing Eastern Europe into spheres of influence as well as plans for the partition of Poland.

The Invasion of Poland

Since World War I, tensions had existed between Germany and Poland regarding the free city of Danzig and the "Polish Corridor." The latter was a narrow strip of land reaching north to Danzig which provided Poland with access to the sea and separated the province of East Prussia from the rest of Germany. In an effort to resolve these issues and gain Lebensraum for the German people, Hitler began planning the invasion of Poland. Formed after World War I, Poland's army was relatively weak and ill-equipped compared to Germany. To aid in its defense, Poland had formed military alliances with Great Britain and France.

Massing their armies along the Polish border, the Germans staged a fake Polish attack on August 31, 1939. Using this as a pretext for war, German forces flooded across the border the next day. On September 3, Great Britain and France issued an ultimatum to Germany to end the fighting. When no reply was received, both nations declared war.

In Poland, German troops executed a blitzkrieg (lightning war) assault using combining armor and mechanized infantry. This was supported from above by the Luftwaffe, which had gained experience fighting with the fascist Nationalists during the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939). The Poles attempted to counterattack but were defeated at the Battle of Bzura (Sept. 9-19). As the fighting was ending at Bzura, the Soviets, acting on the terms of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, invaded from the east. Under assault from two directions, the Polish defenses crumbled with only isolated cities and areas offering prolonged resistance. By October 1, the country had been completely overrun with some Polish units escaping to Hungary and Romania. During the campaign, Great Britain and France, who were both slow to mobilize, provided little support to their ally.

With the conquest of Poland, the Germans implemented Operation Tannenberg which called for the arrest, detainment, and execution of 61,000 Polish activists, former officers, actors, and intelligentsia. By the end of September, special units known as Einsatzgruppen had killed over 20,000 Poles. In the east, the Soviets also committed numerous atrocities, including the murder of prisoners of war, as they advanced. The following year, the Soviets executed between 15,000-22,000 Polish POWs and citizens in the Katyn Forest on Stalin's orders.

NOTES

UNITED NATIONS ORGANISATION (UNO)

During World War II, the leaders of the United States and other nations decided something had to be done to try to prevent new wars from starting. Millions of people had been killed since World War II began in 1939. Millions more had been uprooted from their homes by the fighting. As the war continued, so did international discussions about trying once more to set up a new organization of nations.

The result of these discussions came in 1945, when representatives from fifty countries met in San Francisco, California. Even though World War II had not yet ended, they worked to plan an organization that they hoped would prevent World War III. They wrote a charter that describes how the new organization would work. By October 24,1945, many countries had signed the charter. A new organization, the United Nations, or UN, was born. The Declaration, which is signed by twenty-six countries, set forth the war aim of the Allies. The Allies were all the nations fighting against Germany, Italy, and Japan. The Declaration was signed on January 1,1942. Three years later, the term United Nations was used again, this time as the name of a new international organization for world peace.

Its purposes, as written in the UN charter, are :

- To keep peace among the nations of the world.
- To build trust and friendship among nations.
- To help nations solve international problems.
- To provide a center where nations can work together.

The charter also says that all member nations are equal. They are supposed to settle their arguments in a peaceful manner, without causing danger for other nations. If one country threatens peace, the UN can vote to send troops there to keep the peace.

The UN has three main parts: the General Assembly, the Security Council, and the Secretariat.

The General Assembly meets every year at UN headquarters in New York City. It decides what the UN will or will not do. It can do only those things what the UN charter gives it power to do. Every member of the UN has one vote in the General Assembly. For new countries to join the UN, the Security Council must first recommend them. Then the General Assembly must vote on whether they may join. At UN headquarters, the General Assembly meets to seek peaceful solutions to international problems.

The Security Council meets year-round at the UN building. It has fifteen members. Five of them are permanent: the United States, the Soviet Union, China, Great Britain, and France. The other ten are chosen by the General Assembly to serve for two-year terms. The Security Council's main job is to keep peace

throughout the world. It can vote to send troops to keep the peace. But if any one of the five permanent members votes against taking a certain nation, the UN cannot take that action.

The Secretariat carries out the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The Secretary-General is the head of the Secretariat. One job of the Secretary-General is to bring up problems for the Security Council to study. Another is to prepare the budget of the UN. A budget is a schedule of how money is to be spent and where it will come from. All of the other members are supposed to share the costs of running the UN.

The UN has three other parts that are somewhat less important in the day-to-day work of the organization. These are the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, and the International Court of Justice. There are also many other groups working through the UN that are not officially part of the UN. The World Health Organization is one of these special groups.

