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The Long 19th Century:
European History from 1789 to 1917

Scope:

How, when, and where did the modern world take form? What did this mean for peasants, workers, the middle class, aristocrats, women, and minorities? Why did an era that began with the idealism of the French Revolution and the power of the Industrial Revolution reach closure during World War I—the greatest tragedy of modern European history? Did nationalism and imperialism inevitably lead in such a direction?

These are some of the issues we will encounter, as we move from the impact of the French and Industrial Revolutions, 1789–1848, into the “unifications” of Italy and Germany in the 1850s and 1860s, followed by the spread of industrialism and nationalism into the furthest reaches of Europe toward the end of the century. By that time, British and French predominance was eclipsed by a rapidly modernizing Germany, Austria-Hungary was struggling to survive as a multinational empire, Russia was facing the stresses of inadequate modernization, the United States and Japan were beginning to play roles in an emerging world balance of power, and almost all of Africa and much of Asia had been gobbled up in a final spasm of imperial expansion. Moreover, the European great powers, organized in alliances and enmeshed in an arms race, confronted increasingly dangerous international crises. Although more people in Europe lived better than ever before, Europe had become a dangerous place.

During these lectures, I will concentrate on the political and diplomatic history of the great powers—Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia, and Italy—but always in the context of deeper economic, social, and cultural forces. Each segment of the course will begin with general overviews, as needed, then proceed to national histories. The course will conclude with the events that led to World War I and the devastating impact the Great War had on contemporaries and the following generation. Although Lenin, Stalin, Mussolini, and Hitler were neither inevitable nor likely candidates for national leadership in prewar Europe, they were rooted in their national cultures, children of their age. What had gone wrong?

This course can be experienced on many levels. I assume no prior knowledge, no professional vocabulary—just interest, curiosity, and, one hopes, passion. The more you give, the more you will get. Course readings have been selected carefully and tested on generations of students. This course is dedicated to my family, friends, teachers, former students—and to you. I hope you enjoy it!
Lecture One
The Long 19th Century

Scope: What’s in a number? Although historians would give different answers as to how to define the 19th century (1789–1917, 1815–1914, 1789–1919), I have chosen 1789–1917, because 1789 was the point at which the masses and modern nationalism first presented themselves, in Europe’s most powerful country—France—while 1917 was the point at which the 19th-century Eurocentric world order collapsed, with the Bolshevik victory in Russia and American entry in World War I.

Moreover, the 19th century can be divided into segments, although historians differ somewhat as to the exact dates, based on different understandings of which movements or events were most significant. Besides explaining my choice of macro and micro dates, I will explain some of the possible alternative claims and further present some of the challenges we will encounter during our “dialogue” concerning this crucial era.

Outline

I. The 19th century was a time of European modernization and change.
    A. The most important factors instigating change were the French and Industrial Revolutions.
    B. Given that these historical processes began in France and Great Britain, respectively, the process of modernization generally proceeded from western to eastern Europe and from northern to southern Europe.
    C. Change occurred unevenly, within countries and between countries, with the most radical gaps existing between Great Britain in the west and Russia in the east and between urban and rural areas.
    D. The process of change itself was inherently destabilizing.
    E. Because modernization itself changed power relationships between classes and states, it took on a momentum of its own. Those who adapted best were more successful; others were often humiliated.

II. The 19th century was the zenith of modern European history.
    A. Although the concept of modernity is subjective, causing leading scholars to disagree on its components and when they came to predominate, most agree that Europe modernized during this era.
        1. Economic modernization was spurred by the Industrial Revolution, which began in late-18th-century Great Britain and reached Russia toward the end of the next century.
        2. Among the effects of the Industrial Revolution were increased productivity; new technologies; urbanization; new forms of enterprise; new relationships among classes, genders, and states; expanded education, transportation, and communications; secularization; nationalism; the expansion of a world economic structure; and the zenith of European power worldwide.
    B. Political modernization was first spurred most radically by the French Revolution and Napoleonic era.
        1. Among the most important results of the 1789–1815 era were the further definition and spread of modern political ideologies, such as liberalism, democracy, socialism, and modern conservatism, as well as nationalism itself.
        2. Revolution itself gained legitimacy as a means to achieve change.
        3. Not only did the masses first enter “history” in a self-conscious manner, but so did women and previously excluded minorities.
        4. More highly centralized state structures were spurred on by the French Revolution and made possible by the Industrial Revolution.
    C. Mass culture and mass society are implications of the French and Industrial Revolutions and are central to modernity.
III. Europeans initially predominated in modernization, but European outposts, such as the United States, and non-European states, such as Japan, underwent many of the same changes, as did areas that came in contact with Europe. Modernization was never a one-way street; cultural exchange was constant.

IV. This course can easily be divided into four teaching segments.
   A. This first segment runs from the French Revolution of 1789 through the revolutions of 1848.
      1. The most important forces during this period were derived from the French Revolution and the Napoleonic era.
      2. Although the Industrial Revolution, underway by 1780, did not spread to Belgium and France until about 1830, its impact became prominent in segments of western and central Europe in the 1840s.
      3. The post-Napoleonic era of Metternich came to a close with the revolutions of 1848–1849.
   B. The second era covered in our course runs from the repression of the 1848 revolutions until the unification of Germany in 1870–1871.
      1. This era saw the spread of the Industrial Revolution to expanded urban areas in western and central Europe.
      2. Its most profound political change was the creation of a “unified” Italian state, along with the emergence of Prussian/German dominance in central Europe, at the expense of Austria and France.
      3. The defeat of “backward” Russia by more “modernized” Great Britain and France, in the Crimean War (1854–1856), had made possible this radical change.
   C. The third section of our course will analyze the major domestic developments of the 1871–1914 era. This age saw the full impact of the Second Industrial Revolution, the spread of more exclusive nationalism—often tinged with racialism and social Darwinism—rapid urbanization, industrial capitalism and socialism, mass society, the decline of liberalism, expanded feminism, the cultural determinism of modern science, and the beginning of a leisure-oriented world.
   D. The final segment of our course will cover the developments in European diplomacy that led to World War I, as well as the war’s dramatic impact.
      1. The era from 1871–1890 was the age of Bismarck; he introduced a series of alliances that isolated France, preventing serious thought of revenge.
      2. From the 1880s until 1905, an expanded age of imperialism ravaged most of Africa and much of Asia, also serving as a safety valve for the excess energy of European states, Japan, and the United States.
      3. The collapse of the Bismarckian alliance system after 1890 and the emergence of Wilhelmenian Weltpolitik (“world politics”) facilitated a diplomatic revolution that, by 1907, saw Germany and Austria facing a coalition of France, Russia, and Great Britain, with Italy on the fence.
      4. The breakdown of Austro-Russian cooperation in the Balkans, as well as growing German support for Austria and Russian support for Serbia, made a European-wide war likely.
      5. Militarism and violence-prone cultural assumptions—including a belief that war would be short and cost-effective—made the likelihood a reality in July–August 1914.
      6. Instead of a brief war came industrial mass slaughter.
      7. The Russian Revolution, the subsequent Bolshevik coup d’état, and the entry of the United States in World War I symbolized the collapse of the modern European state system, much as the French and Industrial Revolutions had put a finish to the pre-1789 Old Regime.

Essential Reading:

Supplementary Reading:
Barbara Tuchman, *Practicing History*.
John Lukacs, *At the End of an Age*.

Questions to Consider:
1. Why are you taking this particular course, and what do you hope to learn?
2. What is the best way for you to achieve these goals?
Lecture Two
The Legacy of the Past—The Old Regime

Scope: Although Europe, and especially western Europe, had experienced substantial changes from the Renaissance until the French Revolution, it was still a transformed medieval society, especially for the peasants, 75–90 percent of the population. Still, in terms of the structure of the state and the culture of aristocratic elites and newer middle-class elements, considerable changes had occurred and were accelerating during the 18th century. Moreover, on the eve of the French Revolution, most states were sovereign, territorial, and more centralized, if not yet “nationalist” units, in which considerable new wealth was being generated by expanding commerce, both within Europe and worldwide. Moreover, in the more powerful states that constituted the European balance of power—England, France, Prussia, Austria, and Russia—especially in England and France, corrosive Enlightenment ideas permeated literate society.

Almost inevitably, the structures of early-modern Europe were challenged by new economic, social, and cultural forces, although the mass of Europeans would not be radically affected until more profound agrarian and industrial “revolutions” spread. However, in the areas of state centralization and military modernization, Prussia developed more rapidly, presenting the possibility of changing the European balance of power. Meanwhile, France was still the most powerful European power, while England was a bonafide world power, despite the loss of the 13 colonies between 1776 and 1783. A “new” world was about to take form, though the legacy of the past was profound.

Outline

I. In many ways, 18th-century Europe was a transformed medieval society.
   A. Europe’s economic structure was still overwhelmingly agrarian, and scarcity of food was common.
      1. Most farming was still subsistence in nature, based on a manorial or localized economy.
      2. The most serious problems were limited crop yields and natural disasters; hunger and even starvation were realities.
   B. Europe’s social structure was also traditional.
      1. Most European societies were divided into legal classes, known as estates: the first estate was the clergy; the second was the aristocracy or nobility; the third comprised everyone else.
      2. In larger societies, even those that were well developed, the overwhelming majority of people were peasants, and the majority of peasants in central and eastern Europe remained serfs.
      3. The clergy and aristocracy made up small segments of the population (usually less than 5 percent each) and were bound by different obligations, laws, and privileges.
      4. The middle classes, part of the third estate, were also a small group, although they were growing in western Europe.
      5. Although wealth was important, greater status and access to wealth came from birth rather than from accomplishment.
   C. Europe’s political structure was also traditional in nature.
      1. Most states were sovereign and territorial but not truly national.
      2. Most states were dominated by “divine-right” monarchs, usually supported by aristocrats and the middle classes.
      3. The overwhelming majority of Europeans were, therefore, subjects rather than citizens.
      4. By the 18th century, several important states were more constitutional in nature, such as Great Britain and Holland.
   D. Most Europeans were enmeshed in a traditional culture or civilization.
      1. Most people were religious, superstitious, and illiterate.
      2. Even most clergy were barely literate.
      3. The overwhelming majority lived in a narrow cultural environment, based on family, clan, village, and face-to-face relationships.

II. The 18th century was the last era in what is called early-modern European history; it was a time of accelerating
change, which began during the Italian Renaissance and ended with the French and Industrial Revolutions.

A. The Renaissance, lasting from the mid-14th to the mid-16th centuries, placed emphasis on classical learning, textual criticism, secularism, individualism, and humanism.

B. The Reformation, or Protestant Revolt, from the early 16th century to the mid-17th century, destroyed the unity of medieval Catholic civilization and enhanced the power of “secular” princes.

C. The Scientific Revolution, or the Age of Reason, by which the 17th century is often known, led to a feeling of empowerment for educated elites, stemming from a greater understanding of the universe and a more modern scientific methodology; progress was possible and the future was more relevant than the past.

D. By the 18th century, the forces of change were numerous and important. This was clearly evident in the area of economic change.
   1. Especially in western and central Europe, and more so in states that had international empires, such as Great Britain, Holland, and France, commerce was expanding and created fluid wealth.
   2. Where commercial capitalism was most developed, handicraft industries, dominated by merchant capitalists, expanded.
   3. During the second half of the 18th century, mainly in the Low Countries and Great Britain, an agrarian revolution began to yield surplus food supplies, making urban growth possible.
   4. Around 1760–1780 in Great Britain, a process later known as the First Industrial Revolution was underway.
   5. Economic change brought increasing social change, especially growth in the highly variegated middle class or the middle classes; generally, the more economic development, the larger the middle class.
   6. With increased economic dynamism and competition within and between states, states became more centralized and efficient; a number of 18th-century rulers, known as enlightened despots, realized that the state was more than the expanded “person” of the monarch.
   7. The cumulative impact of cultural and other changes produced a rich and variegated 18th-century cultural synthesis known as the Enlightenment.
   8. Most “enlightened” thinkers, whether aristocrats, clergy, or members of the middle class, believed that governments existed for the purposes of the governed; they should be efficient and tolerant.
   9. Most “enlightened” thinkers believed that progress was possible, that institutions were subject to rational scrutiny, and that education could bring greater happiness.

III. As a rule of thumb, states and societies of western Europe had changed more than those of central Europe and still more than those of eastern Europe; the same was generally true from northern to southern Europe.

IV. The highly competitive and often warring states were aware that they existed in a European state system with a balance of power whose main purpose was to prevent “universal monarchy,” or hegemony.
   A. By the second half of the 18th century, there were five recognized great powers: Great Britain, France, Prussia, Austria, and Russia.
   B. On the eve of the French Revolution, Britain was the most dynamic European power, the first world power.
   C. France, often known as the “great nation,” was the strongest continental power.
   D. The Austrian Empire, whose Habsburg ruler was still the head of a nearly meaningless structure of more than 330 Germanic states known as the Holy Roman Empire, was the historic counterweight to France in the west and the Ottoman Empire in the east.
   E. Prussia became more powerful, especially under Frederic the Great, the Hohenzollern monarch who ruled from 1740–1786.
   F. Russia first joined the European great power club upon entering the War of Austrian Succession, 1740–1748.

V. If most Europeans still had a profoundly traditional worldview and way of life, some were already living in a far more modern and dynamic universe; at that point, greater change was virtually inevitable.

Essential Reading:
Robin Winks and Thomas Kaiser, Europe, 1648–1815, pp. 56–137.

**Supplementary Reading:**

Read further selections from *The Portable Enlightenment Reader*.

**Questions to Consider:**
1. Why is this era referred to as *early-modern Europe*?
2. What seem to be the major forces of change and the greatest areas of continuity?
Lecture Three
The Age of Revolution, 1789–1848

Scope: Although it is not often that an age can be associated with an historian, British Marxist historian E. J. Hobsbawm merits this respect; his trilogy of studies on 19th-century Europe best explains the manner in which the French and Industrial Revolutions served as the midwives of modern European history and, via the umbilical cord of European imperialism, of modern world history as well.

Terming these two processes a dual revolution, Hobsbawm explains how they undermined the Old Regime and ushered in a different world. The French Revolution conceived of its message of liberty, fraternity, and equality in universalistic terms, and its armies and Napoleon’s carried these ideas across Europe, temporarily implementing some as well. Among the most important concepts were: uniform laws, civil rights, careers open to talent, a more centralized state, economic policies that facilitated capitalism, and popular sovereignty in the form of nationalism, which became the most powerful secular religion of the 19th century. The shadow of the French Revolution dominated the hopes and fears of Europeans during the first half of the century, providing its primary ideologies and myths.

Simultaneously, an even more profound historical process, the Industrial Revolution, took shape in late-18th-century Britain, gradually spreading to areas of western and central Europe; thereafter, with increasing rapidity, it ushered in a more modern industrial capitalist urban reality that transformed European life.

Outline

I. The years between 1789–1848, often known as the Age of Revolution, are captured by British Marxist historian E. J. Hobsbawm in a book aptly titled The Age of Revolution, 1789–1848, published in 1962.
   A. Hobsbawm is among the first scholars to have understood how the dual revolutions combined to become the midwives of modern European history, undermining traditional society wherever they spread.
   B. Initially, the French Revolution was the more important, casting a shadow over much of the 19th century, especially the years between 1789–1848.
      1. France, when mobilized, was the most powerful state on the continent, both materially and culturally.
      2. The French Revolution became the most radical of all of the late-18th-century revolutions.
      3. Only the French Revolution saw the rise of a Napoleon, who spread many of its fundamental ideas and concepts, even as he ruled as a dictator and conqueror.
      4. By 1815, with the final defeat of Napoleon, not only had many structures of the Ancien Régime been uprooted or severely challenged, but a series of modern political ideologies and concepts had taken form, creating much of the political vocabulary of the modern world.
      5. Nineteenth-century liberalism believed in promulgated constitutions, basic civil rights, limited male suffrage, careers open to talent, and the primacy of private property and limited government.
      6. Democracy or radicalism shared many of these concepts but favored universal male suffrage and more state action.
      7. Early forms of socialism were expressed during the revolution as well; socialism saw economic necessity as prior to political necessity and wished to redistribute wealth.
      8. A more modern, “utilitarian” form of conservatism emerged in reaction to the revolution, joining divine-right monarchy with updated armor; Edmund Burke’s Reflections on the French Revolution (1790) was conservatism’s most powerful statement.
      9. Significant strides were made toward formulating arguments for equal rights for women, although the revolutionary and Napoleonic eras saw women’s rights neglected and male dominance codified in law.
     10. The concept of nationalism was advanced in concept and reality.
     11. Revolution as a just and efficacious method of change was lodged in the hearts of millions of Europeans.
   C. Parallel to the French Revolution came the First Industrial Revolution, which began in late-18th-century Britain, then spread to Belgium, France, and central Europe in the 1830s and thereafter.
      1. This “revolution” was the most important development in human history, at least since the development of cities and sedentary life several millennia ago.
2. It made possible comparatively unlimited levels of productivity, partially freeing humankind from the harsh whims of nature.
3. With industrialism came significant accelerating changes in virtually every area of life, including urbanization, education, and the entire social structure of society.
4. Given that industrialism was also synonymous with power, especially with military power, all of the great powers were forced to come to terms with it.
5. Globally, the Industrial Revolution also had a deep impact on politics, ideas, and culture as a whole, challenging traditional patterns.

D. Although the impact of the French Revolution on the continent was greater than that of the Industrial Revolution prior to 1848, by mid-century, this balance was shifting; thereafter, their combined impact increasingly challenged and undermined traditional society, ushering in a modern, urban, industrial civilization.

II. In two later volumes, *The Age of Capital: 1848–1875* (1975) and *The Age of Empire: 1875–1914* (1987), Hobsbawm details the continuation of this process throughout Europe and the rest of the world, either through European migration, European imperialism, or both, eventually leading to the era of anti-colonial revolutions as well, especially after World War I.

III. Although other scholars, such as C. A. Bayly in *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780–1914* (2004), have shown that Hobsbawm’s interpretation of modernization was too Eurocentric and that Europeans also were reacting to worldwide developments, the thrust of Hobsbawm’s analysis is a useful way of viewing the development of modern civilization.

Essential Reading:
E. J. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution, 1789–1848*.

Supplementary Reading:

Questions to Consider:
1. What are the major implications of an industrial revolution?
2. What does it mean to say that one is a Marxist scholar? How might non-Marxists evaluate that scholarship, or challenge it?
Lecture Four
The French Revolution

Scope: Although scholars debate the causes of the French Revolution, in the context of the socioeconomic, demographic, and ideological changes that occurred in 18th-century France, all agree it was a dramatic event that helped determine the political vocabulary, expectations, and myths of 19th-century Europe.

Part of the power of the French Revolution is that it lasted for at least 10 years in Europe’s most powerful state. Moreover, from 1787 until 1799, nearly every segment of society, including the poor and women, played an active role, while one segment of the middle class, forever known as Jacobins, implemented radical political and social agendas to save the revolution and to defend France from the wrath of aristocratic Europe. Thus came the Terror of 1793–1794, the most debated revolutionary experience.

In addition, every phase of the revolution represented a political ideology and constitutional/institutional models that spread to other parts of Europe in the “knapsacks” of French soldiers, united by the secular ideology of nationalism. These challenges left a legacy of hope and fear, depending on one’s worldview, and opponents of the revolution would need to mimic some of its reforms and passions in order to survive. Part of this legacy was Napoleon Bonaparte himself and the challenges he presented to a frightened and tired European leadership elite.

Outline

I. Although scholars assign different weights to the causes of the French Revolution, most agree they were multiple in nature.
   A. One area always presented is the impact of the Enlightenment.
      1. Great philosophers, such as Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Rousseau, critiqued established institutions and traditions, including the aristocracy, the church, and the functioning of the monarchy.
      2. These ideas and many others were given focus by Diderot and d’Alembert, whose multi-volume Encyclopedia appeared between 1751–1777.
      3. The ideas of the Enlightenment were spread more broadly through many forms of elite and popular culture.
      4. Even members of the aristocracy and clergy were affected by potentially incendiary ideas, as were members of the middle classes and many common folk.
   B. Many scholars, especially Marxists, stress the contradiction between a growing commercial capitalist economic structure and the bourgeois class, facing the constraints of feudal society, dominated by the aristocracy. Actually, there was much commonality (politically, economically, and culturally) of interest between members of the aristocracy and upper bourgeoisie, although they headed toward a collision course just prior to 1789.
   C. Others stress that French institutions were rotten and could not continue to function for long.
      1. This was particularly true with respect to tax collection, in which the two wealthiest estates, the clergy and the aristocracy, were exempt from many taxes, while the poorest groups were taxed severely.
      2. Most taxes were collected inefficiently and sometimes corruptly by tax farmers; on the eve of 1789, half of the revenues garnered were used to fund interest on the debt.
      3. Still, French institutions were not notably less efficient than those of several other great powers, especially Austria and Russia; Cardinal Fleury, who managed affairs between 1726–1740, had bequeathed his monarch a balanced budget.
   D. Another area of stress, especially on the eve of 1789, was a substantial population increase, not matched by an equivalent agrarian yield.
      1. Increasing misery was evident during the 1770s and 1780s and especially during the agrarian depression of 1787–1788.
      2. Urban unemployment and hunger paralleled rural crisis.
   E. Three costly continental and imperial wars forced the monarchy to live beyond its means, falling deeply in debt.
1. Between 1740 and 1783, France was involved in the War of Austrian Succession (1740–1748) and the Seven Years War, (1756–1763); these two wars were costly economically, and losses in both diminished France’s prestige.

2. French support for the American Revolution, in its victorious revenge against Britain, from 1776–1783, finally bankrupted the monarchy and made the vocabulary of the Enlightenment and American revolutionary ideas the rage of the day.

F. Both Louis XV and Louis XVI, either through their persons or their policies, undermined the status of the monarchy and encouraged France’s elites to challenge their absolutist claims.
   1. With unabashedly dissolute behavior, King Louis XV scandalized even a sex-tolerant Parisian society.
   2. Tarnished by rumors of impotence, Louis XVI’s inability to consistently support the policies of reforming ministers allowed a crisis to turn into a catastrophe.

G. Matters were brought to a head in 1787 when an Assembly of Notables, called into being to accept taxes on the aristocrats and clergy, refused to do so without sharing authority.
   1. This confrontation is often known as the pre-revolution, the aristocratic or feudal reaction, or even the first phase of the revolution.
   2. Deadlock and bankruptcy forced King Louis XVI to summon the Estates General, which last met in 1614.

H. The dramatic year between the two assemblies saw widespread debate concerning French institutions and the crisis of the monarchy.

I. Lack of clarity as to how the three estates would function and whether or not the first two would override the wishes of the third estate, which constituted 97 percent of the 25 million people of France, brought tensions to a head between the middle classes (and some liberal aristocrats and clerics) and more conservative elites. When liberal cleric Abbé Sieyès wrote his famous inflammatory pamphlet, “What Is the Third Estate?” (1789), claiming the masses represented the nation while the aristocrats were parasites, the die was cast.

II. Owing to a complex set of forces (including the king’s weakness, class and ideological conflict, continued economic distress and financial instability, painful decisions concerning the role of the church in France, urban and rural violence, and foreign wars), the revolution unfolded in a series of phases, between 1789 and 1799, each with its own leadership elite, accomplishments, failures, and tone.

A. The first phase, lasting roughly between 1789 and 1792, saw an uneasy balance between an increasingly weakened monarch and an increasingly powerful legislature.
   1. Among its famous early hallmarks were the Tennis Court Oath (June 20, 1789), the storming of the Bastille (July 14), and the Great Fear in the countryside (July–August).
   2. Between 1789 and 1791, the main remnants of feudalism were destroyed and a constitutional monarchy was established.
   3. The Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen (August 26, 1789) was somewhat more radical than the American Bill of Rights.
   4. The confiscation of church property and Civil Constitution of the Clergy, requiring a loyalty oath, deeply divided Catholics and left a legacy of church-state conflict.
   5. The suppression of guilds and prohibition of workers’ organizations signified support for a capitalist economy.
   6. The flight and capture of the royal family in June 1791 raised further questions about the possibility of monarchical compromise.
   7. The mostly bourgeois members of the Legislative Assembly, which convened in October 1791, took stronger measures against non-juring priests and émigré nobles, declared war against Austria in April 1792, and abolished the monarchy in August 1792.

B. A second phase between September 1792 and July 1794 saw the radicalization of the revolution, expanded foreign war, and Robespierre’s Reign of Terror.
   1. Urban and rural masses continued to be active, and revolts against the revolution also occurred.
   2. France now found itself at war with Austria, Prussia, Holland, and Britain.
3. The king was tried and executed (December 1792–January 1793).
4. A more democratic Constitution of 1793 was adopted in late June, proclaiming universal male suffrage, the right to work, the right to subsistence, and even the right to rebel against tyranny.
5. Faced with internal civil war (the Vendée), foreign defeat, severe inflation, and shortages, Robespierre came to dominate the newly established Committee of Public Safety and take even more radical measures, including universal military conscription, wage and price controls, revolutionary tribunals and the Reign of Terror, and state centralization.
6. Following the execution of thousands of real and purported enemies of the revolution, along with republican victories against foreign opponents and numerous internal rebellions, Robespierre and his closest Jacobin allies were overthrown and executed at the end of July 1794.

C. Following a transitional year known as the Thermidorian Reaction, lasting from late summer 1794 to fall 1795, a five-person Directory was established between November 1795 and 1799; both represented a return to the moderate, constitutional phase of the revolution and the search for order and stability internally, although with increasing cynicism.
1. Moderate deputies and surviving Girondins reentered the legislature.
2. Most forms of public protest, whether republican or royalist, and independent political organizations were repressed.
3. The Constitution of 1795, similar to that of 1791, was adopted in early October, with a Directory of five members serving as the executive branch of government, in conjunction with a two-house parliament.
4. Increasingly, the army and its new heroes were used not only to do battle with France’s foreign foes but to maintain order.
5. Continued foreign conquest, often now more traditional in manner, and continued political disunity led to a decline in support for the Directory and to the meteoric rise to power of France’s most popular general, Napoleon Bonaparte, in a new form of government known as the Consulate, in 1799.

Essential Reading:
John Carey, Eyewitness to History, pp. 246–255.

Supplementary Reading:

Questions to Consider:
1. Why did the French Revolution become so much more radical than the American Revolution?
2. Overall, was the French Revolution a positive event in human history?
Lecture Five
The Napoleonic Era, 1799–1815

Scope: An adventurer of enormous talent and capacity for work and intrigue, Napoleon Bonaparte dominated Europe’s historical imagination like no other “great man” until Adolf Hitler. However, unlike Hitler, Napoleon represented much that was best in his era—promulgated law, careers open to talent, administrative efficiency, and religious toleration—although his legacy was marred by a monumental ego and penchant toward conquest.