3.19 COLD WAR (1945-1960)

Cold War is the conflict between the Communist nations led by the Soviet Union and the democratic nations led by the United States. It is fought by all means - propaganda, economic war, diplomatic haggling and occasional military clashes. It is fought in all places - in neutral states, in newly independent nations in Africa, Asia and even in outer space.

The historians have so far not reached any agreement on the time in which the Cold War began. It is, however, quite safe to say that since 1947 when President Truman of the United States declared an anti-communist policy, the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union has begun.

Causes of The Cold War

There were deep-rooted ideological, economic and political differences between the United States and the Soviet Union before the Second World War. These differences were intensified as a result of their mutual suspicions immediately after the Second World War.

Underlying Causes

(i) Ideological:

The United States and the Soviet Union represent two opposing systems of government. In the United States, the government is elected by free elections. The people can form political parties to voice their political opinions. They also possess the right of assembly, of speech and of the press. In the Soviet Union, the government is formed by the Communist Party. The people do not have the right to form their own political parties. They do not enjoy the right of assembly, of speech and of the press. Since these two systems of government are diametrically

NOTES

opposed to one another, there can be little compromise between the United States and the Soviet Union.

(ii) Economic:

The United States wanted to encourage free trade throughout the world. The Soviet Union wanted to shield off her own sphere from international commerce. Russia feared that trade with the West would involve the risk of Russia being opened to western influences which would have eroded the strength of the totalitarian regime. These differences led to much ill feeling between the United States and the Soviet Union.

(iii) Power rivalry:

After the Second World War, with the decline of Europe, power was largely shared between the Soviet Union and the United States. As one wanted 'to dominate the other, conflicts were inevitable.

Immediate Causes Leading to the Cold War

Incipient conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States began at the peace-time conferences. Their conflict was intensified after President Truman declared the Truman Doctrine and launched the Marshall Plan in 1947.

(i) Extension of Russian influence in Europe:

Even before the end of the war, the Soviet Union had gradually extended her influence in Europe. By the fall of 1944, the Red Army had liberated and controlled a large part of eastern Europe. By 1945, at the Yalta Conference, the Soviet Union obtained the Curzon Line as her new boundary line with Poland and also the control of the eastern zone of Germany.

As the war was drawing to a close in May 1945, the Soviet Union quickly consolidated her control of eastern Europe. The Red Army began by influencing the post-war elections. They intimidated the voters and changed the voting lists as they desired.

Although the non-communists could still gain some votes, most of the votes went to the communists. Thus the coalition governments formed immediately after the war were largely dominated by the communists. Two of the key ministries - Defence and Military (Police) - were always under communist control.

Stalin was not satisfied with communist control of eastern Europe. In the meantime, he encouraged the communists to take an active part in the immediate post-war elections in western Europe. In late 1946, the French and Italian Communists were becoming the most powerful parties in France and Italy.

(ii) The reactions of the United States:

Despite the increasing Russian influence in eastern and central Europe, many politicians in the United States were optimistic about the chances of co-operation

NOTES

with the Soviet Union after the war and did not advocate strong resistance against Russian expansion.

But from May 1945 onwards, the situation was changed. The U.S. government favoured a policy of strong resistance against Russia.

The first reason was that President Roosevelt died on April 12, 1945. He was succeeded by Harry S. Truman. President Roosevelt was an optimistic man. He seemed to have believed that although eastern Europe had fallen under the influence of Russia, she would keep her promise (made at Yalta) by setting up freely-elected parliamentary governments in the area. So Roosevelt did not advocate strong resistance against Russian expansion. The new President, Truman, was a complete contrast to Roosevelt. He did not believe the communists. He thought that the communists would not set up democratic governments in eastern Europe. He also believed that after the Soviet Union had established her control in eastern Europe, she would continue to extend her influence into western Europe. Thus, President Truman favoured a policy of strong resistance against Russian expansion.

The second reason was that just before the Potsdam Conference was to take place, the United States had successfully exploded her atomic bomb. President Truman thought that since the United States alone possessed the atomic bomb, she could adopt a stiff attitude towards Russian expansion in Europe.

The third reason was that President Truman was disgusted at the non-co-operative attitude of the Russians at the Potsdam Conference. Russia was determined to exact heavy reparations from Germany. Russia also accused the British of upholding a reactionary monarchy in Greece and supporting an Italian Fascist regime in Trieste. Stalin also blocked Truman's proposal on the internationalization of all principal waterways.

(iii) Poor relations between the United States and the Soviet Union:

The deteriorating relations between the Soviet Union and the United States were reflected in two minor incidents in the year. Land-Lease was abruptly terminated by the United States and the Russian request for American economic aid for the purposes of post-war reconstruction was ignored by the government of the United States. (During the Second World War, the U.S. supplied much war material to the Allied nations through a Lend and Lease programme. As the Lend and Lease programme was suddenly stopped, the war-ravaged Soviet Union could not obtain American material support to help her post-war economic reconstruction.)

The poor relations between the East and West were also reflected in a speech by Churchill. In March 1946, Churchill made a speech at Fulton, Missouri in which he said, "From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the continent .... Behind that line lie all the capitals of the

NOTES

central and eastern Europe - all are subject in one form or another not only to Soviet influence but also to a very high and increasing control from Moscow." The Fulton speech increased the American suspicion of Soviet aggressive designs in Europe.

Beginning of the Cold War

The American alarm of Russian expansion in Europe greatly increased when Britain declared on February 24, 1947 that she could no longer give the much-needed financial and military aid to the Greek government which was in danger of being overthrown by the communist guerillas. Another country threatened by Russian-directed communist guerillas was Turkey. America did not have any doubt about the great increase in power which domination over Greece and Turkey would give to Russia. (Both Turkey and Greece had a population composed largely of poor peasants. These two countries were liberated by Anglo-American troops from German control in 1944. After the liberation, the communist guerillas in these two countries threatened to overthrow their governments. The communist guerillas received military aid from Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. The government of Greece received military support from the British government.)

On March 12, 1947, President Truman enunciated the Truman Doctrine. The essence of the Doctrine was that "it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure." This was clearly an anti-communist doctrine. This amounted to an American declaration of war upon Communist Russia. President Truman followed his speech with massive military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey. (The communist guerillas were defeated by the American troops in 1948 in both Greece and Turkey.)

The U.S. government also realized that a prosperous Europe would be the most effective barrier to Communism. On June 4, 1947, the U.S. Secretary of State, George Marshall, speaking at the Harvard University, stated that, "It is logical that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace." Immediately after the speech the United States invited all European countries to put forward plans for economic reconstruction so that the United States would provide the necessary financial aid to them. The Soviet Union refused to accept the American financial aid.

The first reason was that the state which applied for Marshall Aid was required to disclose her economic records to the American government - this was regarded by the Soviet Union as an American interference in the internal affairs of another state. The second reason was that receiving American aid would involve the risk of opening the Soviet Union to western influences which would weaken

the totalitarian system of government. (In the eyes of the Soviet Union, the United States was giving economic aid to all European countries to make them anti-communist. Shortly after the proclamation of the Marshall Plan, Andrei Zhdanov, one of Stalin's lieutenants, said, "The United States proclaimed a new, frankly predatory and expansionist course. The purpose of this new frankly expansionist course is to establish the world supremacy of American imperialism.") Because of these two reasons, the Soviet Union also forbade her satellite countries (the eastern European countries) to accept Marshall Aid. In 1949, Russia tried to counter the Marshal Plan -by offering financial aid to her satellites under the Molotov Plan.

With the proclamation of the Truman Doctrine of March 1947 and the launching of the Marshall Plan, the United States was clearly leading the western nations to resist Russian Communist expansionist activities in Europe. Cold War had begun.

Important Events Upto 1954

No part of the world escaped the effects of the Cold War. But up to 1949, the Cold War was mainly confined to Europe and the chief arena was in Germany.

(1) Return to Parliamentary Democracy in the West

When the Cold War began, relations between the East and the West became critically strained. Both the United States and the Soviet Union tried to tighten their control over their 'satellites' within their own spheres of influence. In April 1947, the Communist Party was declared illegal in West Germany. In May 1947, the communist ministers were dismissed from the coalition governments in Italy and France.

In April 1948, the United States government intervened in the Italian election. The American diplomats urged the Italian voters to support the Christian Democratic Party and threatened that if the Communist Party won the election, America would stop her financial aid to Italy. The result was that the Christian Democrats won most of the votes in the election and became the ruling party.

(2) Soviet Control of Eastern Europe

In the meantime, Stalin. also intervened in the domestic politics of the eastern European countries. In May 1947, Ference Nagy, the democratically elected Prime Minister of Hungary, was forced to flee for his life. In June 1947, Petkov, a leading opponent of Soviet domination in Bulgaria, was arrested and hanged. One month later, Bulgaria was declared a People's Republic. In October, Mikolajczyk, leader of the democratic Peasant Party in Poland, was forced to flee to the west. In November 1947, Maniu, the 74 year-old head of the Rumanian Peasant Party, was imprisoned and in December Rumania was proclaimed a People's Republic.