A child of the Enlightenment, a son of the revolution, and an enlightened despot, Napoleon was an epoch-making figure. His 16-year reign ensured that many revolutionary accomplishments would be retained, while his desire to dominate Europe virtually ensured that his opponents would unite. In the process, millions died, France lost its position as Europe’s dominant power, the Old Regime temporarily reasserted its ascendancy, and the British maximized their economic and imperial dominance. Still, when the powers met in Vienna in 1814–1815 to reassert the principles of legitimacy, anti-revolutionary solidarity, and the balance of power, the ideologies of the revolutionary epoch had taken form: Liberalism, radicalism, socialism, nationalism, the myth of revolutionary possibility, and more modern conservatism were locked in mortal combat.

Outline

I. Napoleon Bonaparte’s rise to power was based on opportunities presented by the French Revolution and his outstanding political and military talents and powerful ambition.
   A. Born into a poor Corsican noble family in 1769, he received military training in France, specializing in artillery.
   B. Somewhat out of place, he was influenced by Enlightenment thought and threw in his lot with the revolution, joining the Jacobins.
   C. He showed unusual talents in military engagements, especially in lifting the British siege of Toulon in December 1793, and made political connections, switching his support to the Thermidorians and marrying the well-placed Josephine de Beauharnais.
   D. As one of the youngest generals in the French army and after changing his name to Napoleon Bonaparte, he won military victories against the Piedmontese and Austrians in Italy in 1796 and 1797, negotiating treaties and gaining fame.
   E. This was followed by a dramatic campaign in Egypt and Syria, but soon Napoleon’s military victories were undermined by Admiral Nelson’s destruction of his fleet.
   F. Napoleon returned from Egypt in October 1799, in time to join Abbé Sieyès in overthrowing the Directory.

II. Iron-willed, ambitious, and popular, Napoleon assumed overall control of France’s political and military destiny, achieving success during more than four years of the Consulate.
   A. Napoleon became consul-for-life in 1802, then emperor in May 1804.
   B. He consolidated a number of the moderate gains of the revolution, healed some of its worst tensions, and continued to expand the power and efficiency of the state.
      1. He implemented a constitution with a strong executive and a complicated set of three chambers.
      2. Although maintaining “careers open to talent,” Napoleon used highly competent individuals from all political backgrounds, including royalists.
      3. Powerful and effective prefects were appointed in each of France’s departments.
      4. A Concordat with the papacy was reached in July 1801, appeasing most Catholics, while establishing the better part of state control over the church.
      5. Gains made by Protestants and Jews during the first years of the revolution were maintained.
      6. A semi-private Bank of France was established in 1800 and France’s currency was stabilized by 1803.
      7. The major property changes that occurred during the revolution were maintained.
8. Other institutions were created, such as an expanded secondary and university system for the elites and the Legion of Honor, especially for prominent state service.

C. During the early years, France was able to defeat all its military opponents fairly easily, even getting the British to sign the Peace of Amiens in 1802.
   1. France was now not only at peace but in a dominant position in Europe, having made considerable gains along its borders.
   2. A large part of the war costs were paid by the vanquished and by armies that lived off the land.

III. The second phase of Napoleon’s rule, from the early years of his emperorship until the Grand Army invaded Russia in June 1812, can be divided into two periods.

A. Between 1804 and 1808, Napoleon continued to experience great success.
   1. These were the years during which most of the articles of the famous Napoleonic Code were devised and implemented, guaranteeing equality under the law for men—and the subordination of women—the predominance of contracts and the security of property, and careers, in theory, open to talent rather than to preferred birth.
   2. France continued to be relatively prosperous, because most of Napoleon’s battles were still paid for by France’s neighbors.
   3. Although Admiral Nelson’s second decisive victory at the Battle of Trafalgar (October 1805) prevented a French invasion of Britain, Napoleon achieved his greatest military victories against Austria, Russia, and Prussia at Ulm in October 1805; Austerlitz in December 1805; and Jena and Auerstädt in October 1806.
   4. These decisive victories and the Peace of Tilsit, signed with Russia in July 1807, marked French predominance over western and central Europe.
   5. France annexed much territory and established satellite states; most significant was the creation of the Confederation of the Rhine in 1806, followed by the abolition of the meaningless Holy Roman Empire, reducing the number of German states.
   6. Still, the Continental System of 1806, set up to exclude British goods, raised problems in Europe and France.

B. Between 1808 and 1812, French predominance began to unravel, even though Napoleon won decisive victories.
   1. The Peninsular War, France’s conquest of Portugal and Spain in 1808, became an open sore; 350,000 soldiers could not destroy the Spanish guerrilla nationalist movement, aided by British money and men.
   2. Nationalist reactions against French imperialism became prominent in Germany, while Prussian reforms prepared them for upcoming conflict.
   3. The Continental System was leaking all over, including in Russia, also ready for conflict.

IV. More irascible and increasingly impetuous, Napoleon “gambled” on the destruction of Russia in order to finally bring Britain to heel.

A. The Grand Army of 600,000 soldiers invading Russia in June 1812 became the tattered remnants of 40,000 troops returning to France in December, defeated by severe weather and the Russians.

B. Sensing the possibility of finally defeating Napoleon, the more battle-tested Russians, Prussians, Austrians, and British cooperated more effectively.
   1. Severely outnumbered, Napoleon was badly defeated in the Battle of the Nations (Leipzig) in October 1813.
   2. The Allies entered Paris at the end of March 1814, followed by Napoleon’s abdication and “comfortable” exile to the Island of Elba in the Mediterranean.
   3. The Allies, negotiating with French Prince Talleyrand, agreed on a non-punitive treaty; King Louis XVIII was placed on the throne but accepted a charter; and France kept the borders of 1792, its “natural” frontiers.
   4. Napoleon made a dramatic return to France but was defeated on June 18, 1815, at Waterloo, and packed off to St. Helena in the South Atlantic.
   5. Louis XVIII returned to France, stripped of its territorial gains, but mostly glad to be at peace.
V. Although the Allies reached an intelligent postwar settlement at the Congress of Vienna, Europe would never be the same again.

   A. A number of the revolutionary changes were maintained in France and elsewhere.
   B. Constitutional and national ways of thinking could not be erased.
   C. Industrial forces, advancing in Britain, soon spread to the continent.

Essential Reading:

Supplementary Readings:
Alistair Horne, *The Age of Napoleon*.
Paul Johnson, *Napoleon*.

Questions to Consider:
1. Why was Napoleon so successful in maintaining his power internally?
2. How does one explain his military triumphs, facing so many enemies?
Lecture Six
The First Industrial Revolution, 1760–1850

Scope: Although scholars debate the origins of the Industrial “Revolution,” all agree it was the main force propelling Europe’s modernization and urbanization. Now understood more as a process, rather than a radical break, the Industrial Revolution transformed much of Britain’s urban landscape over several generations; by 1850, Britain was the workshop of the world, with a greater productivity than the rest of Europe combined.

Sometimes referred to as the classical or English Industrial Revolution, concentrated largely in textiles and other consumer goods, it developed with less governmental involvement than the “heavy” industrial changes that occurred after 1850. Still, British preeminence was not accidental. The Isles benefited from nearly unique circumstances, including a relatively stable and tolerant political system; a more well-developed commercial and banking system; a more fluid social structure, including a large middle class; an expanded food supply derived from agrarian improvements; ample natural resources; colonial and European markets protected by the world’s premier navy; a widespread “entrepreneurial” spirit; and a series of new inventions that facilitated the machine age.

Once this process took on momentum, it set Britain apart from its neighbors, who sought to catch up, following the hiatus of the Napoleonic wars. Although industrial productivity brought disruption, it brought wealth and power for states that followed suit; the converse was also true.

Outline

I. Although the Industrial Revolution, which can be traced to late-18th-century Britain, was more of a process than a historical event, it was the most powerful force of historical change in modern history.
   A. Involving the replacement of tools by machines with built-in guidance and energy, this revolution made possible undreamt-of levels of productivity, eventually mostly in large factories, and other great changes.
   B. Included in these changes were revolutions in transportation and communications, rapid urbanization, mass literacy, a changed class structure, and eventually, a higher standard of living for most.
   C. Industrialism also made possible the process of national integration of citizens into modern nation-states and changes in the European and global balance of power.

II. Although scholars disagree over the conjuncture of forces that caused or made possible the acceleration of industrial productivity in late-18th-century Britain (1760–1780), many apparent preconditions were most prominent there.
   A. Relatively small in size and having had a “successful” political revolution in the late 17th century, Britain was relatively well governed and politically stable.
      1. There was acceptance of Britain’s basic institutions, especially of shared governance.
      2. Government was relatively cheap and unobtrusive, yet favored policies conducive to all levels of economic expansion, including agriculture, commerce, and manufacturing.
      3. There was a high level of trust in the stability and durability of the system and even a belief in British exceptionalism.
      4. With the establishment of a private National Bank of England in 1694, acceptance of universal low-level taxation, and the sense that the national debt was guaranteed by the elites, Britain’s financial and banking structure was comparatively well developed.
   B. Britain’s national success was based on the trilogy of commerce, colonies, and sea power, all giving economic advantages and inducements.
      1. Britain’s colonial and commercial preeminence, closely connected, gave her excess capital for investment, as well as markets and sources of raw material.
      2. Trade in Britain conferred status, rather than being detested; not only did Britain have a diverse middle class, but there was social mobility among the wealthy elites.
      3. Naval supremacy protected British commerce and blocked invasion, thus obviating an expensive standing army.
C. As with the Low Countries, Britain experienced a moderate agrarian revolution in the 18th century.
   1. Britain had larger farms, more efficient and intelligent forms of cultivation, and the use of fertilizer and nitrogen-fixating crops.
   2. Greater agrarian productivity led to more liquid capital.
   3. Agrarian revolution facilitated a significant population increase and expanding urban industrial labor force.
D. Britain was well endowed with coal and iron ore and had relatively well developed internal transportation.
E. British artisans and inventors produced a series of technological advances relating to the manufacture of textiles, putting them to industrial use.
F. The same was true with respect to steam power, linked with textiles and railroads, the sinews of British supremacy.
   1. Railroads for industrial use began in 1820; for passengers, in 1830.
   2. Britain first used steam for cross-Atlantic voyages in 1816.

III. Although scholars emphasize the gradual nature of early industrial changes, their aggregate impact was tremendous.
   A. Although in 1780, the total value of British trade was slightly above France’s, in 1840, British trade was double France’s.
   B. In 1850, Britain was producing about five times more coal than France and all the states of the Germanic Confederation and more steam power than the rest of Europe.
   C. Inasmuch as the destabilization of the French Revolution and Napoleonic eras may have retarded industrial growth on the continent, while accelerating it in Britain, by 1815, Britain was the workshop and financial center of the world.

IV. Although the long-term impact of the Industrial Revolution(s) led to a better standard of living for most Europeans, this was probably not true until the second half of the 19th century.
   A. Even if the process created more middling-level jobs, living conditions for most workers were terrible and almost totally unregulated until the 1830s, when some unions formed and more public attention was given to the situation; this was particularly true with respect to working conditions for women and children.
   B. By the second quarter of the 19th century, British working and living conditions began to improve somewhat and would continue to do so after most workers obtained the right to vote in 1867 and expanded unions.
   C. Religious and humanitarian reform efforts also played central roles in ameliorating conditions.
   D. Most important was increasing productivity, making possible both profit and better living conditions.

V. If the first phase of the Industrial Revolution was largely a British affair, during the 1830s and 1840s, it spread to parts of France, Belgium, the Rhineland, the Ruhr region, Silesia, Bohemia, and parts of northern Italy.

Essential Reading:
Karl Marx, The Communist Manifesto.

Supplementary Reading:
Charles Dickens, Hard Times.

Questions to Consider:
1. What were the major gains and losses during the First Industrial Revolution?
2. What are the major political implications of this type of economic change?
Lecture Seven
The Era of Metternich, 1815–1848

Scope: The years between the Congress of Vienna and the outbreak of revolutions in 1848 were turbulent, characterized by tensions between the forces of order and the forces of change. The forces of order, represented by Prince Clemens von Metternich, generally dominated, especially in Austria, Prussia, and Russia. However, in Britain and France, a more liberal, constitutional world emerged, far more naturally in “England” and via revolution, in 1830, in France.

In the aftermath of the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, European statesmen, at Vienna and thereafter, established a more stable international order, dominated by the great powers, including France, in a loose Concert of Europe. Conflict and tensions existed, but they were kept in bounds. Meanwhile, constitutional and nationalist revolutions broke out, mostly in 1820 and 1830, as dreams inspired by the French Revolution, especially among urban populations, went largely unfulfilled. Still, this era saw peace and material progress, and its romantic temper was dominated by those who thought ideas mattered.

With the hungry 1840s, particularly the agrarian and urban crises of 1846–1847, tensions came to a head, especially when revolt broke out in Paris in February 1848. Barricades, violence, and mystical expectations dominated, and King Louis Philippe and Prince Metternich took flight.

Outline

I. The Congress of Vienna (November 1814–June 1815) served as a dividing line between the Revolutionary and Restoration eras.
   A. Dominated by Prince Clemens von Metternich of Austria and, to a lesser extent, by Count Robert Castlereagh of Britain, the great powers sought to restore the old order, using the principles of legitimacy, compensation, and balance to ensure stability and peace.
   B. Their goals were to prevent the revival of French expansion, to preserve a general balance of power in Europe, and to prevent the outbreak of further revolutions and wars.
   C. Although there were tensions and fears among the victorious powers—including fear that Russia could replace France as hegemon—intelligent decision making and the desire for peace often prevailed.
      1. With the connivance of Prince Talleyrand, France was “rehabilitated” as a member of the balance of power. The Peace of Paris was not Punic, and France joined the postwar Concert of Europe, or Congress system, including the Holy Alliance, championed by Tsar Alexander I.
      2. The four victorious great powers found ways to compromise and to divide the spoils of war; monarchs were “returned” to states or states were “invented” for them.
      3. The powers created a 39-member Germanic Confederation, or Bund, to stabilize the German states, where Napoleon had wreaked havoc.
      4. Except for Britain, the powers placated the more mystical/romantic Tsar Alexander I, joining his proposed Holy Alliance and adding a Christian dimension to the “sacred” tasks of peace and stability.
   D. Most decisions reached at the Congress of Vienna helped facilitate peace among the great powers, the most prominent marker of the 1815–1848 era, even during the revolutions of 1848.
   E. Still, not only were there disagreements between powers, but meaningful and “legitimate” desires of many of the peoples of Europe were ignored, especially with respect to constitutional and national issues.
      1. The British, unsympathetic toward repression in Europe and with respect to rebellions in Latin America, soon withdrew from the Congress system.
      2. Following the “liberal” French revolution of 1830, the French often sided with the British against the more conservative Austro-Prussia-Russian alliance.
      3. “Old Europe” could not be reconstructed; not even an alliance between throne and altar (monarchy and church) could prevent change.
II. The impact of the revolutionary legacy (ideas, experiences) and of industrial changes (more in Britain) made change or conflict inevitable.

A. Internally, and sometimes externally, European society was loosely divided between the forces of change and the forces of order.
   1. The active forces of order included monarchs, aristocrats, and most churchmen, especially on the continent and even more so in Austria, Prussia, and Russia.
   2. Although moderate conservatives, more so in France and Britain, accepted slow change, Metternichians lumped constitutional or national change into the same basket—verboten (“forbidden”).
   3. The forces of order used military and bureaucratic power to repress forces of change.
   4. Depending on the issue or the place, artisans, peasants, workers, or members of the middle class could also crave some form of “order.”

B. The active forces of change consisted of various proponents, mostly but not exclusively among members of an expanding middle class.
   1. Liberals, radicals (democrats), and some socialists sought constitutional changes, along the lines of the French Revolution or the British experience.
   2. Nationalists, usually liberal or radical, sought independence from “foreign” occupiers, or in the case of “Germans” and “Italians,” a wider unification of their compatriots, defined by language, culture, and history.
   3. Middle-class elements sought the ideal of careers open to talent.
   4. The poor sought more food, protection, the removal of repressive laws, or in central and eastern Europe, the removal of the remnants of feudalism or serfdom.

III. As a result of the obvious clash of interests and worldviews and the inability of conservatives, except in Britain, to reach compromises, especially with the growing members of the middle class, riots and revolutions occurred repeatedly between 1815–1848.

A. Sometimes they occurred in spasms, with increasing range and intensity in 1820, 1830, and 1848.

B. Although most were repressed, there were a number of “successes” from 1815–1848.
   1. Greece gained independence from the Ottoman Empire during the 1820s, formally accepted in 1832.
   2. Belgium gained independence from Holland in 1830, formally guaranteed in 1839.
   3. A number of Latin American nations gained independence from Spain and Portugal in the 1820s.

C. The best example of an intelligent avoidance of violent revolution and a co-opting of the middle class was the British Reform Bill of 1832.

IV. Other major themes were prominent during the 1815–1848 era.

A. The humanities, especially philosophy and history, were held in great esteem.

B. Continentals stressed the power of ideas as the main source of meaning and change, in the work of such German philosophers as Kant and especially Hegel.


D. There was also a religious revival during this era.

E. All these tendencies were related to the dominant Romantic tone of the epoch, evident in literature, art, and music.

F. The 1815–1848 era was often an age of frustration. Constitutionalist and liberal nationalist expectations were often dashed.

G. Until the mid-1840s, it was a time of economic improvement and of the gradual spread of industrial advances to parts of western and central Europe.

V. Severe agrarian depression, from traditional crop failures in 1845–1847, led to urban recession, as well, placing many areas of society in a situation of “overload,” ripe for rebellion and violence.

**Supplementary Reading:**
Barbara Caine and Glenda Sluga, *Gendering European History*, pp. 1–86.

**Questions to Consider:**
1. Why were the conservative elites so resistant to change during this era?
2. What seem to be the wider implications of the Romantic movement?
Lecture Eight
The Revolutions of 1848

Scope: The year 1848 has rightly been called “the springtime of the peoples,” analogous to 1989 but with different results. Sparked by an “unintended” revolution in Paris, outbreaks involving middle-class elements, workers, and artisans erupted in urban areas in the Germanic states, the Austrian Empire, and the Italian states, leading to a temporary collapse of established authority and hasty concessions.

If the causes of these revolutions involved a combination of national, constitutional, and socioeconomic grievances, the early success of the “revolutionaries” was attributable more to the incompetence and lack of nerve of rulers in France, Prussia, and Austria than to the power of revolutionary leaders, who were divorced from the urban and rural masses. Unlike 1789, neither great-power conflict nor successful Jacobin-like revolutionary responses emerged.

If revolutions saw success from February to May, they stalled and were eclipsed during 1849 and 1850. Once the elites, supported by armies and Russian intervention, regained composure, the disunited revolutionaries were no match; on the surface, the old order was largely reestablished by the end of 1850. However, some things had changed. The peasants of Prussia and the Austrian Empire had been “emancipated” from serfdom; moderate constitutions remained in force in Prussia and Piedmont; many monarchs, including the pope, had seen their legitimacy undermined; a series of class and ethno-national tensions had worsened; and elements of the reformist middle class, disabused of “Romantic” sentiments, drew closer to the forces of order. The disillusionment of 1848–1850 and the advent of industrial civilization ushered in a different age.

Outline

I. The revolutions in areas of western and central Europe had a number of causes.

A. Participants, especially in the states of Italy and Germany, but also large ethnic minorities in the Austrian Empire, had nationalist and constitutional frustrations.

B. In France, the issues were primarily political (constitutional) but also social.

C. A growing number of middle-class individuals in expanding urban areas also sought careers open to talent.

D. In central Europe, feudalism or feudal remnants still afflicted large sections of the peasantry.

E. Agrarian depression in 1846–1847, leading to urban recession, brought grievances to a boiling point.

F. Political elites were insensitive, unimaginative, and unprepared for the outbreaks that occurred following the “signal” given by Paris in February 1848.

G. The overall legacy of 1789, in the minds of both revolutionaries and their opponents, was often decisive as well.

II. The revolutions of 1848 generally developed in three phases.

A. From February to May, many revolutions appeared to be successful and obtained major concessions from terrified monarchs.

1. Following outbreaks in Paris, Louis Philippe abdicated and a republic was proclaimed, with universal male suffrage; national workshops were also established, mainly in Paris and Lyon.

2. On March 4, King Charles Albert of Piedmont issued a moderate constitution.

3. After riots in Prague, Vienna, and Budapest, on March 13, Metternich resigned, a constitution was promised, and Hungary became virtually independent.

4. A similar series of events occurred in Berlin and elsewhere in Germany, leading to a more liberal ministry and a military evacuation of the city; King Frederick William IV promised a constitution and support for German unity.

5. The Austrians were ousted from Milan, a republic was proclaimed in Venetia, and Piedmont declared war on Austria.
6. At the end of March, an all-German pre-parliament assembled in Frankfurt, followed by the full Frankfurt Parliament in May, to achieve German unity.

7. In April, a constitution was promised for the Czechs, riots spread to other sections of the Austrian Empire, revolts for independence began in Poland, and Pope Pius IX declared neutrality.

B. During the second stage, between June and December 1848, the revolutions were in trouble.
1. Following the meeting of a Pan-Slav Congress in Prague, Austrian General Windischgratz bombarded Prague, crushing the Czechs.
2. During the June Days in Paris, following the closing of national workshops, radical republicans and socialists were suppressed, leading to wider reaction; Prince Louis Napoleon was elected president in December, defeating republicans.
3. In July, the Austrians reoccupied Milan and Lombardy; in the end of October, General Windischgratz reoccupied Vienna, while Franz Joseph replaced his weak-willed father.
4. Meanwhile, Hungarian forces invaded Austria, while the pope fled following insurrections in November.

C. During the third stage, from 1849 to 1851, reaction succeeded in most areas.
1. In Italy, during 1849, the Roman Republic was overthrown by French troops, while Austria defeated Charles Albert’s Piedmontese forces.
2. In the Austrian Empire, in 1849, with the aid of Russian armies, Hungarian independence ended, while the Austrian Parliament was dissolved in 1851.
3. Following a long debate, the Frankfurt Parliament offered a federal crown to King Frederick William of Prussia, who turned it down. Although his attempt to form a Union of North German states was quashed in 1850 by Austria, backed by Russia, Frederick William maintained the limited constitution granted in 1849.
4. Following attempts to change the French constitution to allow more than a one-term presidency, Louis Napoleon, establishing a dictatorship, proclaimed himself president for 10 years in December 1851 and emperor-for-life in December 1852.

III. After several years of turmoil, not much seemed to have changed.
A. Limited constitutions were established in Piedmont and Prussia.
B. The peasants were emancipated in Prussia and the Austrian Empire.
C. King Victor Emmanuel I replaced King Charles Albert in Piedmont, Emperor Franz Joseph replaced Franz Ferdinand in Austria, and a Napoleonic restoration occurred.

IV. Although complicated factors explain these limited gains, several general tendencies are clear.
A. The initial widespread success of the revolutions was based on the weakness of regimes, rather than on the strength and unity of revolutionaries, who did not offer a real economic or social program to the masses; Jacobin-like elements did not emerge successfully, as they had in 1792–1793.
1. Especially in the German states and in Austria, most revolutionary leaders were more nationalist than constitutionalist, with little sympathy for the aspirations of Slavic, Hungarian, Italian, or Danish claims to self-determination or autonomy.
2. In Prussia and Austria, the military and bureaucracy, dominated by aristocrats, remained loyal to the regimes, and Russia served as the policeman of central Europe.
3. The British, generally favoring liberal constitutional changes, did not intervene, while the French concentrated on their own problems.
B. On some basic level, the Concert of Europe sustained itself; remembering the impact of 1789, the powers had no interest in wars of conquest.

V. Still, the impact of the events and even failures was profound.
A. The revolutions led to new leaders in France, Austria, Prussia, and Italy, less attuned to established ways of governing internally, including the Concert of Europe.
B. The revolutions exacerbated nationalist feelings, between both states and peoples.
1. Italian and German patriots were upset with Austria.
2. British and French liberals were upset with Russia and Austria, while Napoleon III was angry with the Russians, who refused to recognize him.

3. Antagonisms between Germans and Slavs were exacerbated, while Hungarians wanted independence.

4. Austro-Prussian tensions were raised, while Austrian elites felt threatened because they were forced to rely on Russia.

C. Class tensions were raised as the middle class and the more self-conscious working class (proletariat) came into greater conflict.

D. The failure of the revolutions undermined idealistic or utopian “Romantic” conceptions, at least in terms of achieving national, constitutional, or socioeconomic aims, using contemporary methods.

E. However, the revolutions led elites to realize that they needed to placate the middle classes and the masses, by one means or another, including expanding the military, police, and the paternalistic power of the states and by harnessing nationalism.

F. Constitutional and nationalist ideas continued to spread throughout Italy, Germany, and the Austrian Empire.

G. Both the emancipation of the serfs in central Europe and greater state attention, facilitating economic growth, accelerated the spread of capitalism and industrialism throughout much of Europe, except for in Russia.

Essential Reading:

Supplementary Reading:
Peter Jones, *The 1848 Revolutions*.
Jonathan Sperber, *The European Revolutions, 1848–1851*.

Questions to Consider:
1. How does one explain both the early success and the later failure of most of the 1848 revolutions?

2. What tools might the elites use to avoid such disruptions in the future?
Lecture Nine
Europe, 1850–1871—An Overview

Scope: The dashed expectations of those who had fought for change in 1848, combined with expanding urban industrial civilization, ushered in a new age. The disruptions of 1848 facilitated the rise of a new generation of statesmen known as realpolitikers (Napoleon III, Count Camillo di Cavour, Otto von Bismarck) and engendered a series of national antagonisms and hardening class lines. Equally important, the Second Industrial Revolution, characterized by steam, steel, heavier producer goods, and more state guidance, strengthened states that were able to use the new technologies. Once the Crimean War removed the “stabilizing” influence of Russia and Great Britain, by the mid-1850s, the realpolitikers went to work; by 1871, Italy and Germany were “united,” Austria and France were humiliated, and a very different balance of power emerged.

Simultaneously, the 1850s and 1860s saw scientific and materialist explanations capture the European imagination, while Realism replaced Romanticism as the dominant cultural form. Sometimes known as the age of Darwin, Marx, and Wagner, it was an era of remarkable scientific, economic, and urban advancement, of nationalist and class-based antagonism, and of social Darwinism and “modern” racist thought.

Outline

I. The 1850–1871 era has a coherence of its own quite different from that of 1815–1848; many of its components accelerated, at least for several decades after 1870.