NOTES

The most flagrant example that showed how the Russians disposed of political dissenters took place in Czechoslovakia. The Czech government had followed an independent course in both foreign and domestic affairs - to steer a middle course between tile East and the West. (In foreign affairs, the Czech government sided with the Soviet Union. In domestic affairs, the Czech government tried to give some democratic rights to the people as it had done in the inter-war years.)

To assist her economic reconstruction, the Czech government even desired to accept Marshall Aid in spite of Russian objection. In February 1948, the Soviet Union desired to kill the Czech's desire for independence. A coup d'etat was carried out in Prague. Stalin ordered the Czech Communists to arrest the leading figures of the democratic parties. A pro-Russian government under the Communist leader, Gottwald, was soon established. The western nations regarded the forceful seizure of power in Czechoslovakia as a symbol of 'Russian aggression'. They feared that Russia would soon use force to overthrow the other democratic governments in Europe.

In September 1947, the Soviet Union established the Communist Information Bureau (the Cominform). The Bureau was not only to spread communist propaganda to all European countries but also to co-ordinate the activities of the member communist parties in their struggle against 'Anglo-American imperialism'. It also supported the strikes of the workers in France and Italy. Consequently the western nations had increasing fear of Communist conquest of the world.

By 1948, the only country in eastern Europe outside direct Soviet control was Yugoslavia. Here the liberation from the Nazis had been achieved not by the Red Army but by a local communist partisan movement, whose members subsequently occupied major military and police posts, The head of the partisan movement, Tito, had been trained in Moscow. Though a Russian-trained communist, he refused to be a Russian puppet. In 1947-48, Tito made it clear that Yugoslavia would not subordinate her economy to that of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union immediately ordered her satellites in eastern Europe to stop their trade with Yugoslavia. The Soviet Union also tried to create conflicts among the Yugoslav Communist Party leaders. When all these failed, Stalin expelled Yugoslavia from the Cominform in June 1948. The conflict between Yugoslavia and Russia led to a great fear among the western nations that in the near future, Russia would use force to unseat' the government of Yugoslavia and if that was successful, Russia would even order the Red Army to advance into western Europe.

(3) The Berlin Crisis - the Climax of the Conflict between the East and the West in Europe

While the western nations were anxious about their own security, Russia

NOTES

stopped all land traffic between Berlin and West Germany. The western nations took this move as the first of a series of Russian attempts to force them to withdraw first from Germany and then from Europe. They were determined to resist and war nearly resulted. This was the well-known Berlin Crisis.

The Berlin Crisis marked the climax of the conflict between the East and the West. The origins of that conflict can be traced back to the year 1945.

(i) Early conflict (1945)

The Yalta Conference and the Potsdam Conference had laid down some principles concerning the immediate post-war treatment of Germany; but as soon as these principles were carried out, the western nations and the Soviet Union came into conflict because both sides had different interpretations of the principles.

In accordance with the Potsdam agreement Germany was treated as a single economic unit. Russia would obtain as reparations a proportion of the industrial products currently produced by Germany industry in the western zones; and in return the Russian-controlled eastern zone would deliver food and raw materials to the western zones. (The eastern zone was an agricultural region. The western zones were an industrial region. Russia was to receive the industrial products in the western zones because German armies had destroyed the Russian industries severely.) But Russia wanted to exploit the economic resources of the eastern zone as much as possible and did not supply the western zones with food. So the Americans did not deliver any industrial products to the eastern zone. Thereafter the western occupying powers and Russia handled economic affairs in their zones independently.

In accordance with the Potsdam agreement, the 4 occupying powers also agreed to destroy the Nazi system and to prepare the way for democracy in Germany. To the west, denazification meant that only those persons who had taken an active part in the Nazi regime were to be punished. To the Russians, denazification meant that punishment should be meted out not only to individuals but to the whole bourgeois class, because bourgeois capitalism was regarded as the base for the rise of Nazism. The western, nations concluded that Soviet Russia was not only punishing the Nazis, but they were creating a new-regime ruled by a new class the workers and the peasants. Because both sides had carried out different policies in their own occupation zones, they became increasingly suspicious of each other's designs in Europe.

(ii) Economic conflict (1946):

In order to revive West Germany economically as soon as possible, the American and the British governments permitted the West German industries to raise their levels of production. Russia immediately feared that West Germany would re-emerge as a powerful supporter of the western countries.

NOTES

In December 1946, Russian fear increased when the British and Americans formed 'Bizonia' by putting together their two zones for economic purposes. (In June 1948, France agreed to co-operate with the British and the Americans and so converted 'Bizonia' into 'Trizonia'.) The Americans and the British also intended to cut down the German reparations, expand the German industries, adopt a uniform system for railway and other services and restore the German industrial production to the pre-war level.

(iii) Increasing suspicion (1947):

With enunciation of the Truman Doctrine and the launching of the Marshall Plan, (The United States declared to include West Germany in the Marshall Plan.) the Russians felt the U.S. was launching an anti-communist campaign against Soviet Russia.

(iv) Diplomatic conflict (1949):

In February 1948, Russia responded to the pressures of the Cold War by putting forward her claim for the whole of Berlin within her zone. The Russian. claim met with a strong reaction in the Wepst. The United States, Britain, France -and the Benelux countries made a London Agreement in June 1948. They declared that they would form a democratic West German Government in the western zones. In the eyes of the Soviet Union, the U.S. was trying to make West Germany an anti-Soviet military spearhead against her.

(v) Confrontation over Berlin (June 1948):

The hostile relations between the Soviet Union and the United States before 1948 had made the Berlin crisis, inevitable. The currency reform carried out by the western powers in 1948 immediately produced the Berlin crisis. The aim of the western powers was to introduce a new currency in order to revive the Germany economy. (Since the end of the war, shortage of food and other necessities led to inflation in Germany (*i.e.*, selling of food and other scarce goods at inflated prices). The amount of money in circulation rose enormously in the post-war years, and the German marks became valueless. Currency reform was an essential step to recreate financial stability in Germany.) The Soviet Union thought differently. She thought that if the currency reform in West Germany was successful, West Germany would become a strong power, threatening Russia's position in East Germany. When the new currency was introduced to West Berlin, the Soviet Union replied by cutting land communications between West Berlin and the western German zones. Thus, began the blockade of Berlin on June 24, 1948.

Two million citizens in the western sectors of Berlin seemed likely to be starved to death. The Americans regarded the blockade as a Russian attempt to force the withdrawal of the western powers from West Berlin, to consolidate the Soviet control of central and eastern Europe, to frustrate the Marshall Plan and to

encourage the communist parties in western Europe. In short, this was regarded as an overt sign of Communist aggression. General Clay, the Military Governor of the American zone, said, "When Berlin falls, West Germany will be next." He thought that the U.S. should fight a war with Russia.

Although France refused to use force (because she was economically weak), the western nations agreed that they could not give way in West Berlin. They decided to airlift food supplies to the starving million in West Berlin. Every transport plane available in France, Britain and the U.S. was used to transport to West Berlin provisions and materials of every kind. In winter, flying conditions were dangerous -planes often crashed. Even this did not daunt the air-lift organizers. Day and night air-lift went on. This showed the strong determination of the western nations to resist Russian Communism.

In the meantime, the U.S. formed an anti-communist military alliance with the western nations - the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. On May 9, 1949, Stalin realized that he could not force the withdrawal of western nations from West Berlin. He admitted defeat by lifting the Berlin Blockade.

(vi) Significance of the blockade:

(a) It was clear that the western powers would resist with great determination any Russian attempt to dominate Central Europe. They had upheld the Western sectors of Berlin by a vast and costly airlift.

(b) Though Stalin lifted the blockade, the western powers failed to obtain Russian recognition of their rights of a land route to West Berlin. This meant that even in moments of defeat Russia was determined to show strength and determination. A repetition of the Berlin crisis was to be expected in the future.

(c) Though both sides showed great determination to control their own zones, they would only go to war as a final resort. Both America and Russia possessed atomic bombs. (Russia had developed her atomic bomb in 1949.) A Third World War would be disastrous to both sides.

(d) Soon after the crisis, it was understood that Germany would not be unified. The following September saw the setting up of a West German Federal Republic through free elections. The Christian Democratic Party won most of the votes in the elections and Adenauer became the Chancellor. The capital of the Republic was at Bonn. In the following month (October), the Democratic People's Republic was set up under Russian auspices in East Germany. Ulbricht was the Prime Minister. (East and West Germany were separated by strong fortifications on both sides. Since 1961, in order to stop the East Germans crossing into West Berlin, East Germany built a high wall across Berlin.)