II. A number of forces seem to explain this substantial change.
   A. The revolutions of 1848 had a widespread impact on a number of areas of European life.
   B. More important, expanding industrialization began to dramatically affect western and parts of central Europe, especially Germany.
   C. As with the changed emphasis from mid-17th–century to late-18th–century classicism or Enlightenment rationalism to the Romantic era, another generational mood swing came to predominate in the social sciences and humanities from the 1850s to the 1880s, at least.
   D. A combination of these developments, as well as the further spread of the “ideas of 1789” into eastern Europe and the Balkans, helps explain the changed nature of European civilization from 1850–1871.

III. What, then, are the major components of this epoch?
   A. Perhaps the most important marker is the Second Industrial Revolution.
      1. Propelled by new technologies in heavy industry, especially steam and steel, the epoch saw revolutions in urbanization, transportations, communications, capital expansion (banking), and so on.
      2. Increasingly, governments sought to guide the path of the Industrial Revolution, especially because of the military implications of industrial technology.
      3. More and more production took place in larger factories, with obvious implications.
      4. Where industrialism spread, the middle class expanded, as did the increasingly self-conscious proletariat, while artisans, peasants, and even aristocrats needed to adjust somewhat.
   B. The second dominant force in this epoch was an expanding and changing nationalism, within countries and between them.
      1. The more liberal and tolerant nationalism of the first half of the century became more exclusivist and began to be co-opted by conservative elites in their struggle to maintain power.
      2. By the 1860s, nationalism began to combine with the newer forces of social Darwinism and “scientific” racism, both against external and internal enemies, often “imagined.”
      3. This era saw a number of nationalist-related wars, including the Crimean War (1853–1856), a war between France and Piedmont versus Austria (1859–1860), the Austro-Prussian War (1866), and the Franco-Prussian War (1870–1871), leading to the “unification” of Italy and Germany in the 1860s and to the defeat of Russia, Austria, and France.
4. By 1871, “united” Germany or “expanded” Prussia had become the strongest continental power.

C. These changes marked the breakdown of the Concert of Europe and collaborative diplomacy; the era was dominated by new statesmen, such as Napoleon III, Count Camillo di Cavour, and Otto von Bismarck, and a new style of diplomacy, known as *realpolitik*. Machiavellian and self-satisfied, statesmen made secret treaties and planned for wars, without shame.

D. In place of Romanticism, idealism, philosophy, and history, this was an age of cultural Realism, materialism, and above all, science, all of which reinforced one another and reinforced the changing nature of nationalism and diplomacy.

1. It was the age of Charles Darwin, Karl Marx, and Richard Wagner, as even Marx and Wagner, and others, thought they had discovered or revealed the “scientific” laws governing society, the economy, and race—indeed, the whole evolution of life and civilization.

2. Traditional religions were on the defensive during this era; the Catholic Church’s main response was Pope Pius IX’s 1864 encyclical, *The Syllabus of Errors*.

E. In many areas, this was an age of expanded constitutionalism (both liberal and democratic) and remarkable economic development.

1. One can begin to speak of “mass society” during the 1860s in the most developed nations.

2. Even tsarist Russia, faced with defeat in the Crimean War, experienced reform from the mid-1850s to the mid-1860s.

F. The era witnessed the expansion of state action on many levels, as well as a dramatic change in the world balance of power. Although not an age of “self-conscious” imperialism, the British and French rather easily increased their power at the expense of India and China and in Southeast Asia, while the increasingly industrialized United States “opened up” Japan in the 1850s, just prior to the American Civil War.

IV. Although a number of these tendencies continued into the next era, the completion of the processes of Italian and German “unification” in 1870–1871 and the emergence of Germany as the new hegemon, replacing France, mark a transition to a new era, not surprisingly known as the *Age of Bismarck* (1870–1890).

**Essential Reading:**


**Supplementary Reading:**

E. J. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Capital*.


**Questions to Consider:**

1. How does one explain the substantial “discontinuities” between this era and the 1789–1848 era?

2. What seem to have been the major carryovers?
Lecture Ten
The Crimean War, 1853–1856

Scope: Sometimes considered the most senseless of Europe’s 19th-century wars, the Crimean War made possible the structural changes Europe experienced from the late 1850s through the Franco-Prussian War (1870–1871). Scholars disagree with respect to the causes of this bloody conflict. Surely the Concert of Europe had been undermined by the national and ideological tensions unleashed by 1848 and especially by Russia’s repressive role. This left ill will on the part of liberal leaders’ opinions in Great Britain and France, convincing many that Europe’s “policeman” needed to be taught a lesson. A more enduring cause of conflict involved the status of the weakened Ottoman Empire, a serious concern for statesmen since the late 18th century and a particular bone of contention between Great Britain and Russia, as well as for France and Austria (versus Russia).

When misperception and poor leadership led to war between the Ottoman Empire and Russia and to an Anglo-French siege of the Russian port of Sebastopol on the Black Sea, Anglo-French industrial power forced Russia to accept the humiliating Treaty of Paris in 1856. However, not only had Russia been stung, but Austria and Prussia had their status diminished, while Cavour, leading Piedmont into the war to curry Anglo-French favor, placed the plight of Italy on Europe’s agenda.

Although the Concert seemingly acted in Paris, guaranteeing the independence of the Ottoman Empire, the forces that gave the Concert reality were undermined, and the path was cleared for adventuresome statesmen.

Outline

I. Although scholars agree that the Crimean War “need not have occurred,” at least not in the 1850s, this does not mean it did not have significant causes.

A. The Concert of Europe generally functioned until after 1848, because such diplomats as Metternich and British Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Sir Robert Palmerston sought to preserve peace and the balance of power.

B. Although the avoidance of war between the great powers during the revolutions of 1848 reflected these concerns, the year 1848 undermined the Concert in important ways.
   1. It raised a number of specific nationalist antagonisms (Prussia versus Austria, Prussia versus Russia).
   2. It heightened ideological resentments, especially on the part of liberal British and French opinion against Russia.
   3. It saw the demise of Metternich and the rise of Louis Napoleon/ Napoleon III, whose very name was an affront to the Vienna system.

C. Even under the best of circumstances, an “eastern question” existed, given the weakness of the Ottoman Empire, as symbolized by the successful Greek War of Independence in the 1820s, the first of many nationalist Christian independence movements in the Balkans.
   1. Given this reality, the Russians wanted as much control over Constantinople as possible and sought exclusive military access through the Straits of the Bosphorous and the Dardanelles, linking the Black and Mediterranean Seas, while the British and French wanted the reverse of these designs, either the status quo or greater influence at the Porte.
   2. Russia also had divergent interests with the Austrians in terms of military and economic control of the Danube region.

D. During the crisis leading to the outbreak of war between Russia and the Ottoman Empire in 1853, followed by an Anglo-French coalition war against Russia in 1854, shortsighted, inconsistent, and incompetent diplomacy often prevailed.
   1. During 1852, Napoleon III successfully pressed the Ottomans to expand the rights of Latin Christians in the Holy Land.
   2. Tsar Nicholas I sought not only a reversal but the formal right to protect Orthodox Christians throughout the Ottoman Empire; in June 1853, Russian troops occupied the Ottoman provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia (Rumania), as hostages.
3. Receiving conflicting indications from British diplomats, the Sultan declared war against Russia, followed by the Russian destruction of the Ottoman fleet.
4. Outrage in the west, and especially on the part of the British, convinced the tsar to change course and to suggest a compromise agreement to the powers meeting at Vienna in February 1854.
5. Anglo-French refusal to accept these offers represents a breakdown of the Concert and the will for peace—and the desire to teach the Russians a lesson.

II. Although the Crimean War was localized, it was bloody and pregnant with consequences.

A. Between September 1854 and December 1855, Anglo-French forces besieged Sebastopol, the most important Russian Black Sea naval base.
1. Although superior western technology allowed their forces to concentrate more effectively than the Russians, lacking adequate railroads, all of the armies performed poorly, although the French performed less poorly. Approximately 500,000 combatants died, including large numbers from disease and exposure.
2. During the course of the war, Prussia, Austria, and Piedmont—the states most affected by 1848—further jockeyed for position and advantage. Austria, though pressed by Britain and France to engage, was unable to get Prussian acquiescence to intervene in the meetings of the Germanic Confederation. Austria, sending an ultimatum to Russia in December 1855, angered Russia without gaining Anglo-French good will.

B. Although the Peace of Paris, negotiated between February and April 1856, seemed to demonstrate the power of collective European action, this was more apparent than real.
1. Russia agreed to a number of demands made by the other great powers, including demilitarization and free trade in the Black Sea (no warships there), a European commission’s control of the Danube River (free navigation), the complete independence of the Ottoman Empire (now a member of the Concert), and the loss of any Russian rights over Moldavia and Wallachia; however, Russian compliance was a product of force.
2. Count Camillo di Cavour of Piedmont was given the opportunity to bring the plight of Italy before the powers, to the discomfiture of Austria.
3. Prussia and Austria were concerned about their great-power status and at odds.
4. Napoleon III, having gained by gamesmanship, was encouraged to play again.
5. Most important, both Britain and Russia, chastened, entered into an era of internal reform, creating a vacuum of power used by realpolitikers in France, Piedmont, and Prussia to redraw the map of Europe.

Essential Reading:

Supplementary Reading:
David Goldfrank, *The Origins of the Crimean War*.

Questions to Consider:
1. What seem to have been the major causes and consequences of the Crimean War?
2. What does the war tell us about the functioning of the Concert of Europe, and what impact did it have on this institution?
Lecture Eleven
From Napoleon to Napoleon—France, 1815–1852

Scope: More than the American Revolution, the French Revolution left a legacy of debris-disputed claims of legitimacy, disputed rights, and grievances. Restoration monarch Louis XVIII had the sense to accept the moderate elements of the revolution, including a limited constitution, the main property changes, and the Napoleonic Code, although his reign still saw the competing claims of liberals and ultra-conservatives. Louis XVIII’s death in 1824 brought his ultra brother to the throne as Charles X, ushering in six years of confrontation. A divine-right monarchist, Charles X claimed to heal illnesses by the laying on of hands. A showdown was hastened by agrarian and urban economic distress from 1826–1827; Charles brought the issue to a head in July 1830, when he issued decrees that essentially reestablished an absolutist monarchy. Barricades went up in Paris, supported by liberal and republican elites and the masses, and Charles X fled abroad.

Accepting the throne as “King of the French,” Charles’s successor, cousin Louis Philippe, was different; his regime resembled pre-1832 British rule but with less middle-class participation, more repression, and a less enlightened political elite. Louis Philippe’s regime is sometimes characterized as government by the plutocracy (the upper bourgeoisie), and France experienced gradual economic modernization and stability but without national gratification.

Severe agrarian and urban distress in 1846–1847, followed by a quarrel between two factions of the governing elites, led to the outbreak of revolution in February 1848, which saw King Louis Philippe flee. But who would govern France and how would France be governed? Following nearly a year of ferment, climaxxed by the violent Parisian June Days, Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, nephew of Napoleon, was elected president of the Second Republic for a non-renewable four-year term. A man of sincere humanity but with contradictions and character flaws, Louis outsmarted his opponents, courted the army and masses, named himself president for 10 years in December 1851, and declared himself Emperor Napoleon III in November 1852.

Outline

I. The restoration of Bourbon King Louis XVIII was a compromise solution, leaving considerable dissatisfaction, both on the left and the right.
   A. Although he accepted many of the moderate legacies of 1789, including a charter, the Napoleonic Code, and property changes, Louis XVIII’s claim to rule by divine right concerned liberals.
   B. Among more conservative elements, known as ultras, there was a desire to return to an alliance between throne and altar, to compensate nobles for losses, indeed, to return to the Old Regime.

II. This situation was exacerbated when Louis XVIII’s ultra brother became king in 1824, following Louis’s death.
   A. Favoring landed aristocratic interests to those of the urban liberal bourgeoisie, Charles implemented a series of unpopular policies.
      1. Ultras returned to power as his advisers, and aristocrats were compensated for some of their property losses.
      2. The alliance between throne and altar became more open, as the church was given further control over education.
      3. More censorship was introduced, and the largely middle-class National Guard was abolished.
   B. Equally upsetting was the changed tone of the regime, supported by Romantic conservatives. Charles X’s coronation was medieval in nature; he was the last French monarch who claimed to cure scrofula by the laying on of his hands.

III. Following a pitiable harvest in 1826, leading in 1827 to a distressed urban economy, more liberals were returned to the Chambers in successive elections, despite repression.
IV. Throwing caution to the wind, under the advice of ultra Prince Polignac, in July 1830, Charles X attempted a *coup d’état*, issuing a series of decrees. Charles abrogated the Restoration Charter of 1814, curtailed the press, reduced the number of voters, and called for elections.

V. Almost immediately, discontent on the part of a spectrum of groups and powerful individuals, including Victor Hugo and the Marquis de Lafayette, led to the overthrow of Charles X.

VI. Moderately liberal elites offered Louis Philippe, Duc d’Orléans, the throne of France on the part of the French people; although Louis Philippe wished to rule as well as to reign, he accepted this compromise, becoming the Bourgeois King, or the Citizens’ King, from 1830–1848.

VII. Although the kingship of Louis Philippe was often uninspired, sometimes repressive, and even corrupt, these were generally good years, a respite between the revolutions of 1830 and 1848.
   A. Following a series of leftist revolts in the early 1830s, relative calm lasted for nearly 15 years.
   B. Though suffering an occasional setback, French diplomacy was cautious and France lived within its means.
   C. Although favoring more conservative liberals, Louis Philippe accepted constitutional constraints.
   D. His regime fostered economic development, a modernized infrastructure, and expanded secular education.

VIII. Still, discontent persisted, especially as a result of the tensions from the 1840s industrial urban expansion, exacerbated by the poor harvests of 1846–1847 and the resulting urban depression of 1847.
   A. Nationalists received little satisfaction from this moderate regime.
   B. Artisans and urban workers were often dissatisfied, while newer elements in the middle class wanted jobs and the vote.
   C. Little sensitivity could be expected from the Guizot Ministry. As Alexis de Tocqueville uttered in a parliamentary speech: “Can’t you feel the breath of revolution in the air?”

IX. The outbreak of revolution in Paris, when the more liberal former prime minister Adolphe Thiers held banquets to protest Guizot’s policies, was a manifestation of the law of unintended consequences.
   A. Thiers even cancelled a meeting, following Guizot’s orders, only to have “guests” show up, clash with gendarmes, and repeat the known Parisian barricade scenario, putting Louis to flight.
   B. This placed the questions bequeathed by 1789 on the table, complicated by the growing industrial, urban change.
      1. In play were the moderate and radical ideas of 1789, from limited-suffrage liberalism, to universal-suffrage democracy, to forms of utopian or practical socialism, making Paris the most combustible European city in 1848.
      2. However, although a “revolutionary” committee contained these three positions and proclaimed universal suffrage and a system of national workshops, most elites and most Frenchmen wanted order and stability.
      3. This became apparent when civil war erupted in Paris in the bloody June Days following the closure of the national workshops; the middle-class National Guard, with peasant military recruits, quashed the rebels, leaving thousands dead and a legacy of class hatred, popularized by Karl Marx in his 1852 essay *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte*.

X. Prince Louis Napoleon, nephew of Napoleon Bonaparte and a fascinating 19th-century statesman, was pleased to assume leadership, although almost all groups who voted for him in December 1848 got different results than they bargained for. Extremely enigmatic, Louis Napoleon was a composite of many of the conflicting forces of the age, refracted through his understanding of his uncle’s legacy; this romantic adventurer was influenced by a mélange of prevalent monarchist, liberal, democratic, socialist, and liberal/nationalist sentiments.

XI. Following his dramatic election in December 1848 as president of the Republic, by an overwhelming majority of voters, Louis’s main problem, from 1849–1851, was how to remain in power, because the constitution forbade successive terms.
   A. Unable to obtain legislative remedy, although the conservative legislators, elected in May 1849, ended universal suffrage, Louis courted the urban and rural masses and the military, created a leadership cadre,
and pulled off a *coup d'état* on December 1–2, 1851, imprisoning opponents and suppressing a workers’ revolt.

**B.** He then dissolved the parliament, called for new “republican” plebiscitary elections with universal suffrage, and triumphing, established a new form of parliamentary structure and a 10-year presidency.

**C.** One year later, with another referendum (7.8 million versus 250,000), Louis established a hereditary empire and changed his name to Napoleon III.

**Essential Reading:**

**Supplementary Reading:**
Gordon Wright, *France in Modern Times*.
Lloyd Kramer, *Lafayette in Two Worlds*.

**Questions to Consider:**
1. Why did the Restoration era prove to be so conflict-ridden in France?
2. What were the major changes in French society between 1815–1850 or so?
Lecture Twelve
Napoleon III—An Evaluation

Scope: Fascinating and enigmatic, Napoleon III faced the daunting task of establishing legitimacy and creating a liberal, constitutional monarchy in a bitterly divided France and a Europe threatened by his name. Ruling longer than any 19th-century French monarch, Napoleon III’s legacy was marred by France’s defeat in the Franco-Prussian War, for which he must ultimately be blamed.

Still, on the domestic front, Napoleon III governed France creatively, attempting to improve the lives of the agrarian and urban masses, facilitate economic expansion and modernization (which would benefit the middle classes and the wealthy), and maintain the support of Catholics. During the greater part of his regime, prosperity and growth ensued.

Napoleon III’s 1850s regime was dictatorial, although not capricious; it was characterized by bureaucratic manipulation and the courting of the masses. In the 1860s, Napoleon III allowed a constitutional regime to develop, including free elections. In foreign policy, the source of his demise, Napoleon III was energetic and temporarily successful, making France the center of European diplomacy from 1856–1866. However, his character flaws and risk-taking were catastrophic. Favoring moderate self-determination in Italy and Germany, as long as France gained in prestige and territory, Napoleon III facilitated events that led to the “unification” of Italy and Germany, and sharing power with new political elites by the mid-1860s, Napoleon III lost control of events and was “bested” by Bismarck, a statesman of greater focus, intelligence, and ruthlessness.

Outline

I. Although somewhat artificial, given that domestic and foreign policy are interrelated, Napoleon III’s regime can be analyzed in two components, a largely successful and imaginative domestic sphere and an adventurous and finally disastrous foreign policy. Even within the domestic sphere, the regime was composed, at least politically, of two eras, the moderately dictatorial 1850s and the increasingly liberal 1860s.

A. During the 1850s, Napoleon III ruled dictatorially, using prefect-dominated pseudo-elections (with universal suffrage) and moderate repression.

B. At the same time, he attempted to be all things to all people, governing on behalf of the French people.
1. He encouraged industry, commerce, railroads, agricultural development, public works, and foreign investment.
2. He encouraged the expansion of credit, establishing a series of semi-public banks and public bond issues (railroads up four times in the 1850s), while also expanding free trade with the Anglo-French Cobden-Chevalier Treaty in 1860.
3. He encouraged scientific farming, urban renewal, expanded education, hospitals, and other social agencies.
4. He encouraged the arts.

C. Napoleon III liberalized his regime in the 1860s, attempting to establish a hereditary constitutional monarchy to “crown the edifice with liberty.”
1. In 1860, the lower and upper houses of Parliament gained the right to respond to the emperor’s major speeches.
2. In 1861, the lower house obtained more control over the “budget”; in 1862, ministers were required to defend government policies before the chamber.
3. Political prisoners were amnestied and more freedom of the press was allowed.
4. With the legislative elections of 1863, prefectoral “rigging” of elections was called off; opposition groups formed.
5. In 1864, workers were allowed to unionize and to strike.
6. In the hopes of educating the new “workers” of France, during 1865–1866, widespread educational reforms were introduced by Victor Duruy.
7. Between 1867–1869, freedom of the press and assembly were restored; Parliament obtained expanded powers, including over taxation; and a free 1869 election gave Napoleon III a comfortable majority, but with 3.35 million votes for “opposition” candidates.

8. Accepting a ministry headed by liberal Émile Ollivier in January 1870, Napoleon III won an overwhelming victory (7.33 million versus 1.57 million votes) in a May 1870 referendum, seeming to have created a liberal empire.

II. In foreign policy, source of his demise, it must be remembered that Napoleon III seemed to be dominating the fate of Europe, at least until the Austro-Prussian War of 1866.

A. Again, Napoleon was an activist, from a combination of motives—courting patriotic and Catholic support, seeking legitimacy, supporting the cause of liberal nationalism, and seeking French gain.

B. Even when well intentioned, his policies were often poorly considered, events often got out of his control, and he did not learn from past mistakes.

C. In foreign affairs, he was also playing in a high-stakes game, with such players as Otto von Bismarck being more adept and ruthless.

D. At least until 1866, this was not apparent to contemporaries; Paris again became the diplomatic capital of Europe.

III. During his first 15 years, Napoleon’s foreign policy adventures, even when leading to loss of life and expenditures, usually led to French pride and Napoleon’s legitimacy.

A. In the imperialist realm, Napoleon pursued a reasonably “successful” policy, expanding in the Near East, North Africa, West Africa, and Southeast Asia.

B. He expanded the concept of free trade whenever possible, most notably with Britain.

C. Although Napoleon’s support for Piedmont’s anti-Austrian war in 1859–1860 got out of control, it did expand liberal national constitutionalism in Italy, substantially restricted Austrian meddling from Italy, and yielded France the provinces of Nice and Savoy.

D. Napoleon’s quixotic policy of attempting to impose Prince Maximilian of Bavaria as emperor of Mexico between 1861–1867 was a dramatic failure but not fatal.

E. His support for Bismarck’s policy of expanding Prussia and weakening Austria, in 1865–1866, became a disastrous defeat, because Prussia unexpectedly routed Austria, coming to dominate all of north Germany.

F. Although Napoleon must be given responsibility for the events that led to the French defeat in the Franco-Prussian War (1870–1871), ending his regime, there are mitigating circumstances.
   1. During his “liberal empire” he shared control with legislators who blocked military reforms, fearing Napoleon III would use the army against domestic opponents.
   2. After 1865, he was ill and not functioning at his best.
   3. In the final crisis, once Bismarck chose war, Napoleon III was pushed into the conflict by French nationalists and those who had blocked his proposed military reforms.
   4. Still, failure is failure; he had the decency to realize the end had come and abdicated, hoping to end bloodshed and preserve the emperorship for his son.

Essential Reading:
L. C. B. Seaman, From Vienna to Versailles, pp. 55–68.

Supplementary Reading:
James McMillan, Napoleon III.
Otto Friedrich, Olympia: Paris in the Age of Manet.

Questions to Consider:
1. What makes Napoleon III such a fascinating subject for historians?
2. What were his major accomplishments, and what were his major failures?
Timeline

1774..............................Louis XVI takes the throne in France.
1775..............................Beginning of the American Revolution (through 1783).
1776..............................Adam Smith writes *Wealth of Nations*.
1777..............................General Lafayette and his volunteers assist in the American Revolution.
1778..............................Deaths of Voltaire and Rousseau.
1781..............................Kant writes *Critique of Pure Reason*.
1783..............................Peace of Versailles ends the American Revolution; Great Britain recognizes the independence of the United States.
1784..............................Treaty of Constantinople: Russia annexes the Crimea with Turkish agreement.
1787..............................The Austrian Netherlands is declared a province of the Habsburg monarchy.
1787..............................Assembly of Notables in France.
1788..............................The Parlement of Paris presents a list of grievances, and Louis XVI decides to call the Estates-General for May 1789.
1788..............................Austria declares war on Turkey.
1789..............................The French Revolution: The Estates-General convenes at Versailles, and the Third Estate declares itself the National Assembly. The Bastille is stormed on July 14. The feudal system is abolished, and the Declaration of the Rights of Man is drawn up. The king and court move from Versailles to Paris during the October Days (October 5–6).
1789..............................The Austrian Netherlands declares independence as Belgium.
1791..............................France: Louis XVI flees Paris but is caught and returned; the Constitution is promulgated; the National Assembly dissolves.
1792..............................Denmark becomes the first nation to abolish the slave trade.
1792..............................The Peace of Jassy ends the war between Russia and Turkey.
1792..............................France: The Girondists form a ministry in France; the Tuileries is mobbed; a revolutionary Commune is established in Paris; the Legislative Assembly is suspended; and the royal family is imprisoned. The French Republic is proclaimed on September 22. The Jacobins seize power, and Louis XVI is put on trial. France declares war on Austria, Prussia, and Sardinia; France takes Brussels and conquers the Austrian Netherlands.
1793..............................France: Louis XVI, Queen Marie Antoinette, and the Duke of Orleans are executed. The Constitution of 1793 is promulgated. The Reign of Terror begins with Robespierre as a member of the Committee for Public Safety. Roman Catholicism is banned, and the Holy Roman Empire declares war on France. Napoleon takes Toulon. War is declared on Britain, Spain, and the Dutch Republic. The Austrians reconquer Belgium. The Louvre becomes a national art gallery.
1794..............................France again regains Belgium from Austria.
1794..............................Robespierre is executed. The Thermidorian Reaction occurs.
1795..............................France: Third Constitution enacted; the Directory receives power. The bread riots and White Terror take place in Paris. Austria signs an armistice with the French, while the French occupy Mannheim and Belgium. Freedom of worship is granted.
1795..............................Napoleon is appointed the commander-in-chief in Italy.
1795.................................. The Third Partition of Poland is made by Russia, Austria, and Prussia.
1796.................................. Napoleon takes power in Italy, defeating the Austrians and the Piedmontese.
1797.................................. A preliminary peace treaty is signed between France and Austria at Léoben, as well as the Peace of Campo Formio.
1798.................................. Napoleon leads an army to conquer Egypt (and does so at the Battle of the Pyramids).
1798.................................. The French capture Rome, Malta, and Alexandria.
1798.................................. The British navy defeats Napoleon’s fleet.
1799.................................. Napoleon advances to Syria. Later, he overthrows the French Directory and appoints himself First Consul.
1799.................................. The French are defeated in a number of battles with Austria and Russia. The French are chased out of Italy.
1800.................................. Napoleon wins some battles for France against the Turks and Austrians. France regains Italy.
1800.................................. The British capture Malta.
1801.................................. The Act of Union comes into force between Britain and Ireland.
1801.................................. Napoleon signs a concordat with the papacy.
1802.................................. Napoleon becomes the president of the Italian Republic, names himself First Consul for life, and annexes Piedmont, Parma, and Piacenza.
1802.................................. The Peace of Amiens is signed between Britain and France.
1803.................................. War resumes between Britain and France.
1804.................................. Napoleon is proclaimed emperor by the Senate and Tribunate in Paris.
1805.................................. The Treaty of St. Petersbourg is signed by Britain, Russia, and Austria against France.
1805.................................. Napoleon is crowned king of Italy.
1805.................................. Napoleon’s victory at the Battle of Austerlitz against Austro-Russian forces results in the Peace of Pressburg between Austria and France.
1806.................................. Prussia declares war on France.
1806.................................. Napoleon names his brothers as kings of Holland and Naples.
1806.................................. The Confederation of the Rhine is founded by Napoleon, marking the official end of the Holy Roman Empire.
1807.................................. The Treaty of Tilsit ends war on the continent between France, Russia, and Prussia.
1807.................................. The slave trade is abolished in Britain.
1808.................................. The French army occupies Rome and invades Spain, taking Madrid and Barcelona. Later in the year, Madrid rebels against the French, and they are forced to flee.
1809.................................. War resumes between France and Austria, but after a few battles, Austria is defeated and the Treaty of Schönbrunn is signed.
1809.................................. Napoleon annexes the Papal States, and Pope Pius VII is taken prisoner.
1809.................................. Seeking an heir, Napoleon divorces his wife, Josephine de Beauharnais.
1810.................................. Napoleon annexes the Netherlands and the northwestern coast of Germany, issues the Decree of Fontainebleau requiring the confiscation of British goods, and marries the archduchess of Austria, Marie Louise, producing an heir.
1811.......................... The Luddites riot in northern Britain, against industrial change.
1811.......................... Austria is bankrupt.
1812.......................... Napoleon enters Russia with his army of 600,000 but is later forced to retreat; only 40,000 of his troops return.
1812.......................... The United States declares war on Britain.
1813.......................... Napoleon is defeated. Prussia declares war on France but is defeated. Austria declares war on France, and in the Battle of the Nations at Leipzig, Napoleon is defeated and forced to give up Germany. The Prussian army begins invasion of France in December.
1814.......................... The Allied armies defeat the French and enter Paris. In response, Napoleon abdicates the throne and is exiled to Elba. Louis XVIII takes the throne as his hereditary right. The First Treaty of Paris is signed and France is given its 1792 frontiers.
1814.......................... The Congress of Vienna opens.
1814.......................... The Treaty of Ghent ends the British-American war.
1815.......................... Napoleon returns from Elba and the “Hundred Days” begin. Napoleon is defeated at Waterloo by British and Prussian forces. The Second Treaty of Paris leaves France with its 1789 frontiers. Napoleon abdicates again and is banished to St. Helena.
1814.......................... The Congress of Vienna closes.
1815.......................... Prince Metternich opens the Diet of the German Confederation at Frankfurt.
1816.......................... At Wartburg, the German Student Organization organizes a nationalist festival to commemorate the Reformation.
1818.......................... The Allies evacuate their troops from France.
1818.......................... Prussia abolishes its internal customs barriers.
1819.......................... The “Peterloo” Massacre occurs in Manchester, Britain.
1819.......................... Freedom of the press is declared in France.
1819.......................... In Germany, the Carlsbad decrees introduce strict censorship and political repression.
1820.......................... The Final Act of the Vienna Congress is passed.
1821.......................... Revolts break out in Greece and Naples but are put down by Austrian troops.
1821.......................... Revolution in Piedmont causes Victor Emmanuel to abdicate.
1821.......................... Napoleon dies.
1822.......................... The Turks invade Greece.
1822.......................... The Congress of Verona is opened to discuss problems in Europe.
1823.......................... Europeans are no longer welcome to form colonial settlements in America, decreed by the Monroe Doctrine.
1823.......................... The Catholic Association of Ireland is formed by Daniel O’Connell.
1824.......................... The Combination Acts are repealed, allowing British workers to form unions.
1825.......................... Following the death of Alexander I, the Decembrist Revolt in Russia is crushed.
1826.......................... Russia declares war on Persia, defeating her in 1827.
1827.......................... Russia, France, and Britain recognize Greek independence and agree to force an end to hostilities between Greece and Turkey under the Treaty of London.
1828.......................... War is declared on Turkey by Russia.
1829......................... Russo-Turkish war is ended by the Peace of Adrianople, and Turkey finally recognizes Greek independence.

1829......................... The Catholic Emancipation Act is passed in Britain, allowing Catholics to hold office.

1830......................... Revolution and revolts run rampant throughout Europe: The revolution in France results in Charles X’s abdication of his throne; Louis Philippe is crowned. In Belgium, revolts against Dutch rule eventually end in Belgian independence. Revolts take place in some German principalities, such as Saxony and Hannover. Poles revolt against Russian rule.

1831......................... War is fought between Egypt and Turkey.

1831......................... Rebellions continue around Europe in Modena, Parma, and the Papal States, along with uprisings in France caused by abominable working conditions.

1831......................... The great cholera pandemic spreads throughout Asia and Europe, from India in 1826, reaching Scotland in 1832.

1832......................... National and Liberal demonstrations held in Hambach, Germany.

1832......................... The First Reform Act in Britain doubles enfranchised voters.

1832......................... Giuseppe Mazzini forms “Young Italy.”

1833......................... Educational reform takes place in France under Guizot.

1834......................... All German states join the Zollverein; Austria is excluded.

1834......................... Slavery is abolished in Britain and all her territories.

1835......................... The first German railroad line opens between Nuremburg and Furth.

1836......................... The Chartist movement begins in Britain, marking the first national working-class movement there.

1837......................... Victoria becomes queen of Britain.

1837......................... Mazzini is exiled to Britain.

1839......................... The First Opium War breaks out between China and Britain.

1840......................... King Frederick William III of Prussia dies and is replaced by his son Frederick William IV.

1840......................... French crisis: Louis Napoleon Bonaparte begins a new conspiracy and is arrested.

1840......................... The London Conference leads to the London Straits Convention, under which the Bosphorous and Dardanelles are closed to warships of all powers and the Black Sea is closed to Russian warships.

1840......................... The Afghan War ends with the surrender of Afghan troops to the British.

1841......................... Turkey’s sovereignty is guaranteed by the great powers.

1842......................... The end of the Opium War between China and Britain is marked by the Treaty of Nanking, under which Hong Kong is ceded to Britain.

1842......................... Riots and strikes occur throughout the industrial areas of northern Britain.

1844......................... French war in Morocco is ended by the Treaty of Tangier.

1845......................... The Great Famine begins in Ireland.

1846......................... The Corn Laws are repealed in Britain, lowering food costs.

1846......................... Revolts break out in Poland.

1846......................... Louis Napoleon escapes prison and goes to London.
1847.................................. The British Factory Act restricts the working day for women and children to 10 hours.

1848.................................. Revolts and revolutions break out all over Europe: A revolt in Paris results in the abdication of Louis Philippe, uprisings of workers, the June Days, and Louis Napoleon’s election as president of the new French Republic. Revolution takes place in Vienna, resulting in the resignation of Metternich and Franz Joseph I’s ascension as emperor. Revolutions also occur in Venice, Milan, Berlin, and Parma. Czech revolts are put down by Austrian troops. Revolt occurs in Rome. The Prussian revolution is defeated.

1848.................................. Sardinia declares war on Austria but is eventually defeated and forced to leave Venice, where a republic is proclaimed.

1848.................................. Switzerland adopts a new constitution, under which it becomes a federal union.

1848.................................. Serfdom is abolished in Austria and Prussia.

1849.................................. A republic is proclaimed in Rome, but later, the French enter Rome and restore Pope Pius IX.

1849.................................. Hungary is reconquered by Austrian and Russian forces.

1849.................................. Venice surrenders to Austria.

1850.................................. Prussian war with the Danish ends, and a constitution is decreed in Prussia.

1850.................................. Cavour becomes minister in Piedmont.

1850.................................. A limited constitution is adopted in Prussia.

1850.................................. The “humiliation of Olmütz” is signed, under which Prussia agrees not to form a Germanic union.

1851.................................. Louis Napoleon executes a coup d’état.

1851.................................. The German Confederation is restored.

1851.................................. Austria’s centralist constitution is abolished.

1852.................................. Under the new French constitution, the president is given monarchical powers; two weeks after this grant, Louis Napoleon proclaims himself Emperor Napoleon III, and the reign of the Second Empire begins.

1853.................................. The Crimean War begins after the Turks reject the Russian ultimatum.

1854.................................. Britain and France enter into an alliance with Turkey and declare war against Russia, entering the Black Sea and beginning the siege of Sebastopol.

1855.................................. The Russians surrender, and Allied troops take over Sebastopol.

1856.................................. The Crimean War ends with the Peace of Paris.

1856.................................. War begins between Britain and China.

1857.................................. France aids Britain in its war against China.

1857.................................. Relatively new to the throne, Tsar Alexander II calls the Assembly of Nobles in Moscow to consider the emancipation of the serfs.

1858.................................. The Anglo-Chinese War ends with the Treaty of Tientsin.

1858.................................. France comes to an agreement with Piedmont to act against Austria after Cavour and Napoleon meet at Plombières.

1859.................................. War is declared on Austria by France, and the Franco-Austrian War begins, ending later that year with Austria defeated under the Peace Treaty of Zurich. Austria cedes Lombardy, and Piedmont cedes Nice and Savoy (in return, getting Lombardy).

1859.................................. The German National Association is formed.
1860.......................... Garibaldi and his 1,000 troops of red shirts sail for Sicily and take Sicily and Naples.
1860.......................... The king of Piedmont-Sardinia, Victor Emmanuel II, takes the Papal States, and Garibaldi gives Sicily and Naples to him; Victor Emmanuel is declared the king of Italy.
1861.......................... The Italian Parliament proclaims Italy to be a kingdom.
1861.......................... The Warsaw Massacre takes place in Russian Poland, when demonstrators speak out against Russian rule.
1861.......................... Russian serfs are finally emancipated, and other major reforms are enacted.
1862.......................... Bismarck becomes prime minister of Prussia.
1863.......................... Revolts take place in Poland, protesting Russian rule.
1864.......................... Prussia and Austria attack Denmark; Denmark cedes Schleswig and Holstein to Prussia and Austria.
1866.......................... The Austro-Prussian War begins and lasts seven weeks (Italy fights alongside Prussia). Prussia defeats Austria at the Battle of Sadowa. The Treaty of Prague excludes Austria from Germany; Austria cedes Venetia to Italy under the Treaty of Vienna; Prussia annexes Schleswig-Holstein, Hannover, and Frankfurt; the Northern German Confederation is established.
1867.......................... The Second British Reform Bill is passed.
1867.......................... The Dual Monarchy begins in Austria-Hungary (the Ausgleich).
1867.......................... Russia sells Alaska to the United States.
1867.......................... Garibaldi is taken prisoner during his march on Rome by French and papal troops.
1868.......................... Revolution takes place in Spain, causing Queen Isabella to be deposed and flee.
1868.......................... The first Gladstone ministry takes power and rules until 1874.
1869.......................... The Ollivier ministry rules the French government.
1870.......................... Bismarck sends his Ems Telegram.
1870.......................... France declares war on Prussia and is defeated in multiple battles; Napoleon III is taken prisoner; Paris is besieged, and the Third Republic is proclaimed.
1870.......................... Italian forces enter Rome and declare it their capital.
1871.......................... Wilhelm I, king of Prussia, is proclaimed the emperor of Germany at Versailles; Paris capitulates, and the Revolutionary Commune rules Paris for two months.
1871.......................... The Peace of Frankfurt ends the war between Germany and France; the French cede Alsace and Lorraine to Germany.
1871.......................... Thiers is elected president of France.
1871.......................... The British Parliament legalizes labor unions.
1871.......................... The Kulturkampf begins in Germany.
1872.......................... Civil war erupts in Spain.
1872.......................... The Three Emperors’ League is formed by Austria-Hungary, Germany, and Russia.
1872.......................... The Ballot Act in Britain introduces voting by secret ballot.
1873.......................... A republic is proclaimed in Spain.
1874.......................... Disraeli becomes prime minister of Britain.
1874.......................... Civil marriage is made compulsory in Germany.
1875......................... The Public Health Act is passed in Britain.
1876......................... Turkish troops massacre Bulgarians.
1876......................... Serbia declares war on Turkey, with Montenegro.
1877......................... Russia declares war on Turkey, finally defeating Turkey at the Battle of Plevna.
1878......................... In June, the Congress of Berlin addresses the “eastern question,” and Russia loses most
                        gains; a small Bulgaria is created, which is fully autonomous; and Serbia, Rumania, and
                        Montenegro become independent.
1878......................... The Anti-Socialist Law is enacted in Germany.
1879......................... Austria and Germany form an alliance after the end of the liberal era in both countries.
1879......................... The French government returns to Paris.
1880......................... A split in the German National Liberal Party ends the parliamentary dominance of
                        liberalism.
1881......................... Tsar Alexander II is assassinated.
1881......................... The French occupy Tunis.
1881......................... The Three Emperors’ League is renewed.
1882......................... The Triple Alliance among Germany, Austria, and Italy is formed.
1883......................... Bismarck introduces sickness insurance in Germany.
1884......................... In November, a conference is held in Berlin addressing African affairs and colonial
                        conquests.
1885......................... Germany annexes more land in Africa.
1886......................... W. E. Gladstone introduces a bill for Irish Home Rule.
1886......................... The Bonaparte and Orléans families are banished from France.
1886......................... Georges Boulanger becomes French war minister.
1886......................... The Bulgarian crisis occurs.
1887......................... In June, the Russo-German Reinsurance Treaty is formed.
1888......................... Boulanger is retired from the French army and elected to the Chamber of Deputies.
1888......................... Wilhelm II becomes Kaiser after the deaths of Wilhelm I and Frederick III.
1889......................... Accused of conspiracy, Boulanger flees France.
1889......................... Hitler is born.
1890......................... Bismarck is forced to resign by Wilhelm II.
1890......................... The Reinsurance Treaty lapses.
1890......................... Charles de Gaulle is born.
1891......................... The Triple Alliance is renewed among Germany, Austria, and Italy.
1891......................... Russia turns from Germany and enters into the Russo-French Entente.
1892......................... Gladstone becomes prime minister of Britain.
1893......................... The Independent Labour Party is formed in Britain by Hardie.
1893......................... An alliance is signed between France and Russia.
1894.................................. The Dreyfus Affair occurs in France: French army Captain Alfred Dreyfus is arrested and convicted for treason and sent to Devil’s Island.

1896.................................. Kaiser Wilhelm II sends the Kruger telegram.

1896.................................. The first modern Olympics is held in Athens.

1897.................................. The real spy in the Dreyfus Affair is discovered to be Major M. C. Esterhazy.

1897.................................. Germany begins to build a battle fleet.

1898.................................. Esterhazy is acquitted in the Dreyfus forgery trial, and later, Colonel Henry admits to the forgery of a document in the case. Emile Zola publishes his “J’accuse” letter to the French president, flees, and is consequently imprisoned.

1898.................................. The Paris Métro is opened.

1898.................................. The Fashoda incident: France and Britain confront each other in the Sudan.

1899.................................. After being reconvicted by the military, Dreyfus is pardoned by presidential decree.

1899.................................. The First Peace Conference occurs in The Hague.

1900.................................. The Boxer Risings occur in China against Europeans.

1900.................................. Bernhard von Bülow is named German chancellor.

1901.................................. Queen Victoria dies.

1902.................................. The Anglo-Japanese Alliance is signed.

1902.................................. The Triple Alliance is renewed again for another six years.

1903.................................. The Russian Social Democratic Party splits into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks.

1903.................................. The Austro-Serb crisis takes place.

1904.................................. War breaks out between Russia and Japan; Russia experiences multiple defeats.

1904.................................. An entente cordiale is reached between France and Britain.

1905.................................. Russia surrenders to Japan: A demonstration in St. Petersburg against the war is crushed by police and comes to be known as Bloody Sunday. The tsar’s October Manifesto establishes reforms, and the Imperial Duma (parliament) is created.

1905.................................. The Anglo-Japanese Alliance is renewed.

1905.................................. Germany provokes the first Moroccan crisis.

1906.................................. Algeciras Conference gives France and Spain control of Morocco and ends the first Moroccan crisis.

1906.................................. The Russian Duma is dissolved for the first time.

1907.................................. The second Russian Duma is created and soon dissolved, followed by a third.

1907.................................. Universal direct suffrage is instituted in Austria but not in Hungary.

1907.................................. A peace conference takes place in The Hague, Netherlands.

1908.................................. After German threats, Russia agrees to the Austrian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

1908.................................. The Daily Telegraph publishes its famous interview with Kaiser Wilhelm II.

1909.................................. Bülow resigns as chancellor.

1910.................................. Japan annexes Korea.

1910.................................. Revolution in Portugal results in the formation of the Portuguese Republic.
1911................................. The second Moroccan crisis takes place.
1911................................. War is declared between Turkey and Italy and ends with a decisive Italian victory.
1912................................. Workers strike throughout Britain.
1912................................. The Social Democratic Party becomes the strongest party in the German Parliament.
1912................................. The first Balkan War occurs.
1913................................. The second and third Balkan Wars occur, and Albania is created; the second Russo-Serb humiliation occurs.
1914................................. World War I begins: Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife are assassinated on June 28; Austria declares war on Serbia on July 28. Germany declares war on Russia and France, then invades Belgium. In response, Britain declares war on Germany; Austria declares war on Russia; France, Britain, and Serbia declare war on Austria. The Germans invade France; Russians invade East Prussia. The Germans are pushed back by the French at the Battle of the Marne. The Russians are defeated at the Battle of Tannenberg. The Russians invade Hungary.
1915................................. World War I: The first German submarine attack occurs at Le Havre; Germans blockade Britain; Italy joins with Allies; zeppelins attack London for the first time; many battles are fought near the Isonzo River in Italy; the Russians are defeated at the Battle of the Masurian Lakes; British and French troops land in Gallipoli.
1916................................. World War I: The first zeppelin raids occur in Paris; the Battle of Verdun begins; Germany declares war on Portugal; the Easter Rebellion occurs in Ireland; the Battle of Jutland; the Allied Somme offensive is launched; there are strikes and mutinies in Russia; Germany sends a peace note to the Allies; gas masks are introduced.
1917................................. World War I: Nicholas II abdicates after the February Revolution in Russia; many Germans withdraw from the eastern front; the United States enters the war on the side of the Allies against Germany, and troops arrive in France in June; China declares war on Germany and Austria; the October Revolution takes place in Russia; a German-Russian armistice is signed at Brest.
1918................................. World War I: Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points on peace; peace treaty of Brest-Litovsk is signed between Russia and the central powers; the German Luftwaffe is assembled; German offensive on the western front; Germans bomb Paris; Second Battle of the Marne pushes Germans back again; in July, the Allied forces, including American troops, make advances; Germany and Austria agree to retreat to their territories before the armistice is signed; Germans suspend submarine warfare; the armistice ending World War I is signed on November 11 between the Allies and Germany.
1918................................. Nicholas II and his family are executed by the Bolsheviks.
1918................................. German Communist Workers’ Party is founded in Berlin.
1918................................. Austria becomes a republic.
1918................................. Civil war breaks out in Russia and lasts until 1921.
1919................................. Irish Home Rule is proclaimed.
1919................................. League of Nations meeting run by President Wilson in Paris.
1919................................. The Habsburgs are exiled from Austria.
1919................................. The Treaty of Versailles officially ends World War I after the Versailles conference (January through June) sets the terms of peace.
1919................................. The first woman is elected to the British Parliament.
1922................................. Mussolini comes to power.
1923.........................The Beer Hall Putsch, Hitler’s famous attempted coup, takes place.
1924.........................Lenin dies.
1928.........................Stalin obtains full power.
1929.........................The stock market crashes.
1933.........................Adolf Hitler comes to power; Dachau is opened.
1937.........................Japan attacks China.
1938.........................The Munich Conference meets.
1939.........................The beginning of World War II is marked by the attack on Poland by Germany.
1940.........................France falls in June; Hitler gives up the Battle of Britain.
1941.........................Hitler attacks Russia.
1942.........................The Japanese bomb Pearl Harbor.
1942.........................The Wannsee Conference takes place.
1942.........................Auschwitz is opened.
1942.........................The Battle of Stalingrad begins and ends in 1943.
1944.........................The beaches of Normandy are stormed.
1945.........................Hitler commits suicide, and Germany surrenders.
1945.........................The United States drops the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.
1945.........................The United Nations is created.
Glossary

**absolutism**: The principle or practice of a political system in which unrestricted power is vested in a monarch, dictator, or another with absolute power (also known as despotism).

**Ancien Régime**: The political and social system of France before the Revolution of 1789.

**bête noir**: A person or thing that someone particularly dislikes or dreads.

**coup d'état**: The sudden violent seizure of a government in which power changes hands illegally.

**détente**: A relaxation of tensions between nations.

**dialectic**: An interpretive method in which the contradiction between a proposition (thesis) and its antithesis is resolved at a higher level of truth (synthesis).

**dialectical idealism**: The system put forth by Hegel, under which he states that ideas are the generators of historical progress and that the clash of ideas is the motivating force.

**dialectical materialism**: The economic, political, and philosophical system of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels that combines traditional materialism and Hegelian dialectics, producing a system in which historical progress develops, largely as a result of material forces, in a dialectical fashion.

**émigré**: One forced to leave his or her native country for political reasons.

**entente/entente cordiale**: A friendly agreement or understanding between political powers; less formal than an alliance.

**faux pas**: A social blunder or indiscretion.

**fin de siècle**: Literally, the end of the century. Refers especially to the sensibility at the end of the 19th century, when the phrase first came into use as a concept.

**Gemeinschaft**: A social group united by common beliefs, family ties, and similar bonds.

**Gesellschaft**: A social group held together by practical concerns, formal and impersonal relationships, and so on.

**hegemon**: Ascendancy or domination of one power or state within a league, confederation, or similar group or of one social class over others, leading to hegemony.

**humanism**: The rejection of religion in favor of a belief in the advancement of humanity by its own efforts. Also a movement during the Renaissance that focused on classical studies, human improvement, and the well-balanced individual.

**left**: Refers to a political group with radical beliefs. The term was first used at the time of the French Revolution, when the radical party sat on the left in the Assembly.

**modernization**: The adoption of ways more akin to those of modern society, in particular the process that began in late-18th-century western Europe and has spread (and continues to spread) to the present day.

**persona non grata**: A diplomatic or consular officer who is not acceptable to the government or sovereign to whom he or she is accredited.

**Porte**: Government of the Ottoman Empire.

**positivism**: A strong form of empiricism, especially as established in the philosophical system of Auguste Comte, that rejects metaphysics and theology as seeking knowledge beyond the scope of experience and holds that experimental investigation and observation are the only sources of substantial knowledge.

**raison d’état**: An action undertaken by the state, therefore legitimizing it. The action can be immoral or even illegal.

**realpolitik/realpolitikers**: A ruthlessly realistic and opportunistic approach to statesmanship, rather than a moralistic one; exemplified by Bismarck.

**right**: Refers to a political group with conservative beliefs.
sans: Without.

sine qua non: An essential condition or requirement.

Social Darwinism: The adaptation of Darwin’s concept of “survival of the fittest” (phrase first coined by Herbert Spencer) to explain the struggle between nations for superiority. It was used to explain the differences between races and to justify the conquest of “backward” peoples in Africa and Asia.

terra incognita: Unknown territory.

trasformismo: The situation of “political musical chairs” that occurred in late-19th–century Italian politics.

utilitarianism: The belief that the morally correct course of action consists in the greatest good for the greatest number, that is, in maximizing the total benefit resulting, without undue regard to the distribution of benefits and burdens.

volkish: The form of nationalism that emphasizes ethnicity, race, blood, and soil, mainly in 19th-century Germany and Austria.

zero sum: The case in which the gains to one side are equal to the losses of the other.
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The Long 19th Century:  
European History from 1789 to 1917

Scope:
How, when, and where did the modern world take form? What did this mean for peasants, workers, the middle class, aristocrats, women, and minorities? Why did an era that began with the idealism of the French Revolution and the power of the Industrial Revolution reach closure during World War I—the greatest tragedy of modern European history? Did nationalism and imperialism inevitably lead in such a direction?

These are some of the issues we will encounter, as we move from the impact of the French and Industrial Revolutions, 1789–1848, into the “unifications” of Italy and Germany in the 1850s and 1860s, followed by the spread of industrialism and nationalism into the furthest reaches of Europe toward the end of the century. By that time, British and French predominance was eclipsed by a rapidly modernizing Germany, Austria-Hungary was struggling to survive as a multinational empire, Russia was facing the stresses of inadequate modernization, the United States and Japan were beginning to play roles in an emerging world balance of power, and almost all of Africa and much of Asia had been gobbled up in a final spasm of imperial expansion. Moreover, the European great powers, organized in alliances and enmeshed in an arms race, confronted increasingly dangerous international crises. Although more people in Europe lived better than ever before, Europe had become a dangerous place.

During these lectures, I will concentrate on the political and diplomatic history of the great powers—Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia, and Italy—but always in the context of deeper economic, social, and cultural forces. Each segment of the course will begin with general overviews, as needed, then proceed to national histories. The course will conclude with the events that led to World War I and the devastating impact the Great War had on contemporaries and the following generation. Although Lenin, Stalin, Mussolini, and Hitler were neither inevitable nor likely candidates for national leadership in prewar Europe, they were rooted in their national cultures, children of their age. What had gone wrong?

This course can be experienced on many levels. I assume no prior knowledge, no professional vocabulary—just interest, curiosity, and, one hopes, passion. The more you give, the more you will get. Course readings have been selected carefully and tested on generations of students. This course is dedicated to my family, friends, teachers, former students—and to you. I hope you enjoy it!
Scope: The course of Italian “unification,” sometimes known as the Risorgimento, or “rebirth,” is often seen more through the lens of what happened afterward—mass emigration and fascism—than what happened during the actual process. Indeed, the final structure of the Italian “nation,” achieved when Italy occupied Rome in 1870, was not what the major players had anticipated.

The best way to understand the “problem” of Italy and the disappointing results of unification is to analyze the plight of “Italy” in 1848, the proximate jumping off point for unification. Since the decline of the Roman Empire, the peninsula had known effective unification only under Napoleonic occupation, which also accentuated forces that sought to change Italy’s destiny. Even during the Renaissance, Italy’s destiny was in the hands of powerful neighbors, Spain and France, because “Italy” was a series of disunited mini-states.

If the French Revolution and Napoleonic era represented a frontal challenge to the largely feudal, disjointed peninsula, raising liberal, republican, and nationalist expectations, the Congress of Vienna restored most of the old order, giving Austria “legal” right to intervene in northern areas directly under its control, in the duchies in central/northern Italy, and in the Bourbon-ruled Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. Juxtaposed with the poorly ruled feudal states, including the Papal States, was Piedmont-Sardinia in the north, which together with Tuscany, was more well developed. From the 1820s, a number of nationalists and progressives occasionally rebelled, while 1848 saw revolutions throughout the peninsula, most initially successful. The withdrawal of seemingly more liberal Pope Pius IX from the anti-Austrian camp and a failed Piedmontese attempt to expel Austria from northern Italy dashed nationalist expectations. When the dust had settled by 1850, Austria and repression were back in the saddle, except in Piedmont, where the recently granted limited constitutional structure remained; however, constitutional and national questions had been posed and would reemerge.