NOTES

(e) The Berlin Crisis was over but Russian influence over eastern and central Europe was not shaken. The suspicion of the western nations about Russian aggressions remained.

Cold War in East Asia

Meanwhile, events in East Asia moved to a critical stage. The tension of the Cold War seemed to have moved from Europe to East Asia.

On October 1, 1949, the People's Republic, under Mao Zedong, was proclaimed in China. This Communist triumph was a great shock to the United States. Overnight, the Communist influence seemed to have extended into the very heart of Asia and onto the doorstep of occupied Japan. The sheer physical size of Soviet Russia and China, and of their combined populations, gave a double threat to the American policy of containment. It was against this background that a full-scale war broke out in Korea.

After the Second World War, Korea north of 38th parallel had been occupied by the Russians, while south of the 38th parallel by the Americans. As no agreement on a common government for the whole country had been reached, the Russians established a communist regime in North Korea and the Americans a western-oriented democracy in South Korea. Syngman Rhee was elected President of South Korea.

On June 25, 1950 the North Korea troops began to invade South Korea. They attempted to unify Korea and set up a communist regime for the whole nation.

American military leaders had become aware of the importance of a non-communist South Korea for the defence of Japan. When the Security Council of the United Nations condemned the North Korean aggression, on behalf of the United Nations, the United States sent large number of troops under General Douglas MacArthur to fight back the invading North Korean troops. When the Americans advanced to the Yalu River, they met with the strong resistance of the Chinese Communist armies who drove the Americans back to the 38th parallel. The war ended in a virtual stalemate at the 38th parallel.

Finally in July 1953, with the help of the United Nations, an armistice was arranged. It was agreed to restore the status quo ante: Korea remained divided along the 38th parallel.

The effects of the Korean War were that –

(i) Korea was much devastated during the war, particularly North Korea;

(ii) China was protected by a buffer state, North Korea, in her northeast;

(iii) China and the Soviet Union became close allies after the war;

(iv) the western nations had given military assistance to the United Nations to fight against aggression and the authority of the United Nations was upheld.

NOTES

THE FORMATION OF MILITARY ALLIANCES

The formation of the military alliances was the direct result of the tension between the East and the West produced by the Cold War.

(i) Treaty of Dunkirk (March 1947) and Treaty of Brussels (March 1948):

Immediately after the Second World War, the western European nations felt threatened by the military power of the Soviet Union because she had emerged from the war stronger than she had been before it. She had an annexed population of about 23 millions and an annexed area of over 180,000 square miles. Moreover, she had more than 3 million men under arms. Undoubtedly, Russia became the strongest military power in Europe.

In response to this military threat, Britain concluded a military alliance with France, known as the Treaty of Dunkirk. The chief purpose was to prevent future German aggression. It also provided for economic assistance and military co-operation against the political threat of the other aggressors, such as Russia.

The Prague Coup of February 1948 gave new fear of the Russian threat. Bevin, the British Foreign Secretary, immediately called for greater economic and military co-operation among the western European countries. The Treaty of Dunkirk was broadened to include the Benelux countries - Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg - and they signed the Treaty of Brussels. The Treaty of Brussels was not only a military alliance but also an ideological alliance. It provided for collective self-defence, economic and social collaboration in western Europe.

(ii) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (N.A.T.O.) (April 1949):

The five western states were increasingly suspicious of the Russian intentions in Europe since the Berlin Blockade. The United States also wanted to find allies in Europe to contain communist expansion.

On April 4, 1949, twelve nations - the United States, Canada, Iceland, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Italy, Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg signed the North Atlantic Treaty in Washington. (The Brussels Treaty was not dissolved.) The partners of the Treaty believed that Russian Communism, an anti-democratic ideology, had posed a new threat to the democratic world. Thus they stated that "an armed attack against one or more of them shall be considered an attack against them all." In the event of such an attack, for the preservation of peace and their civilized way of life, they promised to take whatever action deemed necessary, including the use of armed force. This regional security arrangement for the defence of the North Atlantic area was valid for 20 years.

As a result of this Treaty, the nations in western Europe were drawn together under American leadership. The headquarters of NATO known as SHAPE (Supreme Headquarters of Allied Powers in Europe) was established at Paris. The

NOTES

most important organization of the NATO was the Permanent Council. It was established in 1952.

Significance of the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization:

(a) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was an essential defensive organization against Communist aggression and a successful step towards European and trans-Atlantic co-operation. Soon after the formation of the NATO, the Berlin Blockade was lifted by the Soviet Union and there was no further advance of Communism in Europe (but not in Asia). Many other efforts at co-operation among the western European countries were made after the formation of the NATO.