Outline

I. The “flawed” unification of Italy, between 1859 and 1870, did not represent the expectations of its major leaders (Mazzini/Garibaldi, Cavour, Pope Pius IX, Napoleon III) and was more a disguised Piedmontese conquest than a reflection of Italian desires.

A. Even in 1870, the majority of “Italians” were illiterate and spoke dialects unintelligible to those who spoke Italian.

B. Despite the heroism and propaganda efforts of mostly middle-class patriots, the improbable “unification” of Italy can only be understood in the context of the complex interaction of 19th-century ideas, politics, and material forces.

II. What were the components of the “problem of Italy” as it encountered its 19th-century Risorgimento, or “rebirth”?

A. From the decline of the Roman Empire in the 5th century, “Italy” had “degenerated” into a series of small states and regions, experiencing particularism and localism in politics, diplomacy, economic development, and culture.

B. During the late Middle Ages and Renaissance, when Italian culture and urban economic development were comparatively advanced, Machiavelli bewailed the incapacity of rulers to defend Italy against France and Spain (the Holy Roman Empire), which fought their battles on Italian soil.

C. The shift of Europe’s economic center of gravity from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic during the 16th and 17th centuries and the simultaneous growing power of the Ottoman Empire in the eastern Mediterranean, undermined the economic vitality of much of Italy.

D. Still, some members of the Italian elite participated in the 18th-century Enlightenment, such as the historian Vico and the criminologist Beccaria.
E. The French Revolution and Napoleonic era shook Italy from its lethargy, because French armies, especially under Napoleon, introduced a semblance of unified equal laws, administrative modernization, and a variety of constitutional ideas, undermining the old regime. French occupation and nationalist ideas also stimulated patriotic local responses.

F. As elsewhere, the “Vienna restoration” of 1814–1815 attempted to reimpose much of the old order, including the ghettoization of Jews, lasting in Rome until 1870, and the enhanced power of Austria in the peninsula.

1. In the north, Lombardy and Venetia became part of the Austrian Empire; the duchies of Parma and Moderra, nominally independent, were governed by Austrian “stooges.”
2. Tuscany (Florence) was still independent and fairly well governed by dukes.
3. The Papal States, in central Italy, were governed by reactionary popes and cardinals, who feared the potential immorality of railroads and tunnels and opposed secularism and “national” economic unification.
4. The Bourbon-ruled Kingdom of Naples and Sicily, restored and protected by the Austrians, with its overpopulated peasantry, was one of the worst governments in Europe.
5. Only in Piedmont-Sardinia did one see the beginning of middle-class and aristocratic liberal and industrial development, especially in the 1840s.
6. On the eve of 1848, only Piedmont and Tuscany seemed to represent progressive developments; the rest of the peninsula was dominated by Austria, the pope, and the Bourbons.

G. Still, diverse liberal and democratic nationalist voices surfaced in the wake of Metternich’s handiwork, and most Italian patriots agreed that Austria should be expelled.

1. The most irrepressible voice was that of Giuseppe Mazzini, “soul” of the Risorgimento, whose writings and revolts inspired a generation of adherents and forced more moderate individuals to enter the fray. A democratic nationalist who believed in an egalitarian and united republican Italy, created by the people, Mazzini participated in revolts in 1820–1821, led conspiracies, spent time in prison, founded the Young Italy Movement in 1830–1831, and inspired Giuseppe Garibaldi.
2. By the 1840s, a number of moderate voices emerged, including Count Camillo di Cavour, a Piedmontese liberal influenced by British economic and constitutional development. Believing in some form of greater unity to achieve economic development, protect property, and expel Austria, Cavour thought that the middle and upper classes should guide the people.
3. On the eve of 1848, the most promising nationalist threat came from the Neo-Guelf Movement, those Catholics who supported a federalist Italy under the guidance of the papacy; this movement was given a boost by the more liberal papacy of Pius IX, who became pope in 1846.

III. Although the revolutions that broke out throughout Italy following the “signal” given by Paris in February 1848 were defeated, once the Austrians and French regained their composure, it was a clarifying experience for nationalists.

A. Although defeated by the Austrians at the Battles of Custozza and Navarro, King Charles Albert of Piedmont had stepped forward against the Austrians, while Pope Pius IX, fearing disorder and not wanting Catholics to fight Catholics, sat this one out.

B. Defeated, Charles Albert abdicated on behalf of his son, Victor Emmanuel, who maintained the moderate constitution of 1848, while Pius IX, chased from Rome, only returned to power with French troops.

C. Although defeated Mazzinians remained steadfast, more patriotic eyes were directed toward Piedmont.

D. Austria, like Russia, was now despised by liberals everywhere, especially by lovers of Italy.

Essential Reading:
Jan Goldstein and John W. Boyer, Nineteenth-Century Europe, pp. 282–287.

Supplementary Reading:
Harry Hearder, Italy in the Age of the Risorgimento.
Denis Mack Smith, The Making of Italy, 1796–1870.
Questions to Consider:
1. What were the major differences between the visions of Mazzini and Cavour?
2. What were the major forces retarding Italian unification during the first half of the century?
Lecture Fourteen
Cavour and Napoleon III—“Unifying” Italy

Scope: If the process of Italian “unification” occurred between 1860 and 1870, the developments that set this in motion were instigated by Count Camillo di Cavour, Piedmontese minister between 1852–1861, and by Napoleon III. Recognizing that Piedmont could not challenge Austria without support, Cavour facilitated Piedmontese economic and military expansion and courted France and Great Britain by participating in the Crimean War, calling attention to the plight of Italy at the Congress of Paris in 1856.

Involving Napoleon III in a “trumped-up” war against Austria in 1859–1860, Cavour maintained Napoleon’s support when events got out of control in the northern duchies and during Garibaldi’s conquest of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. By preventing Garibaldi from imposing a radical unification, had he conquered the Papal States, Cavour avoided French intervention.

The creation of the Kingdom of Italy in 1860—sans Venetia and Rome—was more of a Piedmontese conquest than a “unification,” as the Piedmontese constitutional/administrative structure was imposed largely without concern for local customs and needs. The same was true when Venetia was “added” during the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 and Rome, during the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1871.

The “great” Cavour, who might have done better, died in 1861, leaving this process to lesser talents. The new state was shackled with severe socioeconomic and religio-cultural problems, particularly between northern and southern Italy and between secularists and Catholics, urged on by the papacy. Events in Italy encouraged similar developments in the German states. Austrian power was diminished; that alone helped undermine the status quo.

Outline

I. Following the failure of 1848 in Italy, the conservative turn in the papacy, and Austria’s defeat of Piedmont, it was clear that the next attempts at liberation or unification would require careful planning and outside help.

II. Fortunately for Piedmont, it found a first-rate leader, Camillo di Cavour, who remained prime minister almost continuously from 1852 until his death in 1861 and who achieved far more “success” than anticipated.

III. Although it seems that Cavour was mainly concerned with strengthening Piedmont and forcing Austria out of northern Italy, he was a pragmatist and a powerful administrator.
   A. A capable economist, he strengthened Piedmont’s infrastructure (railroads), expanded trade (with Britain and France), and helped modernize agriculture.
   B. He strengthened his political base, balancing divergent political interests and ideologies, making himself indispensable to King Victor Emmanuel II, and modernizing Piedmont’s military forces.
   C. Courting favor with Britain and France and gaining status for Piedmont, Cavour sent a Piedmontese contingent to join the Allied forces during the Crimean War, and the Italian question was discussed at the Peace of Paris.
   D. At this point, Cavour accelerated plans to confront Austria.
      1. In 1857 and thereafter, he worked with the Italian National Society, which began to establish branches in north and central Italy.
      2. On July 20, 1858, Cavour and Napoleon III plotted war at Plombières les Bains. If Austria could be coaxed into war, French forces would help liberate northern Italy and broker an Italian confederation, nominally under the pope, while Piedmont would cede Nice and Savoy to France, and Victor Emmanuel’s daughter would marry Napoleon’s cousin, a blatant example of realpolitik.
      3. The plot nearly failed, as the British attempted to bring the issue before the Concert, where Austria would have benefited from the Vienna Treaty. Austrian unwillingness to “launder her politics” in public yielded an Austrian ultimatum against Piedmont, an excuse for a “defensive” Franco-Piedmontese coalition.

IV. Although events got out of control, Cavour mastered the field, maximizing Piedmont’s gains and minimizing
A. Following French victories at Magenta and Solferino in June and July and rebellions by National Societies calling for union with Piedmont, Napoleon reached a compromise peace with Austria in November, leaving Cavour in the lurch.

B. More rebellions and calls for union “materialized,” forcing Napoleon III to reconsider. In January 1860, Nice and Savoy were ceded to France, while, following plebiscites in the north, all of northern Italy, except Venetia, was annexed by Piedmont.

C. A more dangerous situation was defused by Cavour when, following Garibaldi’s “liberation” of Sicily and Naples in the spring of 1860, Cavour and Victor Emmanuel II prevented Garibaldi from “liberating” Rome as well by conquering the adjacent papal territories and blocking Garibaldi’s path. Unwilling to cause a civil war, Garibaldi turned the liberated areas over to Victor Emmanuel, soothing France.

D. Although realizing that hard work remained, Cavour helped proclaim the Kingdom of Italy in March 1861, soon dying from illness after claiming: “Now that we have created Italy, we must first create Italians” and “We are ready to proclaim throughout Italy the great principle of a free Church in a free state.”

V. The remaining stages of Italian unification occurred in 1866 and 1870, without real Italian glory.

A. During the Austro-Prussian War of 1866, in which Italy was Prussia’s mostly silent ally, Italy annexed Venetia.

B. During the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, during which French troops abandoned Rome, papal forces were pushed aside, and Rome became the capital of Italy.

VI. Given the haphazard and forced process of Italian unification and the later emergence of fascism in Italy, it is not surprising that many have emphasized its negative consequences.

A. Italian unification became synonymous with Piedmontese expansionism, with northern laws, procedures, taxes, military conscription, and elites foisted on the rest of the peninsula.

B. The legacy of a severe church-state quarrel was possibly even more damaging.
   1. Self-besieged in the Vatican, the papacy forbade participation in politics until the eve of World War I.
   2. Although imperialism and hyper-nationalism might have developed anyway, the lack of Catholic legitimacy encouraged the state to seek legitimacy and grandeur by other means.

C. Italian unification, by its example and by further weakening Austria, encouraged a similar pattern in Germany, especially given that Napoleon III had not learned to leave well enough alone.

VII. Events might have turned out differently had Cavour lived to set a more intelligent course.

A. As L. C. B. Seaman maintains, the case of Italy was a “bad imitation of a good model”—England. A constitutional structure with fundamental human rights, promulgated laws, and due process was in place; the Austrians were expelled; and the Bourbons ceased to rule so poorly in the south.

B. At least until after 1900, Italian statesmen were not up to the challenges they faced; not much was done to create a modern state or facilitate a healthy national identity. Europe had one more loose canon in a world of too many similarly immature players.

Essential Reading:
L. C. B. Seaman, From Vienna to Versailles, pp. 69–95.

Supplementary Reading:
Denis Mack Smith, Cavour.
———, Mazzini.

Questions to Consider:
1. What seem to have been Cavour’s greatest challenges, and how (well) did he overcome them?
2. To what extent was Italy “unified” by 1870?
Lecture Fifteen
Germany on the Eve

Scope: If the structure of “Italy” in 1848 presented a series of contrasts, that of “Germany” was even more complex. From the Middle Ages until the Napoleonic era, Germany’s only semblance of unity was provided by a loose Holy Roman Empire. Competition among princely and aristocratic states and the claims of the Holy Roman Emperor, from 1555 on an Austrian Habsburg, was exacerbated by the Protestant Reformation and wars of religion, culminating in the Thirty Years’ War (1618–1648), fought largely in Germany. These wars left a legacy of destruction in the more than 330 territorial units of “Germany” and further separation between northern Protestant “Germany” and southern Catholic, Austrian-dominated “Germany.” Amidst this turmoil, four generations of princes/kings of Protestant Brandenburg-Prussia centralized and expanded their power base, creating an autocratic, militaristic, bureaucratic, and efficient state. Under Frederick the Great (1740–1786), Prussia temporarily eclipsed its Austrian rival, becoming one of the five great European powers.

The “peculiar” Austrian component of this competition was that the more Austria expanded in the east and southeast, at the expense of the declining Ottoman Empire, the more multi-ethnic and non-Germanic it became, just prior to the nationalist passions unleashed by the French Revolution. Indeed, the 1789–1815 era engendered a variety of nationalistic and constitutionalist aspirations, later accentuated by Metternichian repression and urban growth. In the meantime, Napoleon’s abolition of the Holy Roman Empire in 1806 and reconfiguration of the region into nearly 20 larger components was given permanence by the creation of the 39-member Germanic Confederation in 1814–1815, with Austria and Prussia dominating, preventing revolution, war, and change.

However, the dikes would not hold. If Prussia accepted Austrian leadership in the Confederation, the Prussian-dominated Zollverein, a customs union created between 1819 and 1834, divided the two powers and helped stimulate economic growth in the north. At the same time, the trauma of 1848 led to an Austro-Prussian confrontation in 1850, leaving a legacy of Prussian humiliation and anger. The future of “Germany” was unclear, but Prussia’s new constitution and economic growth called further attention to its separation from Austria and to its more liberal nature.

Outline

I. The German states were extremely disunited from the breakup of the remnants of Charlemagne’s empire in the Middle Ages.
   A. Although the Holy Roman Emperor was an Austrian Habsburg, from the time of Charles V’s separation of his unwieldy empire into Spanish Habsburg and Austrian Habsburg segments, the “empire” was more a shell than a reality.
      1. The kings, princes, and dukes of larger regions restricted the power of the “elected” Holy Roman Emperor.
      2. The Holy Roman Empire consisted of more than 300 separate states, dukedoms, ecclesiastical principalities, and free cities.
   B. These divisions were exacerbated by the 16th-century Protestant Reformation, the Catholic Reformation (or Counter-Reformation), and the Thirty Years’ War (1618–1648), fought mainly in Germany.
      1. As a result of the rough equality of forces, by the time of the Peace of Westphalia (1648), northern Germany had become predominately Protestant, while southern Germany and Austria remained Catholic.
      2. In parts of Germany, the population suffered losses of from one-third to one-half of its bulk, along with economic disaster.
      3. Strengthening the structure of the Holy Roman Empire was a moot issue, especially given the pressure of Ottoman expansion (Vienna was besieged in 1683), often in cahoots with Catholic France, which emerged as the most powerful European state at the end of the Thirty Years’ War.
C. With the center of economic expansion shifting to the Atlantic seacoast, western Germany often saw socioeconomic patterns more reminiscent of France. In eastern Germany and the Austrian Empire (especially as it expanded eastward against the Turks, in Hungary), however, patterns of feudalism and serfdom intensified, while they were disappearing in the west.

II. In the midst of this turmoil, several medium-sized states developed in Germany (including Saxony and Bavaria), the most precocious being Brandenburg-Prussia, in Protestant northeast Germany, but with outposts elsewhere.

A. In the aftermath of the Thirty Years’ War, a series of predatory and autocratic Hohenzollern monarchs developed an efficient bureaucratic apparatus, a fine-tuned military, and a carefully managed financial structure, colluding with the Prussian aristocrats known as Junkers.
1. In return for loyalty and military service, the Junkers received life-and-death control over their peasant-serfs, acting as the main social prop on which the state and its culture rested.
2. In the early 18th century, Berlin was a small frontier capital, lacking the splendor of Vienna, Paris, or London.
3. Still, the northern German economy began to expand, given the stability provided by the Hohenzollerns, who even allowed a small number of “privileged” Jewish merchants and court bankers to enter their cities.

B. A radical expansion of Prussian power occurred under King Frederick the Great (1740–1786), under whom Prussia emerged as a great power.
1. Audacious and talented, Frederick attacked Austria at the moment of Marie Theresa’s ascension to the emperorship, annexing Silesia and expanding Prussia’s population and resources by about 50 percent.
2. Allied with Britain, Frederick made good on this conquest against the forces of France, Austria, and Russia during the Seven Years War (1756–1763).
3. In addition, “Enlightened despot” Frederick the Great improved Prussia’s financial, administrative, and military apparatus; Berlin became a center of European culture, and primary education in Prussia was second to none.

C. Prussia and Austria also expanded eastward, partitioning Poland (with Russia) in 1772, 1793, and 1795.

III. Still, without Frederick, the military efficiency of Prussia could not withstand the material and nationalistic power of revolutionary French armies, especially under Napoleon’s command, at least not until 1812 and thereafter.

A. The ideologies and administrative/constitutional forces of revolutionary and Napoleonic France were spread throughout Germany, sometimes via French armies and administrators.

B. In Prussia, a number of military and administrative reforms were undertaken, many of which survived into the Restoration era, because the masses had to be given some reason to resist the French.

C. Throughout much of Germany, especially among intellectual elites and the educated middle class, an anti-French, pro-Germanic nationalism was born, even among liberals who initially heralded the message of the revolution, and among “volkish” German nationalists, who were often very conservative. Johann Gottlieb Fichte’s Addresses to the German Nation was the best example of this ethno-cultural nationalism.

D. When Napoleon abolished the Holy Roman Empire in 1806, reducing its 330-plus members to a confederation of 19, he facilitated further mergers by simplifying the confusion that was Germany.

IV. The powers at Vienna (1814–1815) set up a Germanic Confederation of 39 states under the presidency of Austria and vice-presidency of Prussia. Austria and Prussia also gained territory, Austria’s mainly outside of Germany, and Prussia’s in Germany, including further west.

V. Although Austria and Prussia mostly cooperated between 1815–1848 under the conservative, anti-revolutionary Metternich, Prussian economic and administrative development continued to outstrip Austria’s, especially in the 1840s in railroads and industry.

A. Noteworthy was the Prussian-dominated customs union (Zollverein), developed in much of Germany between 1819 and 1834, which excluded Austria.

B. Even under the lackluster Prussian monarchs Frederick William III and Frederick William IV, Prussian military and educational reforms continued.
C. Austria, rather, spent more time dealing with liberal and nationalist threats in its large, multinational empire.

VI. Even as both Prussia and Austria struggled against liberal, democratic, and/or nationalist forces, especially in the early post-revolutionary era and during the Revolutions of 1830, a variety of constitutionalist, nationalist, and some socialist proponents emerged.
   A. This was hastened by the developing urban middle class, particularly in cities; conservatives failed to co-opt newer economic and intellectual elites, including liberals, radicals, and nationalists.
   B. This frustrated the forces of change, which were ready to erupt, especially given the agrarian/urban economic calamities of 1846–1847.

VII. Although the initially successful revolutions that broke out in early 1848 mostly failed by 1849, the status quo was shaken, especially in Austro-Prussian relations.
   A. Austrian refusal to countenance a Prussian-dominated Germanic political union at the “humiliation of Olmütz” in 1850 inclined the two toward collision, while Prussia’s modest new constitution separated it from conservative and reactionary Austria.
   B. These tensions were exacerbated during the 1850s.
      1. Austria’s attempt to tighten the Germanic Confederation by introducing centralizing mechanisms was blocked by Prussian representative Otto von Bismarck.
      2. During the Crimean War (1853–1856) and the Franco/Piedmontese War against Austria (1859–1860), Prussia opposed Austrian support in the Bund.
   C. Fears of revolution and concerns about great-power status led both Prussia and Austria to attempt to augment their military and police structures. Greater Prussian economic development and Austria’s squandering of resources on repression in northern Italy and Hungary allowed Prussia to modernize at a greater pace, under the talented Helmut von Moltke and Albert von Roon, Prussian chief of staff and minister of war, respectively.
   D. Still, the balance of power in Germany was relatively even, because the Catholic German states, notably Bavaria, opposed Prussian domination; Germany’s future was uncertain.

Essential Reading:
John Breuilly, Austria, Prussia, and Germany, 1806–1871, pp. 3–60.

Supplementary Reading:

Questions to Consider:
1. How does one account for the generally positive nature of Austro-Prussian relations between 1815–1848?
2. What impact did 1848 and the Crimean War have on the German question?
Lecture Sixteen
Age of Bismarck—Creating the German Empire

Scope: Although Austro-Prussian relations seemed satisfactory after 1850, tensions grew in the Confederation during the Crimean War and the Franco/Piedmontese-Austrian War (1859–1860). Austrian attempts to centralize the Confederation were thwarted by Prussian representative Otto Von Bismarck between 1852–1859, especially when Austria sought support during the Crimean and Italian conflicts.

By 1860, both powers worried about their status. Not only had a parallel Austrian attempt to centralize its own empire failed, but a Prussian attempt at military reorganization in the early 1860s was stonewalled by liberal parliamentarians, who feared autocracy. Near resigning, King Wilhelm I appointed the arch-conservative Bismarck as his prime minister to save his monarchy.

Like Cavour, more a local patriot rather than a full nationalist, but unlike Cavour, a believer in absolutist power and aristocratic ascendancy, Bismarck knew he had to master the forces of the age; his initial tools were military success, nationalist pride, economic/industrial expansion, and astute political manipulation. A consummate tactician, during wars against Denmark (1864), Austria (1866), and France (1870–1871), Bismarck excluded Austria from German affairs, humiliated France, and gained the support of most moderate liberals, who legitimized his prior illegal collection of taxes.

What Bismarck created during the second half of the 1860s was a Prussian-dominated German Empire, with a large national ego, a history of military success, and a pseudo-constitutional structure that offered few constraints on the monarch or on the Junker Prussian aristocracy—in short, the possibility of an irresponsible and dominant European power. Unlike Cavour, Bismarck lived to defend “his” creation for 20 years, until his dismissal in 1890, a victim of the irresponsible structure he had created.

Outline

I. The events that brought Otto von Bismarck to power, leading to a showdown between Prussia and Austria, began during a constitutional crisis in Prussia.
   A. Somewhat similar to what would happen in France in the mid-1860s, liberals were unwilling to vote increased taxes for the Prussian army, preferring a greater role for civilian militia.
   B. Unable to increase his electoral support, in September 1862, Wilhelm I was convinced by General von Roon to appoint arch-conservative Bismarck as prime minister, hoping to break the impasse.
      1. Sharing many of the deeply conservative beliefs of Junker aristocrats and loyal to the Prussian monarchy, Bismarck had come to believe that Germany was too small for both Austria and Prussia.
      2. More broadly educated, brilliant, opportunistic, ruthless, and daring than most Junkers, Bismarck was prepared to harness constitutional and nationalist forces to glorify Prussia and its monarch and to preserve power; as W. N. Medlicott has indicated, “He was a man of instinctive violence saved by his intelligence.”

II. Often skirting defeat and, as with Cavour, functioning more as a brilliant tactician than as a grand strategist, between 1862 and 1871, Bismarck mastered his domestic opponents and bested both the Austrians and the French, radically changing the European balance of power.
   A. Confronting parliament, Bismarck said that Prussia’s destiny would not be determined by “speeches and majority decisions… but by blood and iron.”
   B. Claiming raison d’état in his stalemate with liberals, Bismarck collected taxes without consent, enraging opponents, who complied nonetheless, which enabled military expansion and reorganization.
   C. Bismarck then involved Prussia in three successful wars.
      1. Having placated Russia during its suppression of an 1863 rebellion in Poland, Bismarck joined Austria in a popular war against Denmark in 1864.
      2. Having reached agreement with Napoleon III in October 1865 and an alliance with Italy in April 1866, Bismarck provoked war with Austria and the other members of the Confederation, calling for a German National Assembly based on universal male suffrage.
3. Using rapid mobilization and railroads, Prussian forces easily defeated the smaller German states, then bested the Austrians at the Battle of Sadowa (July 1866).

4. Bismarck then imposed a one-sided but not draconian peace on the Austrians: Austria was excluded from the affairs of Germany; the Germanic Confederation was abolished; the North German States were annexed or compelled to enter a North German Confederation under Prussian leadership; and the South German states, nominally independent, were placed under moderate tutelage.

5. Welshing on whatever “promises” of compensation he had made to Napoleon III, Bismarck goaded the French into war in July 1870 ("editing" the EMS telegram), while German (mainly Prussian) armies defeated the French at the Battle of Sedan (September), occupying Paris in January 1871.

6. Following the proclamation of the German Empire in January 1871 (the southern German states joined under similar conditions as the northern ones in 1867), in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles, Bismarck imposed a Punic peace on France in the Treaty of Frankfurt (May 1871): The strategic and wealthy provinces of Alsace and parts of Lorraine were annexed; a considerable indemnity was imposed; and German forces occupied French territory until the indemnity was paid (accomplished earlier then expected, in 1873).

D. Following the Prussian victory over Austria, Bismarck’s use of nationalism against liberalism had already yielded fruit. In the fall of 1866, the Prussian parliament, including most liberals, indemnified the government (and Bismarck) for the illegal collection of taxes.

III. Bismarck’s ruthless yet brilliant policies largely accomplished both his domestic and foreign agendas but had dire consequences.

A. To use the gendered language that captures 19th-century culture and diplomacy, Europe had “lost a mistress and gained a master.” In as radical a change in the balance of power as had occurred since France defeated the Habsburg forces in the mid-17th century, the German Empire replaced France as the dominant continental power; the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine poured salt on an open wound, making war more likely.

B. The “unification of Germany” was more the “Prussianization of Germany” than the immersion of Prussia in Germany.

1. The modified Prussian constitution became the constitution of the German Empire, while Prussia, with 17 out of 43 seats in the upper chamber of parliament and a two-thirds majority required to pass legislation there, could always effectively veto objectionable bills.

2. Although the Catholic federal states maintained their armies, they came under the control of the Kaiser (“emperor”) in time of war, and only he had the power to declare war. Military forces were outside of parliamentary jurisdiction, except for passing a military budget every five or seven years, and the aristocracy continued to dominate the military, remaining a separate caste, a state within a state.

C. Although Bismarck employed limited constitutional forms, he succeeded in emasculating much of the “reality” of German liberalism and had no intention of permitting shared governance.

1. “Civilian” ministers were not responsible to the Reichstag but only to the Kaiser.

2. In Prussia, a three-class voting system was kept, in which the votes of the elites counted far more than those of the masses.

3. In accepting these strictures, which clearly demonstrated that Macht (“power”) and Einheit (“unity”) trumped Recht (“right”) and Freiheit (“freedom”), most German liberals and many intellectuals “sold out,” either becoming more conservative or deferring to the military and the state.

D. Although this assertion must be handled cautiously, what occurred, socially and culturally, was the “feudalization” of the German upper middle class, rather than the “bourgeoisification” of the German and Prussian aristocracy, in what is often known as the marriage of rye and steel (agrarian and heavy industrial enterprise).

1. Growing material prosperity often took the fight out of those who protested unmodified Prussian rule.

2. In the words of A. J. P. Taylor: “The capitalists accepted Junker rule because it gave them prosperity and unification; the working classes accepted Junker rule because it gave them Social Security and the vote. The only loss was Freedom, and that is not an item which appears in the balance sheet in a history of trade union benefits.”

IV. This is not to say that all the consequences of “German unification” were negative or that its future could not
have developed more positively.

A. A limited constitutionalism now became normative, not only for all of Germany but for Austria. In the aftermath of defeat in the Austro-Prussian War, Austria reached a historic compromise with the Magyar elites of Hungary (the Ausgleich), establishing limited constitutionalism in what now became known as the Austro-Hungarian Empire, or the Dual Monarchy. As was the case in Germany, this “deal” between the elites of Austria and Hungary (against the interest and wishes of the other subject nationalities) was not intended to introduce shared governance, except between the Austrian and Hungarian elites.

B. In Germany, a certain level of the rule of law and efficient government facilitated tremendous material progress and a leap forward in science, education, and the quality of life.

C. At least as of 1871, most Germans were thrilled with Bismarck’s achievements.

V. With hindsight, most historians conclude that Bismarck had created an autocratic, aristocratic, and militaristic state, with only trappings of constitutionalism.

VI. Moreover, he guided the destiny of Germany until 1890, against all potential domestic and foreign opponents, reinforcing most of the state’s negative tendencies. Germans became more powerful and richer but dissatisfied with constraints on Germany’s growth.

Essential Reading:

Supplementary Reading:

Questions to Consider:
1. What major obstacles did Bismarck face when he became prime minister, and how (well) did he overcome them?
2. What role did economic forces seem to play in the process of German unification?
Lecture Seventeen

The British Way

Scope: By the time of the French Revolution and Napoleonic era, Great Britain’s political, economic, and social structure was more liberal and “modern” than structures found in other great powers. This allowed Britain not only to survive this turbulent era without radical swings in politics but to continue to make adjustments to an urban, industrial reality with flexibility and less disruption.

During the age of Metternich, the “British way” can be viewed by analyzing the opinions of several of Britain’s greatest political and cultural leaders, such as Jeremy Bentham, Thomas Babington Macaulay, and John Stuart Mill, as they confronted emerging problems of expanding voting rights and factory legislation, along with the appearance of such popular movements in civil society as the Chartist Movement and the Anti-Corn Law League. By 1848, the British aristocracy and upper middle class had reached several fundamental compromises, often known as the Victorian Compromise. This solution allowed Great Britain to weather the storm of the mid- to late 1840s, although hundreds of thousands in Ireland were allowed to starve on the altar of laissez-faire economics, religious and ethnic prejudice, and callous neglect.

The first world’s exposition, held in England in 1851 in the massive Crystal Palace, testified to British industrial dominance in a world in which material progress seemed there for the taking. If British colonial expansion in India and China in the 1850s validated Victorian smugness, her lackluster performance during the Crimean War and the ideological challenge unleashed by the American Civil War gave rise to another call for democratic reform. Responses to this challenge on the part of W. E. Gladstone, the new Liberal Party leader, and Benjamin Disraeli, his conservative counterpart, especially surrounding the passage of the Reform Bill of 1867 and other reform measures, substantiate the sense that Britain was still following a somewhat unique path to political and economic modernization.

Outline

I. Although 19th-century Britons committed their fair share of sins, such as miserable treatment of working-class labor; the repulsive if “unintentional” genocide of the Irish during the potato famine from the late 1840s to the early 1850s; the harsh and sometimes soulless treatment of “people of color” in the British Empire; their slow recognition of equal rights for women; and even their often arrogant, self-righteous view of the world, the 19th century was very much their century, and Britons had much to celebrate.

A. Already in the 18th century, the British economic system was the most dynamic in the world, giving them an industrial lead until around 1900.

B. Their political system, too, was relatively well balanced and stable, allowing for change without revolution—perhaps too slowly but also with less risk of severe error or “collateral” damage.

C. Largely because of these two factors, as well as Britain’s history of shared governance and her larger middle class enjoying a more fluid relationship with the aristocracy, the British were blessed with a relatively dedicated and changing leadership elite, often pragmatic, one of the marvels of the century. Over the long run, if the Prussian upper middle class was “feudalized,” the smaller British aristocracy was somewhat “bourgeoisified” and more merged with the nation.

D. Even during the French Revolution and the Napoleonic era, which probably delayed political reform in Britain, the British often stood alone against Napoleon, almost as they would do nearly 150 years later against Adolf Hitler, without a rabidly reactionary turn in politics.

1. Even the so-called conservative British philosopher and statesman Edmund Burke was more pragmatic and realistic than many a continental liberal, and the same was true for many British conservatives throughout the 19th century.

2. What many Brits were trying to “conserve” were rights and freedoms most continental Europeans would not achieve until the second half of the century, such as relative freedom of speech, press, and religion; the right to a fair trial; promulgated law; and protection against inconsiderate government.

II. The “peculiar” nature of British history, at least from the time of the Vienna settlement in 1815 until the last
decades of the 19th century when mass society became a reality, can be examined by analyzing a sample of historical developments and significant statesmen, emphasizing change and adjustment over time with less disruption.

A. Although more people are aware of the nearly unique success of the Reform Bill of 1832, which gave most of the middle class voting rights and more fairly redistricted voting constituencies, a number of other pre-1848 developments are of nearly equal importance.

1. Following the emancipation of Catholics in 1829 and the granting of some greater political rights for Jews immediately thereafter (because of Christian oaths, Jews could not sit in the Commons until the mid-1840s, nor the Lords until the mid-1880s), the wealthy political elite, probably aware that change would eventually go further, co-opted the greater part of the middle class in 1832.

2. As the great “Whig” historian and statesman Thomas Babington Macaulay explained during this debate, this was a “practical question,” and “we drive over to the force of revolution those whom we keep out of political power.”

3. This was followed in 1835 with the Municipal Corporations Act, which fostered local government, an expanded political elite, and greater experimentation based on local conditions.

4. From the 1830s until the mid-1840s, amidst debate and mass meetings (the Chartist Movement and the Anti-Corn Law League, for example), the aptly named Victorian Compromise was reached.

5. In the face of working-class life hardships, especially for women and children, the largely “Whig” (liberal) upper-middle-class industrialists yielded some of their self-interest and laissez-faire “faith” against government intervention, accepting the beginning of regulations ameliorating industrial abuses.

6. Shortly thereafter, in 1846, the largely Tory (conservative) aristocrats “accepted” the abolition of agrarian tariffs (the Corn Laws), as free trade lowered the price of essential foodstuffs, notably grain, for the working class and the poor. Tory leader Sir Robert Peel broke with his party over this issue, maintaining that the needs of the nation took precedence over those of party or class.

7. Meanwhile, in 1833, slavery was abolished in the British Empire, although certainly not repression.

B. Having suffered the severe agrarian/urban crisis of 1846–1847, which brought on the peak years of starvation in Ireland, the British celebrated their unique fortune in having “sat out” 1848 and their industrial preeminence during the Great Hyde Park Exhibition of 1851.

1. Lasting for 141 days, this first universal exposition brought world attention to how far Britain had come.

2. Besides material, scientific, and industrial prowess, the exhibition represented faith in hard work and progress so characteristic of the mid-19th century, especially in self-satisfied Victorian Britain.

3. It was also the crowning era of the individualist doctrine of self-help, popularized by Samuel Smiles in his writings, and of Viscount Robert Palmerston’s belief that, in foreign affairs, liberal Britain could do no wrong.

C. Britain was also blessed with such public reformers as Richard Cobden and John Bright, while philosopher John Stuart Mill, whose career shifted from laissez-faire liberalism to popular democracy (including equality for women) and responsible social welfare, produced one of the great political tracts of the 19th century, On Liberty, in 1859.

D. The claims of reformers, combined with the logic of the “incomplete nature” of the Reform Bill of 1832, in a maturing urban, industrial society, whose “superior” aristocratic and upper-middle-class elites looked insipid during Britain’s poor performance in the Crimean War, produced another surge of reform from the mid-1860s to the mid-1870s. This occurred under two remarkable, though different political leaders, William E. Gladstone and Benjamin Disraeli.

1. During the turmoil and debates surrounding the passage of the Reform Bill of 1867, enfranchising the rest of the middle class and most workers and further equalizing voting districts, Liberal Party leader W. E. Gladstone and Conservative Party leader Benjamin Disraeli sought to get out in front of the pack, partially to claim credit for an idea whose time had come.

2. Although Disraeli succeeded in “passing” the bill, the Liberals were returned to office in 1868, making possible the first great Gladstone ministry (1868–1874).

3. An easily caricatured, moralistic, nonconformist, laissez-faire humanitarian, Gladstone had come to believe in honest, open, fair-minded liberal democracy, including equality of opportunity. Eschewing needed factory regulation, Gladstone helped democratize Britain, ending “religious tests” for
Developing a more modern national party apparatus while in opposition, Conservative Party leader Benjamin Disraeli formed a government in 1874, remaining in office until 1880.

5. A converted but recognizable Jew and a first-rate novelist who was sensitive to the plight of the poor, Disraeli’s modern conservatism was apparent in a number of his speeches and policies: In 1867, he maintained: “Change is inevitable. In a progressive country, change is constant.” Eschewing laissez-faire in the face of the obvious need for more government regulation, in 1875 alone, “conservative” Disraeli passed legislation dealing with public health issues, housing, a food and drug act, and conditions for seamen, while liberalizing trade union laws.

6. He then shifted his attention, becoming one of the apostles of British imperialism, symbolized by the purchase of the Suez Canal from Egypt in 1875 and by many of his most “Churchillian” speeches.

E. Straddling the ministries of Gladstone and Disraeli in the 1870s was the dynamic and creative mayorality of radical Joseph Chamberlain in Birmingham, one of the largest newer industrial behemoths. Chamberlain pioneered social and urban legislation, made possible by the 1835 Municipal Corporations Act, which had liberated cities from the centralized control of London. In the process, Birmingham was made more livable and gained national recognition.

F. The careers of Gladstone, Disraeli, and Chamberlain represent the extent to which liberal, constitutional, bourgeois, industrial Britain was beginning to make the transition to a mass democracy with a modern two-party system of government.

Essential Reading:
Jan Goldstein and John W. Boyer, *Nineteenth-Century Europe*, pp. 41–62 (Macaulay), pp. 82–121 (Smiles, the Great Exhibition (1851), debates about the status of women).

Supplementary Reading:
Asa Briggs, *Victorian Cities*.
Joan Perkin, *Victorian Women*.

Questions to Consider:
1. What seem to be the major ways in which developments in British society were different from those found in continental powers during the mid-19th century?
2. How do the careers of Gladstone and Disraeli symbolize the changes underway in Britain during the 1860s–1870s?
Lecture Eighteen
The Russian Experience, 1789–1881

Scope: In 1789, Britain was poised to engage in a period of modernization, but Russia was at the other end of the spectrum. Oversized but still expanding; multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, and multi-religious but privileging Russian Orthodox culture; overwhelmingly agrarian, with poor transportation and communication routes; and dominated by a divine-right absolutist monarchy allied with a privileged aristocracy, Russia lacked many of the stimuli for change, especially a native middle class. Having entered the European balance of power during the wars of Frederick the Great and the partitions of Poland, Russia was the most conservative European great power.

The French Revolution and Napoleonic era, during which Russia emerged more powerful than ever, enhanced Russia’s religiously based sense of destiny. If the regime of mystical Alexander I (1801–1825) saw talk of reform but little change, that of Nicholas I (1825–1855) was a reactionary age, in which Orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationalism (Russification) dominated.

During the revolutions of 1848, Russia was eastern Europe’s policeman. Still, much of Europe was modernizing, and Russia’s comeuppance during the Crimean War (1853–1856) brought her underdevelopment to center stage, ushering in an era of reform. Engineered by more liberal Tsar Alexander II (1855–1881), the emancipation of the Russian serfs (1861–1863) was the centerpiece of reforms, including local political participation, judicial reforms, educational reforms, and loosening of the state’s police apparatus. Unfortunately, while rebellion in “Russian” Poland (1863–1866) undermined further reforms, the assassination of Alexander II in 1881 brought the reform era to a halt until a generation later.

Outline

I. Diametrically opposed to Britain geographically, economically, and politically was tsarist Russia, although the two states did share something in common in terms of their relationship with the rest of the continent.
   A. Russia was partly European and partly Asiatic in nature, never entirely “continental.”
   B. Russia had a love/hate relationship with Europe, wanting to play a major role, while privileging Russian Orthodox Slavic spiritual specialness, as opposed to secularism and materialism.
   C. Although it was a different kind of empire than Britain’s, Russia covered about one-seventh of the globe by the mid-19th century.
   D. Russia and Britain were also mainstays in the defeat of Napoleon.

II. More significant, however, were their differences.
   A. During the early modern period, the interests of the Russian aristocracy and the monarchy converged. The aristocrats owed the monarch loyalty and service, while they continued to enjoy nearly exclusive local control and other support from the crown.
   B. Serfdom also continued to increase in Russia, even under late-18th–century Enlightened despot Catherine the Great.
   C. Both politically and economically, Russian society was still localized and communal.
   D. The Russian economy was overwhelmingly agrarian; the peasants made up more than 90 percent of the population and were poor, illiterate, and superstitious, and the native middle class was less well developed than elsewhere.
      1. As late as the mid-18th century, Russian tsars continued to attempt to expel all Jews, even as the Prussian and Austrian autocracies employed “privileged” Jews to help develop their economies.
      2. Germans, Greeks, and Armenians constituted a larger segment of Russia’s small middle (commercial) class.
   E. Continuously expanding from the 17th century on (against the Swedes, Turks, Poles, Crimeans, and into the Moslem Caucasus), the Russian Empire was a behemoth, with undeveloped transportation and communications and little industrial development.
F. A multinational, multi-religious, multi-racial empire, Russia had no experience in liberalism or toleration; the tsars, who headed both church and state, were pictured as Christ on Earth, spreading Orthodoxy and Russification.

G. Although Russia experienced internal religious conflict within Orthodoxy, she was not part of the Renaissance, Reformation, or even the Scientific Revolution, at least not until the reign of Tsar Peter the Great (1682–1725).
1. Curious and concerned that Russia was falling behind the west, Peter initially traveled widely, gathering information.
2. Returning home and imposing reforms, Peter moved his capitol to the newly constructed city of St. Petersburg, his “window” on the west.
3. However, anticipating the policy of later tsars, Peter sought only the material and scientific secrets of the west, not its political culture.
4. Forcing secularized westernization on Russian elites where necessary, he harnessed the spiritual power of the Orthodox Church behind his throne, centralizing the structure of an expanded state.

H. Indeed, very much a bridge between Europe and Asia and a land of enormous contrasts, Russia did not become a permanent member of the European balance of power until the mid-18th century, during the wars of Frederick the Great and the partitions of Poland.

I. Still, before the Industrial Revolution in the west, this huge state was enormously powerful, singly defeating Napoleon’s Grand Army, with the help of “Generals” Weather and Space.

J. Playing a powerful role at the Congress of Vienna, Russia was now feared by many European elites.
1. As a result of Russia’s delayed modernization, the elites were 150 years early in their predictions.
2. During much of the period from 1815 to 1917, the overall policies of Russia’s tsars were autocracy, Orthodoxy, and nationalism, with the exception of much of the reign of Alexander II (1855–1881).

K. Although Alexander I (1801–1825), a somewhat mystical and romantic tsar, flirted with liberal ideas, his advisers kept him on a traditional course, opposing constitutional and national change, except in Greece’s rebellion against the Ottoman Empire.

L. The reign of Alexander’s son, Nicholas I, began inauspiciously, with the Decembrist Revolt in 1825.
1. A portent of what was to come, as the union of tsar, aristocracy, church, and serfs slowly broke down during the century, the revolt arose from young military elites who thirsted for change.
2. Thoroughly repressed, this revolt further set Russia’s course on autocracy, Orthodoxy, and Russification (nationalism).
3. Still, the west was modernizing and Russia was not; Russia’s defeat during the Crimean War (1854–1856) highlighted her inferiority, a pattern that would be repeated during the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905) and World War I (1914–1917), for the tsars.
4. Combined with the growing awareness that serfdom had to end, defeat in war, and the fortuitous ascendance of Tsar Alexander II to the throne, Russia entered an era of serious reform.
5. The most important reform was the emancipation of the nearly 50 million serfs, implemented from 1861–1863. It fell short of “total” emancipation, because the peasants’ commune, the mir, was collectively responsible for the government loans used to repay the nobles for that segment of their land given to the peasants.
6. Still, as John Merriman indicates, this was surely the largest single radical social policy implemented in 19th-century Europe; it also occurred without a revolution.
7. Other reforms included the establishment of rural councils, or zemstvos (1864), and urban councils, or dumas (1870), and in 1864, judicial system reform (giving Russia roughly what England achieved in 1688–1689).
8. The tsar also carried out significant reforms in secondary and university education.
9. Much of this legislation applied to Jews as well, while the most egregious anti-Jewish laws, including doubly burdensome military conscription, were abrogated.
10. Still, the tsar maintained ultimate power and Russia expanded its borders into eastern Siberia (near China) and Muslim central Asia (north of Persia) and pressed in on the Ottoman Empire in the Balkans.
11. Although reform was slowed by the repressed rebellion in Poland (1863) and by an attempted assassination of the tsar, Alexander II had just abolished the worst of Russia’s secret police agencies and was considering a national parliamentary structure when he was assassinated.

12. Although much remained to be done, much had been achieved; Alexander’s successors would still play a major role in deciding Russia’s fate.

Essential Reading:

Supplementary Reading:
W. Bruce Lincoln, *The Great Reforms*.
Isaiah Berlin, *Russian Thinkers*.

Questions to Consider:
1. What were the most important reforms undertaken by Tsar Alexander II, and what impact did they seem to have?
2. What factors made it imperative for the tsar to undertake these reforms?
Lecture Nineteen
The Apogee of Europe, 1870–1914

Scope: Although many trends from the post-1848 era became more widespread between 1871–1914, there were several shifts in emphasis, particularly in diplomacy and culture. One force that expanded and became associated with other passions was nationalism. Spreading to wider segments of society and to less developed areas of Europe, nationalism frequently became associated with Social Darwinism, racism (especially anti-Semitism), and with a variety of “pan” movements (pan-Germanism and pan-Slavism). National integration was intimately connected with the dominant material force of the age, the Second Industrial Revolution. Driven by the cumulative power of steam, steel, electricity, and finally, oil and propelled by the merging of science and industry, the Second Industrial Revolution was synonymous with urbanization, mass society, cartels, unions, modern politics, and growing political democratization, including expanded legal rights for women and better living conditions for most Europeans. Unfortunately, the Industrial Revolution also facilitated the intensification of militarism, mass conscription armies, an arms race, and political radicalization.

Also derived mainly from nationalism and industrialism, and fueled by the competitive state system, was a burst of European imperialism, between the 1880s and 1905, mainly in Africa and Asia. Imperialism helped fuel the arms race and nationalist-Social Darwinian impulses and led to a reconfiguration of the Bismarckian alliance system after 1890.

The spread of nationalism, imperialism, and aggressive cultural assumptions, synonymous with a decline in the “liberal” spirit, was soon paralleled by “modernist” end-of-century avant-garde anti-rationalist, intuition-oriented philosophies of such greats as Nietzsche, Freud, Bergson, and Sorel. Indeed, if 1871–1914 was an age of massive change and material growth, it also produced dangerous extremes.

Outline

I. Although European powers began to be challenged toward the end of this era by Japan and the United States, and even by the first wave of anti-colonial revolts, this era represented the zenith of European power worldwide.
   A. During this era, the advanced and industrialized European states became the world’s banker, even in the United States.
   B. Demographically, even with tens of millions of emigrants, Europe’s population reached its zenith relative to the rest of the world.
   C. Culturally and militarily, Europe’s sway was unchallenged, as even the United States did not project much power worldwide until the end of the century.
   D. Particularly from the 1880s until about 1905 or so, another burst of mostly European expansionism, often known as new imperialism, saw Europe come to control whatever “available” territories were left, especially in Africa and Asia.
      1. The Middle East was the only large region in which Europe expanded further after World War I, with the collapse of the Ottoman Empire.
      2. Although Europeans and Japan came to control more of the periphery of China during this era, a greater collapse of China was prevented both by the powers checkmating each other and by the beginning of a more effective Chinese nationalist response, foretold by the Boxer Rebellion (1899–1901).

II. Returning to Europe, in many respects, the 1870–1914 era witnessed a spread and intensification of developments already underway.
   A. This was the era in which the Second Industrial Revolution “took off,” changing the European environment.
      1. It was an era of steam and steel, telegraphs and telephones, and electricity, then oil.
      2. Science and industry merged, and modern technology, including research and development, was born.
3. The period saw rapid urbanization, especially of the megalopolis, along with the growth of industrial cartels, large unions (defending an industrial proletariat), mass political parties, and more effective national integration.

4. Industrialism, which spread eastward and southward, reaching Russia during the 1890s, also encouraged the spread of education and literacy.

5. Leading to an enlarged middle class and an even more rapidly growing working class and, therefore, to the further spread of universal male suffrage in most industrialized states, the era also saw an expansion of legal and human rights for women and a push for political rights.

6. Industrial capitalism and mass society led to the development of forms of socialism (Marxist and others) and more violent protest movements, such as anarchism and syndicalism.

7. It also led to an improvement of living standards, modern medicine, leisure time, organized sports, and a weekend.

B. The second force in this era was nationalism, which spread eastward and southward, usually first as a cultural, then a political force; it became less liberal in nature and more aggressive, Darwinian, and racialist.

1. Beginning in the previous era, conservative forces used nationalism and military success as weapons against liberalism and democracy, attempting to co-opt the middle classes and the masses.

2. With the spread of such Social Darwinian concepts as “struggle for survival” and “survival of the fittest,” nationalism hardened and became a more competitive, zero-sum game.

3. With the spread of “scientific racism” as a means of understanding life and history, and even as an ideology or worldview, nationalism and racism were often fused, against both external and internal (minority) enemies.

4. Even in liberal and democratic states, elites increasingly used symbols of nationalism and patriotism to obtain legitimacy and conformity, especially through expanding primary and secondary schools. This is one reason why the state sought to oust control of education from the church and to establish national curricula.

5. The Prussian victory over Austria and France, perceived as the victory of “secularized” Protestantism over “religious” or doctrinaire Catholicism and of the primacy of science, heightened the battle over education, especially in some Catholic countries, and put people of faith on the defensive.

III. Nowhere was the impact of Darwinian nationalism and that of industrial-capitalism more noteworthy than in the new European imperialism.

A. Not only a product of the primary forces of the age, among them technological superiority, aggressive nationalism, Social Darwinism, racism, and the struggle for preferential markets and raw materials, the race for empire reinforced these tendencies.

B. It was also a primary vehicle with which political elites, using the spirit of nationalism, glory, adventure, and humanitarian mission, reported daily in the press, attempted to reinforce their power.

C. Scholars still debate whether imperialism was a primary cause of World War I or whether it served as a safety valve for Europe’s excess energy, focusing conflict outside of Europe, where compromises could be reached.

D. Under any circumstance, imperialism played a significant role in the development of the competitive alliance systems, first instigated by Bismarck in the 1880s, and in exacerbating the arms race after 1900, particularly the Anglo-German naval race.

IV. A second new theme, or counter-theme, especially in the 1890s and after, was the growth of a neo-Romantic reaction to the scientific, rationalist, and materialist cultural assumptions so prevalent since the 1850s, especially on the part of the younger intellectual and artistic avant garde, which came to be known as modernism.

A. As with earlier Romanticism, modernism stressed the centrality of emotion, intuition, and psychic energy and the power of subconscious, irrational forces, as opposed, or as a corrective, to the previous positivist ethos mandating the dominance of science and reason as the path to progress.

B. With names such as Nietzsche, Freud, Einstein, Bergson, Durkheim, and Weber at play, we are entering our world.
Essential Reading:

Supplementary Reading:
E. J. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Empire, 1875–1914*.

Questions to Consider:
1. What seem to have been the most important themes and developments during this era?
2. Does this era feel “modern” to you? Why?
Lecture Twenty
The Industrialization of Europe

Scope: Although its impact was uneven, the Second Industrial Revolution (c. 1860–1914) brought about greater change than any prior era, affecting virtually “everyman” in its wake. Powered by steel, steam, electricity, and oil and involving new technologies and forms of business organization, as well as possibilities for national integration as a result of revolutions in transportation, communications, and education, the Second Industrial Revolution was synonymous with urban civilization.

Moreover, wherever it occurred, throughout Europe and in the United States and Japan, industrialization led to undreamed-of levels of productivity, trade, and investment and to disruptions in traditional patterns of thought and social reality. Even industrial workers, replacing peasants as the most numerous class in England and Germany, gained materially, while political representation and unions caused political elites and humanitarians to respond to their concerns. Increasingly, both workers and peasants were linked to the nation via an expanded state bureaucracy, national education, and mass literacy.

Outline

I. Throughout much of western and central Europe, the United States, Japan, and Russia, society underwent greater economic and related changes than ever before between 1860 and 1914 and especially after 1870.
   A. Thereafter, these forces spread to the rest of the world, often with greater disruption.
   B. Known as the Second Industrial Revolution, this process had an impact on the ideas, values, and material forces of society, transforming cultures from relatively local to national or even global and from static to dynamic.
   C. Following the “take-off” of this process, a number of significant developments usually ensued.
      1. Through the process of industrial technology, increasingly concentrated in large urban factories, dramatic increases in productivity occurred, including agrarian productivity.
      2. New sources of energy were used, as well as enhanced methods of productivity, merging science and industry through technology.
      3. These developments were interconnected with revolutions in transportation and communications and the development of new industries, such as steel, electricity, and chemicals.
      4. Facilitating these changes were new forms of capital investment and banking, cartels and stock markets, legal changes (limited liability), and protective tariffs.
      5. This created not only internal economic dynamism but also a tremendous increase in foreign trade worldwide. Between 1870 and 1914, Europe’s foreign trade increased from approximately $2 billion per year to $40 billion.
      6. Europe’s population also increased dramatically during this era, from about 266 million in 1850 to 295 million in 1870 and more than 400 million in 1900.