(b) The United States had committed herself to a military alliance in peace time for the first time in her history ' From 1949 onwards, a large number of American troops was stationed in western Europe. For the next 20 years, her allies could call for American military assistance. This marked an end of the isolationist policy which had always been upheld by the United States.

(c) In response to the formation of the NATO, Russia formed the Warsaw Pact.

(iii) The Warsaw Pact:

Since the end of the war, Russia had set up pro-Russian communist governments in eastern and central Europe. By 1948 the Cominform had been formed and Russia had concluded mutual assistance treaties with Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Rumania. The confrontation over Berlin (1948-49) and the formation of NATO meant that the Cold War would continue. Soon after the Communist victory in Indo-China, the anticommunist nations in Asia formed the South-East Asia Treaty Organization. In Europe, West Germany was admitted to the NATO in 1955 and allowed to re-arm. (West Germany was essential to an overall defence system in Europe. As her economy advanced rapidly after 1950, her rearmament was of great help to the defence of western Europe. Because of Britain's promise not to withdraw her NATO forces from Europe (in order to counterbalance the German forces), France did not object to the admittance of West Germany into the NATO and West Germany's rearmament in the 9 Power Conference of 1954.)

The Soviet Union looked at these anti-communist moves with fear. She concluded the Warsaw Pact with her satellites in May 1955. It included all communist states in Europe except Yugoslavia - Soviet Russia, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia and East Germany. The Pact spoke of peaceful intentions and defence. It precluded its members to participate in any other coalition or alliance but it assured members of immediate assistance,

including the use of armed force, in the event of armed aggression. To provide for military assistance, a Russian Supreme Commander was appointed to lead the combined armed forces of its members. A Consultative Committee was established to foster political understanding of its members.

Significance of the formation of the Warsaw Pact:

(a) The Pact allowed Russia to station her troops in eastern European countries. This meant that Russia could attack western Europe at any moment and could suppress any sign of rebellion in her satellite countries.

(b) By 1955 when the most critical phase of the Cold War was over both Russia and the United States had organized their satellites into opposing alliances. Political tension between the East and the West will continue.

THE TENSION EASED AFTER 1953-54

After 1953, the Cold War was waning. There were two reasons which could explain the easing-of the tension.

The first reason was that since 1953, both the United States and the Soviet Union possessed hydrogen bombs. Both sides realized that the use of these destructive weapons in war would destroy each other. Thus, they were determined to improve their relations in order to avoid direct military clash.

The second reason was that since 1954, the bonds between the 'Super Powers' and their 'satellites' began to slacken. As their 'satellites' did not fully support their leader - the United States and the Soviet Union, it made political sense for the two Super-Powers to improve their relations.

In Europe, the Far East and Middle East, the interests of the western European nations often conflicted with those of the United States. In Europe, the United States was anxious to increase the share of the western European nations in the defence of western Europe against Soviet Russia. The western European nations objected to this American demand. They did not want to pay for the heavy military expenditure. In the Far East, President Eisenhower accepted the following domino' theory, *i.e.*, the American belief that if one country in Asia fell into the hands of the communists, the others would also become communist. Thus the United States intervened actively in Taiwan, Vietnam, Thailand and Laos. The European nations feared the cost of a war and did not like to support the expense of the American troops fighting against the communists in Asia. In the Middle East, the United States wanted to befriend the Arabs in order to counteract the influence of the Russians. This ran contrary to the British and French interests in the area. The Arab policy of nationalizing the remaining French and British oil investments in Egypt was particularly resentful to Britain and France.

In the Soviet bloc, the members were able. to enjoy greater freedom of action as a result of a change in Russian policy after the death of Stalin in 1953.

NOTES

Stalin's successors were more willing to give greater freedom to the Russian satellite states. Khrushchev admitted in his speech to the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party (1956) that there were different "forms of transition of various countries to socialism." Signs of rebellion quickly appeared in the Soviet bloc. Very soon Poland and Czechoslovakia gained greater independence in their own economic affairs. The Hungarians were greatly encouraged. They demanded not only economic but political autonomy as well. They made an uprising against Russian domination in 1956. Although the uprising was unsuccessful, the Soviet Union wanted to avoid similar rebellions and relaxed her control over the eastern European countries. (On October 23, 1956 before the Polish embassy in Hungary, 50,000 people participated in an anti-Russian demonstration. The Russian-dominated government appealed to the Russians for help. On November 4, Russian troops entered Budapest to put an end to the uprising.) They were treated more as allies than as satellites. In other words, the Soviet Union could not command eastern Europe to fight against western nations as she might wish. (The eastern European countries were afraid of a costly war with the United States).