II. By 1914, industrialized Europe (and, to some extent, the United States and Japan) was the world’s workshop and banker, in an interconnected European-wide and global trade network, based far more on interdependence than rivalry, although most perceived it otherwise.
   A. The combined historical experiences of earlier colonial competition, mid-19th-century nation building by warfare, and the Social Darwinian rage all emphasized a culture of competition.
   B. Although the liberal doctrine of free trade peaked in the 1860s, government intervention soon included protective tariffs.
   C. Stimulated by the ideas of Friedrich List, who argued that less well-developed economies needed protection against cheaper British goods, and by the economic interests of Junker landowners and newer industrial magnates, Bismarck introduced protective tariffs in 1879, followed by France in 1892 and others thereafter.
III. Internally, the process of industrial/urban development led to rapid population expansion (except in France) and redistribution throughout Europe and to equally significant changes in the social structure.

A. For example, between 1870 and 1914, Britain’s population rose from 23 to 40 million; Germany’s, from 41 to 65 million; Italy’s, from 27 to 36 million (and several million emigrated, mainly to the United States); and France’s, from 36 to 39 million.

B. As a result of higher birth rates and lower death rates, along with the mechanization of agriculture and more widespread international trade in grains and meat, a constant agrarian population was able to feed the new industrial cities.

C. By 1914, France had become nearly 50 percent urbanized; Germany, more than 60 percent urbanized; and Britain, 78 percent.

D. Europe’s social structure also became far more variegated. Within the upper and middle classes, there was a small new class of cartel-based robber barons, whose wealth rivaled that of the aristocrats. At the same time, the upper middle class (large merchants, smaller bankers) expanded, followed by a larger professional middle class.

E. Although the working classes were also highly variegated, from the highly skilled “labor aristocracy” to those who worked at repetitive tasks, the new factory proletariat was quickly becoming the urban majority. Despite boring, difficult, unsanitary, and dangerous work, living and working conditions improved between 1870 and 1914, but not steadily; economic recessions, depressions, and technological unemployment made life insecure, with unions and social insurance only beginning to appear.

F. The aristocracy dominated high society and government in most countries and remained enormously wealthy, often inter-marrying with the upper middle class or engaging in lucrative enterprise.

G. Among the great powers, only the French government was the preserve of the middle class; the aristocrats and upper middle class dominated British government until the Liberal victory of 1906.

H. The peasantry was also highly variegated, from small farmers to prosperous tenants, marginal tenants, sharecroppers, and day laborers. Especially in eastern and southern Europe, peasants were still the largest segment, often barely surviving the scourges of overpopulation, underdevelopment, and the whims of nature.

I. Although most citizens in industrialized societies were living better than ever and larger segments of the middle class were beginning to live with comforts and leisure, great wealth was also more concentrated and obvious.

J. Even in Britain, 5 percent of the population controlled more than 60 percent of the wealth, while one-third of the population lived in poverty.

K. These were fertile conditions for the rapid expansion of organized political and economic movements that attempted to ameliorate this situation either by revolution or (legalized) unions and leftist politics.

Essential Reading:
Peter Gay, Schnitzler’s Century: The Making of Middle-Class Culture, 1815–1914.

Supplementary Reading:
Emile Zola, Germinal.
Peter Fritzsche, Reading Berlin, 1900.

Questions to Consider:
1. What were the most important implications of the Second Industrial Revolution?
2. Why does this process seem to have developed at a different pace among the great powers, and what impact did this have?
Lecture Twenty-One
The Socialist Response

Scope: Although the implications of industrial, urban civilization included modern political culture, growing democratization, and an expansion of opportunities for the growing middle class, second only to nationalism in this era was the expansion of socialist visions and unionism. The modern urban proletariat was now real, capturing not only the attention of Otto von Bismarck but the fear and Christian passion of more liberal Pope Leo XIII, who recognized that “the plight of the worker is the question of the hour.”

To those who cared only for their wealth and social hierarchy, fear was justified, as even Bismarckian repression and insurance schemes failed to blunt the growth of socialist voters, numbering 35 percent of the electorate in Germany by 1914 and growing in all industrial societies. Nonetheless, whenever working and living conditions showed amelioration, much of the revolutionary bite was taken out of socialist and unionist activity, as the flaws in Marxist eschatology became more apparent; the poor were not getting poorer, and most workers felt they had a stake in their nations. Marxist rhetoric might dominate, but parliamentary representation led to social democracy in practice.

Conversely, where sufficient political and economic gains were not evident, as in Russia, Spain, and Italy, revolutionary forms of socialism and unionism gained ground, and even in France and Great Britain, more violent forms of unionist activity emerged from workers’ frustrations and sense of grievance. Indeed, governments and elites ignored the claims of workers at their peril.

Outline

I. Although there were many non-radical, reformist political and economic responses to the Industrial Revolution, including greater state regulatory intervention and various humanitarian religious responses, the most dramatic responses were a variety of socialist and unionist movements.

A. Most widespread, well organized, and well developed ideologically were the socialist movements inspired by Marx and Engels.

1. In a powerful series of prophetic essays and studies, Marx and Engels argued that history and the development of society were determined by economic forces, especially the dominant means of production in any era, and derivative social relationships.

2. During the phase of capitalism, especially industrial capitalism, the bourgeoisie replaced the aristocracy as the dominant class and, by controlling the means of production, controlled politics and culture.

3. The Marxists believed they had discovered scientific laws of history (parallel to Darwin’s); reversing Hegel’s dialectical idealism, they believed history unfolded by means of dialectical materialism.

4. In each phase of history, at least until the communist phase, the dominant economic system and elite generated their opposite (or gravedigger), who eventually wrested power from it.

5. The bourgeoisie had wrested power from the aristocracy when capitalism replaced feudalism, and the proletariat would wrest power from the bourgeoisie when communism (or a socialist interlude) replaced capitalism.

6. Communism’s victory over capitalism was virtually inevitable, not because capitalism was unethical, but because it was historically unprogressive.

7. Capitalism was doomed because capitalists would proletarianize most of the middle class, making the oppressed (overwhelming) majority have “nothing to lose but their chains” and, therefore, destroying capitalism from within via revolution or through a capitalist-engendered war.

8. Although the process was seen as inevitable, once the proletariat became conscious of its plight, the process could be accelerated by national and international organizations led by elites.

9. Following revolution, a brief dictatorship of the proletariat would create an egalitarian society, ending the class struggle; liberated humanity would then generate wonders.

10. Although Marxism is far more sophisticated than this outline, and can be modified, it suffered from many faulty assumptions.
11. Marx, a pre-Freudian, overemphasized human rationality and, therefore, human perfectibility. Marxists also underemphasized nationalism and caricatured the uni-dimensional nature of capitalism and capitalists, as well as the proletariat.

B. Developing parallel to Marxism were varieties of anarchism, stimulated by the writings and leadership of such powerful individuals as Pierre Joseph Proudhon, Prince Alexander Kropotkin, and Mikhail Bakunin. They also believed in the destruction of capitalism and the transformation of society, either by violence (propaganda and the deed) or by moral persuasion and volunteerism.

1. In common with Marxists, anarchists believed in the goodness of man, corrupted by property and corrupt institutions. The state would wither away, following their triumph.
2. Anarchists disagreed most adamantly with the Marxist “brief” dictatorship of the proletariat; they understood its likely abuses.
3. Most anarchists believed society should be organized in small units, or cooperatives, based on volunteerism.
4. Although, as Barbara Tuchman comments, these radical individualists constituted “a day dream of desperate romantics” and “half hatred of society, half love of mankind,” their propaganda and dramatic, brutal deeds (including assassinating six heads of state) helped raise workers’ consciousness, contributing to collective action, as well as state repression.

C. Somewhat of an offshoot of both Marxism and anarchism was the revolutionary doctrine of syndicalism, an important Marxist movement in France and even more so in Spain and Italy.

1. Its clearest statement was offered by French ex-engineer George Sorel in 1908 (Reflections on Violence).
2. Syndicalism called for the destruction of the state by economic means and direct action, especially a general strike, bringing society to a standstill and causing a revolution.
3. Syndicalism, calling for mass unions and solidarity, had a major impact on unions in France, Spain, Italy, and elsewhere.

D. Another offshoot of the Marxists were the Russian Leninists, or Marxist-Leninists.

1. Separating from the Russian Social Democratic Party at a conference in 1903, in which the Leninists were the majority, they called themselves Bolshevik (“majority”) socialists, while their erstwhile allies came to be called Mensheviks, or “minority.” Proclaiming themselves Marxists, they reinterpreted Marxist ideas sufficiently to warrant a hyphenated title, Marxism-Leninism.
2. In a series of powerful pamphlets and short studies, Vladimir Lenin argued that a tightly organized, vanguard elite (rather than a mass-based party) could “telescope” the revolution, jumping over bourgeois industrial capitalism.
3. Whether a result of needing to adjust Marxism to the tortured state of Russia’s masses or a product of Lenin’s desire to strike out on his own, this was the only Marxist movement able to gain and consolidate power during and after World War I.

E. A final grouping or tendency among the Marxist Social Democrats were the revisionists, those who revised Marx’s theory of increasing misery (the rich get richer; the poor get poorer; and the middle class withers away), which was increasingly untenable.

1. Edward Bernstein was the most forthright opponent of classical Marxism in the German Social Democratic Party.
2. All the parliamentary socialist parties had members who functioned along Bernsteinian lines and assumptions, even if they did not say so.
3. In Britain, under the thrust of the Fabians and other non-Marxist Socialists, the democratic and reformist core of the new Labour Party, working with liberal allies, was well developed.

II. Although the socialist and unionist movements failed to either capture power or prevent war, they accelerated the long process of socioeconomic amelioration of the working classes.

A. In addition to bringing workers a degree of self-respect and psychological well-being, these movements brought their concerns to the forefront of political and religious elites, forcing even conservatives to respond with more than repression or avoidance.

1. Ironically, conservative Otto von Bismarck pioneered sickness, accident, and old-age insurance during the 1880s, arguing that either the state would be partly socialist or the socialists would take over the state.
2. Equally significant, Pope Leo XIII argued in an encyclical, *Rerum Novarum* (1891), that the social issue was paramount. Attacking socialism, he encouraged the formation of Christian unions, enlightened policies and fair wages from capitalists, and acceptance of hierarchy and inequality by workers.

B. Despite concessions, socialist parties and unions grew stronger.
   1. In the election of 1910, obtaining 35 percent of the vote, the German Social Democratic Party became the largest party, while French socialists were led by brilliant and humane Jean Jaurès.
   2. Significantly, in the small democratic Scandinavian states, Norway, Denmark, and Sweden, which avoided World War I, social welfare and regional economic cooperation developed more quickly than in and among the western great powers.

**Essential Reading:**


**Supplementary Reading:**


George Lichtheim, *A Short History of Socialism*.

**Questions to Consider:**

1. How does one explain the rapid spread of socialism and unionism between 1870–1914, and what impact did this seem to have?

2. What is meant by *revisionism*, and why did it develop?
Lecture Twenty-Two
The Longest Hatred—European Anti-Semitism

Scope: Historian Robert Wistrich has called anti-Semitism a protean ideology and the longest hatred. Indeed, it was a deeply embedded and changing element of Europe’s culture, especially at the end of the 19th century, when it developed into newer political and racial forms, notably in central and western Europe.

Although most of Europe’s approximately 8 million Jews lived in the Russian Empire, suffering from age-old hatreds and restrictions, leading millions to seek refuge elsewhere, most Jews in central and western Europe were integrating into the national fabric, especially in the major European capitals. Some were making unsurpassed cultural and economic contributions, many were middle class, and many were desperately poor. Nearly everywhere, except in Russia, Jews were met by new forms of political, racial, and ethnic hatred from many groups in society, from the extreme left to the extreme right. Ironically, given the emancipation of the Jews during the French Revolution and French Jews’ belief that France was the New Jerusalem, both the earliest proto-fascist movement and the first National Socialist platform emerged in France, during the Dreyfus Affair, which also led to Theodore Herzl’s pamphlet *The Jewish State* and to the first Zionist Congress, in 1897.

Outline

I. As Robert Wistrich explains, anti-Semitism may well be the “longest hatred,” dating more than 2,000 years and experiencing many permutations.

   A. During the Greco-Roman era, a number of figures stigmatized Jews for their religious separatism and refusal to accept the “civilized” norms of the dominant culture; however, this sense was not deeply rooted, and many Jews even had privileges under Roman rule.

   B. The authors of the Gospels, in competition for the faithful (and under Roman rule), branded Jews a deicide people; failing to accept Christ as Messiah, they had forfeited God’s grace and were supplanted by the New Israel.

   C. Competition and calumny were transformed into repression and ostracism when the Roman Empire accepted Christianity during the 4th century, while such church greats as St. Augustine and St. John Chrysostom vilified Judaism.

   D. Although the long process of subjugating Jews was inconsistent, the Crusades, from 1096 through the 13th century (intermittent mass murders), and the Fourth Lateran Council (1215; Jews forced to wear badges), marked a dramatic degradation of Jews’ conditions.

      1. Further, the exclusion of Jews from the rural-based feudal/manorial system, resting on Christian vows, excluded Jews from owning land, concentrating more of them into commerce and usury, forbidden to Christians by the church.

      2. This added economic-based resentments and increasing forced social exclusion of Jews; it garnered Jews the hatred of Christian merchants and bankers once usury laws lapsed.

      3. Worse was the growth of popular superstitions and fears that Jews used Christian children’s blood for Passover matzos, desecrated the Host, and poisoned wells (especially during the Black Death). These deep cultural and psychological superstitions became rooted among the illiterate masses, even in Poland, where bishops, kings, and aristocrats had invited Jews to develop the economy, despite the fact that Jews were banished elsewhere in western Europe (England, 1290; France, 1394; Spain, 1492; Portugal, 1496; hundreds of expulsions from parts of Germany and elsewhere).

      4. Moreover, during the 16th century, Jews were segregated into prison-like ghettos in many cities in Italy, Germany, and Austria, even as the large Jewish community in Poland still fared well until the murderous Ukrainian Cossack revolt of the mid-17th century.

   E. Another turning point was the Protestant Reformation, especially founder Martin Luther’s vilification when Jews refused to heed the purified call to truth. In the Protestant areas of Germany, anti-Semitism was given new vigor, while Catholic prelates did “business as usual.”
II. However, the inability of either dominant faith to subdue the other, after almost 150 years of intermittent religious wars, mandated a functionally more tolerant attitude, simply for survival.

A. Significantly, Jews began to gain acceptance in Protestant Holland and Protestant England during the 17th century, which was then transferred to the 13 colonies.

B. Meanwhile, the 17th-century Scientific Revolution (the Age of Reason) and the 18th-century Enlightenment began to undermine religious bigotry and call for toleration, often based on inalienable human rights. Some even appreciated who Jews were and what they might become if liberated and integrated.

C. At least in theory, and increasingly in practice, the French Revolution and Napoleonic eras saw the emancipation of Jews and the end of the ghettos wherever promulgated law was implemented. This came more from modern state building from above than from any change in popular mentality. It was hoped that Jews would assimilate to the point of disappearing; as Jews gained individual rights as citizens, they lost all corporate rights (Rabbinic and communal authority became voluntary), an exchange most Jews were prepared to accept.

III. In western and central Europe, as constitutions were implemented between 1815 and 1870, Jews gained the better part of legal emancipation, although social exclusion prevailed, especially in Germanic areas.

A. Jews were emancipated in the Austro-Hungarian Empire during the Ausgleich of 1867 and finally allowed to own real estate. The last ghetto in western Europe—that in Rome—was torn down in 1870, and Jews gained the right to sit in the House of Lords in Britain when Lord Rothschild took his seat in 1884.

B. However, the emancipation process was more organic in Holland, Britain, France, and Italy (all had fewer Jews) than in Germany or the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Even in France, there were anti-Jewish riots during the Revolution of 1848 and during the Dreyfus Affair.

C. However, even during the emancipation era, there were regressions and serious danger signs.

1. As for regressions, and far more damaging immediately, the late-18th-century partitions of Poland (1772, 1793, and 1795) yielded Russia the largest number of Jews.

2. However, while late-18th-century Prussia and Austria (at least under Joseph II) were beginning to expand access, previous Russian tsars had issued expulsion decrees against all Jews.

3. For most of the 19th century until the Russian Revolution, Russia became an Orwellian-like prison for the world’s largest Jewish community (1 million “Russian” Jews in 1850; 5–6 million in 1900), with long periods of repression, briefer moments of respite, and severe government repression and violence (late-19th-century mayhem known as pogroms).

4. Demographic pressures and economic stagnation, combined with riots and repression, sent more than 2 million Jews to the United States between 1880–1924, when severe American quotas functionally limited the entry of Russian Jews and Italian Catholics.

5. Even where emancipation was more widely accepted, it had many opponents, mostly among conservatives and religious elites.

6. However, over time, most British, French, Dutch, and Italian Jews became acculturated, largely middle class, and did not need to convert to obtain influence in politics or culture.

7. German nationalism, in particular, was more volkish in nature, especially among anti-French conservatives but even among many liberals; rights and freedoms were understood more in ethno-communal terms than in individual/legal terms, and society was deeply Christian.

8. Although Jews were emancipated in Austria and Germany by 1870, they were never viewed as part of the core nation by either the upper elites or the masses; even converted Jews were often excluded from positions of power in the army and universities.

9. Sadly, within the “native” cultural elite, including the universities, there was a negative reaction to the emancipation of Jews and to their contributions. In Germany, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and France, there were mass-based political and religious movements calling for the removal of Jewish rights during the 1880–1914 era, in what Peter Pulzer calls the rise of “political anti-Semitism.”

10. One of the developments that fed into political anti-Semitism was the Darwinian, racist cultural mania of the late 19th century.

11. As “racism” was deemed scientifically based and biologically determined and “racial science” categorized the world’s ethnic communities into hierarchies, Jews were categorized as a race as well, with mostly negative characteristics. Where this biologically based understanding of culture became most rooted—especially in the Germanic lands—racial poisoning (Judaicization) was seen as even
more dangerous than in other nations, such as France, where the poisoning was understood to be more cultural.

12. Thus, the late 19th century saw a large number of major scholars, journalists, and religious luminaries decrying the demise of European civilization as a result of Jewish cultural, economic, and biological domination and contamination; these folks called for a battle to save Europe’s soul, and their message spread widely.

13. This agitation came to a head most pointedly in democratic France during the Dreyfus Affair (1894–1905); at that time, at least, it got a widespread hearing, in a process of values clarification, leading to the Jewish officer’s exoneration and rehabilitation.

14. However, a large segment among the elites continued to oppose Dreyfus’s innocence, while opponents founded one of the earliest proto-fascist leagues (the Action Française).

D. Still, on the eve of World War I, things seemed to have quieted for the Jews of western and central Europe, even as tens of thousands more arrived from Russia.

Essential Reading:

Supplementary Reading:
M. Perry and F. Schweitzer, *Anti-Semitism: Myth and Hate from Antiquity to the Present.*
George Mosse, *Toward the Final Solution: A History of European Racism.*

Questions to Consider:
1. What seem to have been the major causes of “modern” anti-Semitism?
2. How was it different from the traditional variety, and what impact did this have?
Lecture Twenty-Three
England, 1868–1914—Liberalism to Democracy

Scope: Although England’s industrial dominance was eclipsed by Germany and the United States on the eve of World War I and her extended empire was becoming a source of both strain and pride, the English response to industrial society was still more successful than that of the other European powers. Benefiting from a reasonably effective two-party system, even as Irish nationalists and laborites played a larger role by 1900, and from a relatively responsible political elite, England sought increasing democratization of national and local politics; governmental responses to industrial, urban problems; a serious attempt to cope with growing Irish nationalism; and an earnest response to urban blight and the challenges of socialism and unionism. Even though the English aristocracy was still the richest in Europe, its members’ political dominance was passing and they increasingly paid taxes. If British imperial expansion was second to none, their isolation during the Boer War (1899–1902) began to bring a reevaluation of the implications of empire and “splendid [diplomatic] isolation.” They simply seemed to adjust better to problem solving, although suffragette and syndicalist union claims and tactics belied this, while near civil war brewed with respect to Irish Home Rule, interrupted only by the outbreak of World War I in late summer 1914.

Outline

I. Although Britain made a reasonable transition from mid-19th–century liberalism to pre–World War I democracy and mass society, its exceptionalism within Europe was challenged, and it faced a number of difficult problems.

A. Still competitive, with advantages in acquired markets and its preeminent merchant fleet and navy, British industrial supremacy was yielding by 1900.
   1. German banking, industrial entrepreneurship, science, technology, and university training were more dynamic, its industrial plant newer and more modern.
   2. The United States was simply the United States.
   3. Even France and Japan were capable competitors.

B. The British Empire expanded greatly during these years, equaling that of Rome. It was a source of pride and advantage but also expensive and dangerous, particularly when others were pressing the British for concessions around the globe. This forced the British to expand their navy, first adopting a two-power standard (against any two opponents), then even beyond this level.

C. Because industrial mass society, with universal male suffrage in 1884 and the challenge of mass-based unions, required more revenue for social expenditures, overextended Britain now faced the problem of balancing guns and butter.

D. Britain also faced a number of other seemingly intractable “domestic” issues, including the Irish national movement’s drive for self-rule or independence and the growing militancy of both the organized industrial proletariat and the suffragettes. With the greater stridency in political discourse, in a world impregnated with Social Darwinism, liberal attitudes of tolerance and compromise seemed on the decline.

II. Still, an analysis of selected issues in British politics from 1880 to 1914 indicates that the “British way” had not been totally compromised.

A. Forming a Liberal ministry between 1880 and 1884, W. E. Gladstone enfranchised the last group of men, the rural labor force, and attacked the problem of Ireland through further land reforms and some repression.
   1. Ireland was no longer simply a religious, cultural, and economic issue but a national one, with racial overtones. Ireland had become a typical colonial problem and could not be settled either by reform or repression.
   2. The issue was complicated by the fact that Northern Ireland (Ulster) had a majority of Protestants, against concessions, while the Catholic nationalist parties in Ireland sent a number of delegates to the British Parliament, where their votes were sometimes critical.
B. Returning to power briefly in 1885 and once again between 1892–1894, Gladstone introduced Home Rule bills for Ireland that might have worked similarly to arrangements made with the “white” dominions of Canada (1867), Australia (1900), New Zealand (1907), and South Africa (1909).

1. Both bills failed, with Joseph Chamberlain bolting the liberals in 1886, establishing a relationship with the (imperial) conservatives.
2. On the eve of World War I, another Liberal ministry, supported by Irish and Labour Party votes, was poised to implement Home Rule, risking civil war in Ulster. The outbreak of war delayed the crisis, and Ireland got both Home Rule (and later full independence) and civil war during and following World War I.

C. With the exception of the 1892–1894 interlude, the years between 1886 and 1905 were a time of conservative dominance, under Lord Salisbury until 1903.

1. Now a party of big business and aristocrats, little national legislation was passed. This relative “loss of time” was unfortunate, as growing urban social issues did not evaporate. Matters for workers were temporarily made worse by the House of Lords’ Taff-Vale decision of 1901, which made unions liable for damages and losses incurred by businesses during strikes.
2. Conservative hegemony was brought to a close by Britain’s imperial misadventure during the Boer War (1899–1902), begun by Colonial Secretary Joseph Chamberlain.
3. The Boer War, against the Dutch settlers in what later became South Africa, became a kind of British Vietnam.
4. Extreme measures, including “concentration camps,” were used against white Protestant guerillas, who bedeviled a large British army, to the delight of Britain’s competitors and costly in revenue and pride to Britain.
5. Tragically, the “liberal” settlement Britain afforded the Dutch later enabled them to establish apartheid.

D. These circumstances brought the Liberals, led by new leaders, into power in 1906, now facing a backlog of issues.

1. Between 1901 and 1903, studies made it clear that one-third of the population still lived in chronic poverty and that many men were unfit for military service.
2. Between the 1880s and 1906, the Labour Party took form, composed of a variety of strands of British socialism, from reform-oriented Fabianism to transformative Marxism. However British socialism was more moderate, and Labour and Liberal candidates often cooperated against Conservatives; the Labour Party pushed for social legislation and economic redistribution.
3. From the 1880s, mass-based unions undertook large strikes, often with public support, only to be incensed by the 1901 Taff-Vale decision and the 1909 Lord Osbourne decision, which forbade unions from using dues for political campaigns.
4. As women gained more control over their bodies and somewhat more over their property and their children during the second half of the century, as well as the right to take university degrees, the suffragette movement became more well organized and militant.
5. Beginning in 1909, suffragettes began to deface property and set fires, to go on hunger strikes, and to create powerful spectacles at large public gatherings.
6. Considerable economic progress had been achieved in Ireland, but it was too little, too late; Ireland was now a “national” issue.

E. Faced with this reality, which was magnified by the naval race with Germany and the need to expand the army, Liberals, abandoning laissez-faire, except for free trade, passed a number of reforms between 1906 and 1910.

1. The navy was expanded, while a series of army reforms established a British Expeditionary Force, a reorganized general staff, and more reserve officers.
2. A number of mild social reforms were passed, and some additional workers’ regulatory legislation, but the House of Lords, against common practice, began to veto a number of pieces of social legislation.

F. Pressed by increasingly independent Labour Party leaders and unions (Taff-Vale had been overturned by legislation) and wanting to revive the popularity of the Liberal party, Finance Minister David Lloyd George provoked a conflict with the House of Lords in his People’s Budget of 1909 (substantial income taxes, inheritance taxes, and land taxes).
1. The Lords vetoed this legislation but passed it after the Liberals triumphed narrowly in the 1910 election and resubmitted the bill.
2. Seeking revenge and unwilling to allow the Lords to blunt the pace of social reform, the Liberals passed the Peerage Bill of 1911, with King George V threatening to create liberal peers if they balked further.
3. Although the Lords could still hold up legislation somewhat, they now became largely an advisory body.

G. Between 1911 and 1914, the Liberals passed significant legislation.
1. Most important was the National Insurance Act of 1911, an omnibus bill dealing with sickness, accident, and old-age insurance.
2. Payment was introduced for MPs in 1911, and unions were permitted to use funds for political purposes in 1913.
3. A third Irish Home Rule Bill was introduced in 1912, which would have become law in 1914 had war not broken out.
4. Women's suffrage might also have been introduced but for the war; it became law in 1919, completed in 1929.

H. Although Britain was a more turbulent society, a transition to full democracy was well underway.

Essential Reading:

Supplementary Reading:
George Dangerfield, *Strange Death of Liberal England*.

Questions to Consider:
1. What seem to have been the major developments that occurred in England between 1880 and 1914?
2. To what extent could England still be considered somewhat exceptional, in terms of how it coped with the process of modernization and change during this era?
Lecture Twenty-Four
The Third Republic—France, 1870–1914

Scope: Emerging from the Franco-Prussian War and the trauma of a civil war (known as the Commune of Paris) but already in “political gesticulation” during the last decade of Napoleon III’s regime, the Third Republic struggled to consolidate itself during the 1870s and most of the 1880s and to defend itself during a progressively more intensive series of crises—the Boulanger Crisis (1887–1889), the Panama Scandal (1893), and the Dreyfus Affair (1894–1905), an event so profound that it is sometimes known merely as “the Affair.”