Because of these two reasons, a period of co-existence seemed to have begun after the armistice in Indo-China in 1954. In 1955, Khrushchev met with President Eisenhower at the Geneva Conference. Although they could not agree on a specific programme for more peaceful East-West relations, the cordial atmosphere of their informal discussion had suggested a remarkable lessening of the world tension.

The events of October and November 1956 also showed that the relations between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. were improving. In the above-mentioned Hungarian revolt, the United States did nothing to assist the Hungarian rioters. In the Suez crisis of the same year, the United States did not help the British and the French in their attack on Egypt. Instead the United States co-operated with Soviet Russia in condemning the Anglo-French attack.

Up to 1960, peaceful co-existence between the East and the West seemed to have been accepted by both the United States and the Soviet Union.

3.20 SUMMARY

- The year 1871 marked the beginning of the German Empire under the Prussian crown. An empire in name, Germany was actually administered by its chancellor Otto von Bismarck, a landed aristocrat (or, Junker) from east Prussia. Though Germany maintained universal manhood suffrage, the Reichstag, the house of Parliament in the German Empire, held only very restricted powers of legislation. Most power remained with Bismarck himself.
- Message sent by Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany to President Kruger of the Transvaal 3 January 1896 congratulating him on defeating the Jameson

raid of 1895. The text of the telegram provoked indignation in Britain and elsewhere, and represented a worsening of Anglo-German relations, in spite of a German government retraction.

- In 1888, Wilhelm II ascended to the German throne as Kaiser. The policies and style of government he instigated over the next 26 years played a major role in the outbreak of war in 1914. In a marked change from the conservative Bismarckian politics of the 1870s and 1880s, Wilhelm II embarked upon a militaristic and expansionist political path in an attempt to 'defend Germany's so-called "place in the sun"'.
- The period before the First World War was one of increasing tension between the European powers. On 28 July 1914, Austria declared war on Serbia. Now the alliance system swung into play. On 30 July, Russia started mobilisation. In reaction, Germany declared war against Russia on 1 August.
- The League of Nations first met in November 1920. Forty-two nations were represented at this first meeting. Notably absent were German, Russia, and the United States. Germany, identified as the aggressor in World War I, was barred from admission at first, and admitted in 1926. Russia, now the Soviet Union, was not invited to join the League due to the radical policies of the new communist government. The Soviet Union finally became a member of the League in 1935.
- Massing their armies along the Polish border, the Germans staged a fake Polish attack on August 31, 1939. Using this as a pretext for war, German forces flooded across the border the next day. On September 3, Great Britain and France issued an ultimatum to Germany to end the fighting. When no reply was received, both nations declared war.

3.21 REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Do you consider Bismarck as the founder of German empire? Explain.
2. Discuss the cause and consequence of Russo-Japanese war.
3. Explain the causes of World War I.
4. What was the economic condition of Europe during inter-war days?
5. Discuss the evolution of UNO.
6. What were the principal causes of Cold War?

3.22 FURTHER READINGS

- Buell, Raymond L. *Europe: A History of Ten Years*. The Macmillan Co., New York: 1928.

NOTES

- Churchill, Winston S. *While England Slept: A Survey of World Affairs 1932 - 1938.* G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York: 1938.
- Dorf, Philip. *Europe at the Crossroads.* Oxford Book Co., New York: 1935.
- Dutt, R. Palme. *World Politics 1918 - 1936.* International publishers, New York: 1936.
- Gibbons, Herbert A. *Europe Since 1918.* The Century Co., New York: 1923.
- Jackson, J. Hampden. *Europe Since the War: A Sketch of Political Development 1918 - 1932.* E.P. Dutton and Co., Inc., New York: 1933.
- Kitchen, Martin. *Europe Between the Wars: A Political History.* Longman Group, London: 1988.
- Orton, William. *Twenty Years Armistice.* Farrar and Rinehart, Inc., New York: 1938.
- Powers, James H. *Years of Tumult: The World Since 1918.* W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., New York: 1932.
- Schuman, Frederick L. *Europe on The Eve: The Crises of Diplomacy 1933 - 1939.* Alfred A. Knopf, New York: 1942.
- Soward, F.H. *Twenty-Five Troubled Years: 1918 - 1943.* Oxford UP, London: 1944.