Although already divided because of the unresolved remnants from 1789 (church versus state, aristocracy/monarchy versus middle class/liberal democracy, Paris versus most of the rest of France, peasant versus worker) and in some ways becoming more polarized as a result of industrial/urban changes and attendant radical ideologies, Republican France became more stabilized as a result of the “values-clarifying” nature of the Dreyfus Affair. An overwhelming majority of Frenchmen, including most peasants and workers, recognized that they were best served by republican institutions, due process, and basic civil rights. Thus, France would remain a republic, although still a fairly conservative one. On a more profound level, France’s greatest potential problems came from her sluggishness in economic modernization and demographic growth. This was to make the price France would pay in World War I even more profound and enduring.

Outline

I. Following the Franco-Prussian War and the Commune, the Third Republic went through a series of fairly distinct, troubled, and “very French” phases of development.

A. The first phase, from the Commune until the triumph of the Republic in 1879, represents the conflict-laden nature of French political culture, the residue of 1789.

1. Following the French defeat at the Battle of Sedan, Parisians resisted the German siege from September 1870 to January 1871, with extreme privations.
2. After learning of France’s surrender, largely democratic and patriotic forces (including some anarchists and socialists) took power in Paris, forming a government known as the Commune.
3. Standing for a decentralized republic (with tinges of socialism and anarchism), the Communards were angered by what they perceived to be the capitulation of conservative France, and that the provisional government, set up under Orleanist workhorse Adolphe Thiers, decided to meet in Versailles.
4. Terminating the moratorium on Parisian rent and debt payments and canceling pay for the National Guard, Thiers seemed insensitive to the special needs of Paris. As Thiers said, “The republic is the form of government that divides Frenchmen the least,” and “the republic will be conservative or it will not be.”
5. Between May 21–28, the provisional government’s regular army, reinforced by thousands of volunteers from rural France, subdued Paris in an orgy of recriminations, terror, and murder, leaving 20,000 dead, 7,500 imprisoned, and deep class hatred.
6. Thereafter, Thiers and moderate to democratic allies oversaw the installation of conservative republican institutions, with Thiers elected president in 1871 against the designs of a variety of monarchists.
7. The early years were touch-and-go; peasant France and local nobles first elected a majority of monarchists to the Chambers.
8. Fortunately, because the Bourbon claimant wanted a full restoration, the monarchists had to bide their time, hoping the Orleanist claimant might get his chance.
9. In May 1877, when republicans controlled the Chamber of Deputies, the monarchists attempted an electoral coup, only to be bested by the republicans, who came to control the Senate as well in 1878, “forcing” monarchist president General MacMahon to resign in 1879.
B. Between 1879 and 1885, in a brief stabilizing era, republicans consolidated their gains, attempted to heal wounds, and tried to emasculate their enemies.

1. In 1880, Paris was made the capital; Communards were amnestied; July 14, Bastille Day, became a national holiday; The Marseillaise was made the national anthem; and civil liberties were enacted, including greater freedom of the press, unions, and local government.

2. In a series of educational reforms and anticlerical legislation enacted from 1880–1882, the Jesuits were expelled, civil divorce was permitted, unauthorized clerical orders lost their rights to teach, and free, compulsory elementary education was established.

3. During this era, transportation facilities were modernized, while France made imperial “gains” in Asia and Africa.

C. From the mid- to late 1880s through 1905, the Republic survived a series of self-inflicted trials, which again brought France to the brink of civil war but ended by strengthening its republican character.

1. The first challenge surrounded the persona of General Georges Boulanger, an adventurer who became minister of war during a scandal surrounding the president and whom ultra-nationalists and monarchists hoped would overthrow the Republic. More “sound and fury” than substance, Boulanger fled when the minister of the interior summoned him.

2. The second crisis, the Panama Scandal (1893), had deeper meaning; coming after 10 years of anti-Semitic propaganda (Edouard Drumont’s 1886 Jewish France, a bestseller), it involved the bribery of numerous members of Parliament by, among others, several Jewish financiers. Many conservatives and Catholics believed Jews (the Rothschilds) were responsible for the Catholic Union Générale bank failure (1882) and that “Jewish power” was behind anticlerical legislation. These were the stock in trade of Drumont’s popular anti-Semitic newspaper, La Libre Parole, but were also propounded by La Croix, one of the more powerful, anti-Semitic Catholic newspapers.

3. These successive crises collapsed into the Dreyfus Affair (1894–1905), often referred to as the Second French Revolution. It began in 1894, when the military elite, threatened by Drumont, charged Jewish Captain Alfred Dreyfus with spying for the Germans and convicted him, using forged documents and illegal procedures. When crowds chanted “down with the Jews!” at Dreyfus’s degradation ceremony, Theodor Herzl dashed off his prophetic essay The Jewish State, founding the Zionist movement.

4. However, Dreyfus was innocent and the treason continued.

5. What transformed the “case” into “the Affair” in January 1898 was Emile Zola’s inflammatory letter “J’accuse,” published in radical Georges Clemenceau’s newspaper, L’Aurore, ushering in the “protest of the intellectuals.”

6. It came down to two different views of France: For Dreyfusards, inheriting the mantle of 1789, the rights of the individual were paramount, and even the army had to be governed by just laws. For anti-Dreyfusards, Dreyfus, the alien, was existentially guilty, technically or not; protection of the army’s honor, even by forged documents, was a patriotic duty

7. For three years, amidst public disorder and fear of civil war, Frenchmen argued with one another, while Dreyfus was again convicted, “with extenuating circumstances,” by a second court martial, then pardoned by the new French president (in the fall of 1899), and finally, fully rehabilitated by the highest court in 1906.

8. More important than the particulars was the dramatic impact this mass experience had on French society and politics.

9. Although anti-Dreyfusards (including loud voices in the church and military) held their ground, actually founding early proto-fascist and even National Socialist platforms, the majority of the elite and the majority of Frenchmen reconfirmed the 1789 revolution and the Republic—equality of the law, sacred rights of the individual (even for Jews), and civilian authority.

10. Although the political center of gravity shifted to the left, bringing the “radicals” (center-left democrats) into power, this political drama made most socialists more moderate, demonstrating that due process and the Republic were worth defending.

11. As part of a punitive reaction that went too far, the church and state were finally separated, in 1905, which in the end, probably worked best for both.

D. The aftermath of the Affair could have led to even more tensions between Catholics and Republicans and between the military and civilians but for the bellicose nature of German diplomacy, beginning with the First Moroccan Crisis (1905–1906). This acted as a segue into the last pre-war era, which saw a partial
national reconciliation, relative political stability, and economic progress. By 1914, for better or worse, a patriotic revival had occurred, backed by military and diplomatic preparation; the French national fabric was readied for the immense challenge that awaited all European great powers.

II. Although the history of the Third Republic, from 1870–1914, was often tormented, in relative terms, France was a wealthy, well-governed, and free society. In “democratic” France, more than 8 million individuals owned land or real estate; there were also 14 million savings accounts—not a bad record for a government born amidst national humiliation and civil war.

Essential Reading:

Supplementary Reading:
Robert Gildea, *The Third Republic from 1870 to 1914*.

Questions to Consider:
1. Why did the French have so much difficulty establishing and maintaining a republican form of government?
2. What were the Republic’s greatest successes during this era?
Biographical Notes

**Charles Albert** (1798–1849): King of Piedmont-Sardinia from 1831–1849. In a rather undistinguished political career, he modified the army and the state’s fiscal system and tried to stave off revolution in the 1840s by implementing a number of moderate reforms, including a constitution in 1848. Desiring to rid northern Italy of Austrian domination, he twice supported unsuccessful revolutions against Habsburg positions in Lombardy and was forced to abdicate in favor of his son, Victor Emmanuel II.

**Alexander I** (1777–1825): Tsar of Russia from 1801–1825. Cosmopolitan in his vision, he implemented liberal reforms in the police department and educational system while abating restrictions on travel. He allied against Napoleon in 1805 but signed a treaty with the emperor in 1807 at Tilsit after humbling defeats at Austerlitz and Friedland that all but decimated Russian resistance. Alexander added to the size of the empire by obtaining lands in the Caucasus region, as a result of a war with the Persians (1804–1813), and Bessarabia, after a war with the Turks (1806–1812). After helping to defeat Napoleon’s fateful expeditions into Russia’s interior, he became more conservative and reactionary, rescinding many of his more progressive measures.

**Alexander II** (1818–1881): Successor to his father, Nicholas I, as tsar of Russia from 1855–1881. He emancipated the serfs in 1861, reformed the judiciary, granted more local autonomy to the zemstvos (local assemblies), and relieved press censorship and educational restrictions—all of which contrasted sharply with the violent repression imposed on the Polish insurrections of 1863. Alexander worked quickly to achieve a peace with Britain and France after the Crimean War but pursued an aggressive policy of conquest and expansion in central and east Asia. He sold Alaska to the United States in 1867 and committed Russia to the Three Emperors’ League alliance with Austria-Hungary and Germany, a tenuous situation because of the conflicting Balkan interests of Russia and the Dual Monarchy. Alexander was assassinated in 1881 by members of a radical terrorist organization.

**Alexander III** (1845–1894): Succeeded his father, Alexander II, as tsar of Russia from 1881–1894. He did much to rescind many of the progressive achievements of the previous regime. Police powers were augmented, education was made increasingly conservative, the autonomy of local zemstvos and judicial bodies was curbed, and religious freedom was curtailed. Despite efforts for peace in European relations, his rule saw Russian expansionary endeavors in Asia and chronic disputes with Austria-Hungary over the explosive Balkans region.

**Marie Antoinette** (1755–1793): Wife of King Louis XVI of France and daughter of Austrian Archduchess Maria Theresa and Francis I, Holy Roman Emperor. Her marriage was arranged to strengthen the ties between long-time rivals France and Austria. Unhappy in her relationship, she turned to a life of debauchery and material excesses. Her queenship was embroiled in scandal and rumor, most notably the Diamond Necklace Affair. Her hostility to the revolution and her hatred of the popular minister of finance, Jacques Necker, brought public scorn. She was tried in front of a revolutionary tribunal on October 14–15, 1793; found guilty; and guillotined.

**Herbert Asquith** (1852-1928): British politician. Entered Parliament as a liberal in 1886, served as junior counsel to Charles Parnell, advocated free-trade and imperialist policies (particularly toward Africa), and served as Chancellor of the Exchequer before replacing Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman as prime minister in 1908. Asquith instituted social welfare reforms and led a push for Irish Home Rule. His wartime cooperation with the conservatives dissolved amidst military failures, compelling him to resign in 1916 in favor of David Lloyd George.

**Alexander Bach** (1813–1893): Austrian statesmen. Initially a liberal revolutionary in 1848, Bach turned conservative, beginning his political career as minister of justice later that year. He served as minister of the interior before becoming prime minister in 1852. Best known for implementing his infamous Bach System, a program of rigid bureaucratic centralization characterized by a powerful secret police organization bent on suppressing liberal opposition. The program also saw the elimination of the domestic tariff system, the emancipation of the serfs, and the return of Catholic influence throughout the kingdom.

**Mikhail Bakunin** (1814–1876): Russian revolutionary and anarchist. Bakunin participated in the 1848–1849 revolutions in Paris and Dresden and spent time in exile in Siberia. He was a leading figure of the First International and was an advocate of militant revolutionary measures for the procurement of natural human liberty.

**Ludwig van Beethoven** (1770–1827): Widely regarded as one of the greatest composers of all time. Beethoven spent much of his life in Vienna, where he learned from some of the most renowned composers of the age,
including Mozart. Profiting greatly from the patronage of Vienna’s elite, he produced some of music’s most breathtaking achievements, including his Third (1803–1804), Fifth (1809), and Ninth (1817–1823) Symphonies.

Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832): English philosopher and political author. Founded the philosophy of utilitarianism as a synthesis of his studies on morality and legislation. His beliefs were predicated on the notion that all life consists in the pursuit of pleasures and the avoidance of pains and that government should operate to maximize these parameters to the greatest possible extent. His works were instrumental in the reformation of British suffrage and labor legislation in the early and mid-19th century.

Leopold Berchtold (1863–1942): Foreign minister of Austria-Hungary from 1912–1915. At the conclusion of the Balkan Wars of 1912–1913, Berchtold played a crucial role in the creation of a sovereign Albanian state, effectively blocking Serbian aspirations for access to the Adriatic. His caustic ultimatum to Belgrade following Archduke Franz Ferdinand’s assassination in the summer of 1914 made armed conflict with Serbia all but a foregone conclusion and set all of Europe on a path toward war.

Henri Bergson (1859–1941): French philosopher. Bergson argued that human experience owes its path and substance to individual intuition rather than reason. He posited that scientific explanations were inadequate in human analyses and invoked the notion of a collective *élan vital*, or “life force,” that consisted of mankind’s creative capacities. His rejection of science as deterministic and incapable of explaining everything brought widespread popularity among the religious and those disillusioned with the positivism of Comte.

Eduard Bernstein (1850–1932): German socialist and leader of the moderate, revisionist socialist movement. In his *Evolutionary Socialism* (1898), he argued that capitalism was far from doomed and that social reform and progress could be achieved within the parliamentary process; thus, he rejected those, like Kautsky, who espoused militant Marxist agendas.

Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg (1856–1921): German chancellor from 1909–1917. More concerned with the maintenance of Austria-Hungary’s great-power status and with making Russia appear the aggressor in a great-power conflict, his support of the Dual Monarchy’s ultimatum to Serbia contributed to war between the great powers of Europe in the summer of 1914.

Otto von Bismarck (1815–1898): German statesman and architect of unification. A Prussian nationalist, his background in law, the Prussian Landtag, and ambassadorships to St. Petersburg and Paris developed the sagacity that characterized his reign as Prussian prime minister under Wilhelm I after 1862. In foreign politics, he proved to be both aggressive and shrewd, greatly expanding Prussian borders and prestige in successive wars against Denmark (1864), Austria (1866), and France (1870–1871), while remaining adverse to large-scale conflict thereafter. Domestically, Bismarck was just as cunning, dissolving Parliament to obtain funds for the army, allying with the liberals against the Catholic Church and Catholic Center Party in the *Kulturkampf* of the early 1870s, alternatively passing repressive legislation to stem the tide of socialist sympathy throughout the empire during the late 1870s, and finally, implementing modern social legislation in the form of accident, sickness, and old age insurance and widespread labor reform in the late 1880s. Initially averse to overseas exploits, he oversaw the establishment of German colonies in west, southwest, and east Africa before being dismissed by Wilhelm II, in 1890.

Louis Blanc (1811-1882): French politician, historian, and social theorist. A member of the provisional government of 1848 and exiled after the June Days to England, Blanc returned to France as a liberal in 1871 and a member of the national assembly. His socialist beliefs were combined with a desire to see society, within which each individual got what he or she needed and provided what he or she could, transformed into a web of national workshops facilitated by the state.

Louis Napoleon Bonaparte (1808–1873): Emperor of the French (1852–1870). After spending time in exile and prison for participating in two insurrections in 1836 and 1840, Louis returned to France after the February Revolution, was elected to the national assembly, and was soon elected president of the Second Republic (1848). He dissolved the legislative assembly in the coup of December 1851, ended a subsequent insurrection, and was elected Emperor of the French by plebiscite in 1852. Louis oversaw victory in the Crimean War (1854–1856) and patronized Piedmontese wars against Austrian positions in Italy (1859–1860). His reign saw the completion of the Suez Canal, imperial conquests in Southeast Asia and China, the death of Maximilien in Mexico (1867), and the end of the Second Empire at the humiliating conclusion of the Franco-Prussian War. Domestically, many of France’s
cities were refurbished, construction and investment were encouraged, and civil liberties and legislative authorities were augmented, creating a liberal and social empire.

**Napoleon Bonaparte** (1769–1821): Born to Corsican parents and educated in French military schools, Napoleon was a member of the Jacobins during the revolution and rose to prominence by defeating the British at Toulon in 1793 and putting down a royalist uprising in Paris in 1795. The Convention promoted him to commander of the army of Italy, where his successes led to the treaty of Campo Formio. On November 9–10 of 1799, he overthrew the Directory in the coup of 18 Brumaire with the help of Talleyrand and Sieyès. A concordat with the Catholic Church was signed in 1801, while the Napoleonic Code of 1804 made French laws uniform and declared freedom of religion and equality before the law. His armies fought and conquered the counterrevolutionary forces of monarchical Europe from the Iberian Peninsula to the outskirts of Moscow until 1814–1815. He lived in captivity for the rest of his life after a defeat at Waterloo in 1815.

**Bernhard von Bülow** (1849–1929): German foreign secretary and chancellor of Germany from 1900–1909. As an extension of Wilhelm II’s temerity in colonial and diplomatic affairs, von Bülow exacerbated Germany’s political isolation. His hard-line stance during the Moroccan Affair in 1905 and his consent to the Dual Monarchy’s diplomatic endeavors in the Balkans soured relations with France, Britain, and Russia.

**Edmund Burke** (1729–1797): British writer and politician. Burke became a member of Parliament in 1765 and clamored for a more socially prudent policy toward the American colonies and relations with the Indian peoples. Despite some leftist leanings and reform proposals, his *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790) made him a beacon of the conservative and anti-revolutionary ideology. His dual liberal and conservative tendencies illustrate that, above all else, he held political stability as vital to the nation-state. Burke viewed reform as valuable and desirable so long as it did not interfere with political and religious tranquility.

**Lord George Byron** (1788–1824): English poet of the Romantic period and friend of fellow Romantic poet Percy Bysshe Shelley. Byron attended Trinity College and began writing extensively thereafter. Unique in his flamboyance and satirical inclinations, he personified the Romantic period in life and death, succumbing to a fever in 1824 while devoting himself to the cause of Greek independence from the Ottomans. Some of his more notable works include *Don Juan* (1819–1824), *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* (1809), and *Childe Harold* (1812, 1816, and 1818).

**George Canning** (1770–1827): British politician. Canning was undersecretary for foreign affairs under William Pitt, treasurer of the Navy (1804–1806), and foreign minister from 1807–1809 and again in 1822, after Castlereagh’s suicide. He reversed his predecessor’s policy of cooperation with autocratic powers in the repression of European insurrections, supporting leftists in Portugal, recognizing Latin American independence gains, and organizing a British, French, and Russian alliance that eventually secured the independence of Greece. He was prime minister briefly before his death.

**Viscount Robert Castlereagh** (1769–1822): English politician who served in the Irish Parliament before becoming a member of the British Parliament in 1794 and a proponent of Catholic emancipation. President of the India Board of Control (1802–1806) and secretary of war on two occasions from 1805 to 1809. As foreign secretary from 1812–1822, he was instrumental in the formation of the Quadruple Alliance and the Congress system, established at the Congress of Vienna to maintain stability in Europe. He lacked the charisma and sagacity of Metternich and was criticized for his dealings with the autocratic powers of the Holy Alliance and for his support of some of the repressive measures used in cases of domestic disturbance. Castlereagh committed suicide in 1822.

**Louis Cavaignac** (1802–1857): French army general. Cavaignac was appointed to general in 1844 after his service in the conquest of Algeria and was made governor-general of Algeria in 1848 but returned to Paris as minister of war and quashed the June Days insurrection. He lost in the presidential elections of 1848 to Louis Napoleon.

**Camillo di Cavour** (1810–1861): Prime minister of Piedmont-Sardinia and a key orchestrator of Italian unification under the monarchy of Victor Emmanuel II. Long before war against Austria, he had set about modernizing the kingdom, reforming the bureaucratic, military, commercial, and fiscal sectors of the state. He obtained the assistance of Napoleon III in the expulsion of the Austrians from northern Italy in return for the cessation of Nice and Savoy. His leadership brought the annexation of much of northern Italy, the end of Garibaldi’s insurrections in the Papal States, and the inclusion of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies under Victor Emmanuel II.
Joseph Chamberlain (1836–1914): British politician. Chamberlain was mayor of Birmingham from 1873–1876, where he was hailed for his municipal reforms and became a liberal member of Parliament at the conclusion of his term. A proponent of social reform, he split with his one-time mentor, William Gladstone, over the issue of Irish Home Rule, siding with the Liberal Unionists. As a conservative colonial secretary in 1895, he advocated imperial expansion and sought to integrate the empire. Chamberlain is perhaps best known for his proposal of a preferential imperial tariff program that ran counter to England’s liberal free-trade tradition. He resigned amidst controversy and spent the next few years pushing for tariff reform, an issue that split the Liberal Unionist-Conservative coalition before the 1906 election.

Charles X (1757–1836): Successor to Louis XVIII as king of France (1824–1830). Charles augmented the influence of the clergy throughout the state and oversaw preliminary military operations in Algeria. His censorship of the press, dissolution of the Chamber of Deputies, and abatement of suffrage rights amongst the bourgeois class led to the July Revolution of 1830 that resulted in his abdication in favor of Louis-Philippe of the Orléans house.

Karl von Clausewitz (1780–1831): Prussian army general and writer. Von Clausewitz fought in the coalition against Napoleon in Russia and at Waterloo. He is best known for his 1832 masterpiece On War, in which he muses on the vagaries of battle while anticipating the possible outbreak of total warfare that pits the sum total of a nation’s resources against an equally strong enemy.

Georges Clemenceau (1841–1929): French radical and Dreyfusard. Clemenceau was a mainstay in the Chamber of Deputies from 1876 to 1893. Made prime minister in 1906, he helped forge amiable relations with Britain in the face of what he perceived to be a growing German naval and imperial menace. Faltering French morale on the front during World War I prompted his replacement of Paul Painlevé as prime minister in 1917; the result was a unification of Allied forces and reaffirmation of French commitment to the war, personifying French determination. Representing French interests at the Paris Peace Conference, Clemenceau stood opposed to the leniency proffered by Woodrow Wilson, pushing instead for severe German penalties that he believed necessary for French security.

Auguste Comte (1798–1857): French philosopher and founder of positivist philosophy. Deeply influenced by his relations with Saint-Simon, he was an idealist who saw the potential for a more comfortable, enjoyable society in the application of science and technology and a rejection of theological or metaphysical systems.

Marquis de Condorcet (1743–1794): A tragedy of the French Revolution, Condorcet was a mathematician and philosopher and was appointed to the Academy of Sciences in 1769 and to the French Academy in 1782. He foresaw the perfection of man at the conclusion of the French Revolution in his Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Mind (1795). He advocated universal suffrage and equality under the law and fought against the death penalty, slavery, and the subordination of women.

Francesco Crispi (1819–1901): Twice Italian prime minister (1887–1891, 1893–1896). A revolutionary in 1848 and again in cooperation with Garibaldi, Crispi was initially a liberal member of the Italian Parliament in 1861 but became increasingly conservative, harboring the belief that only monarchy could unite northern and southern Italy. He was minister of the interior before succeeding Agostino Depretis as prime minister in 1887, at which time he reaffirmed the Triple Alliance with Austria-Hungary and Germany and encouraged Italian ventures into North Africa. His reactionary domestic policies included the repression of labor movements, police intimidation, and mass disenfranchisement, which coupled with the humiliating defeat at Adwa in 1896, led to his forced resignation.

Georges Jacques Danton (1759–1794): French statesman who became the figurehead of the Cordeliers club early in the revolution, as well as a member of the Paris Commune of August 1792. Danton was a member of the Constitutional Convention and a leading figure in the Committee of Public Safety in its early stages. He urged restraint in foreign policy and within the Committee of Public Safety, denouncing the atrocities of the Terror. He and some of his associates in the Cordeliers club were charged with conspiracy in March 1794 and were guillotined.

Charles Darwin (1809–1882): English natural scientist. Darwin was the author of the famed On the Origin of Species (1859), an account of his travels and findings during his five-year hiatus aboard the H.M.S. Beagle and a comprehensive outline of his theory of evolution. He later penned the supplementary Descent of Man (1871), which further explained natural selection as the key mechanism operating throughout nature, whereby those species that are best suited to their environments survive and multiply. His theories met with great skepticism and animosity for proposing that all life had, through a series of countless and minuscule adaptations, evolved from a single ancestor and, by implication, for denying a divine hand in the human predicament.
Theophile Delcassé (1852–1905): Chief French architect of amiable and fruitful diplomatic cooperation with Britain that saw colonial disputes in Morocco, the Sudan, and Egypt reconciled—achievements manifested in the entente cordiale of 1904. He was largely responsible for strengthening France’s alliance with Russia and improving relations with Italy as well.

Charles Dickens (1812–1870): English novelist and most popular English writer of his time. His works, often written in installments, include Oliver Twist (1838), A Christmas Carol (1843), A Tale of Two Cities (1859), Great Expectations (1861), and David Copperfield (1850). He often wrote from personal experience and used his imagination to extrapolate from there. His books pulsed with the rhythms, misfortunes, and political evils of London, all endured by his unforgettable characters. Because of his enormous popularity, his works helped foment social reforms in England’s crowded cities.

Benjamin Disraeli (1804–1881): British politician and writer, originally of Jewish origin. Disraeli wrote extensively and achieved moderate fame before being elected to Parliament in 1837, where he became a strong opponent of Peel and his reformist leanings. He became a prominent Tory leader after the party split, precipitated by the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. He was made prime minister in 1874 and aided the lot of the poor by improving housing, public health services, and labor conditions throughout the country. Disraeli oversaw war against the Boers in South Africa and the subsequent annexation of the Transvaal, the conquest of the Fiji Islands, and the purchase of majority shares in the Suez Canal operation.

Emile Durkheim (1858–1917): French sociologist. Influenced by the nascent sociology of Weber and positivism of Comte, Durkheim believed in the applicability of scientific observation and analysis to the study of contemporary society. He posited that urban growth, scientific progress, and a steady abatement of religious influence had disrupted social order and propriety, which in turn, was causing individual angst and anomie throughout urban Europe.

Edward VII (1841–1910): Successor to his mother, Queen Victoria, as king of England (1901–1910). Edward was well known for generosity toward the arts and sciences and for debauchery. As king, he was interested in the diplomatic maneuverings of the time and took it upon himself to act as an emissary while abroad. He was instrumental in improving relations with France and the subsequent Anglo-French entente of 1904.

Victor Emmanuel II (1820–1878): Succeeded his father, Charles Albert, as king of Piedmont-Sardinia from 1849–1861. Popular with his people for social reforms and general tolerance, Victor Emmanuel, with Prime Minister Camillo di Cavour, obtained France’s assistance in a war with Austria in 1859. He benefited from the rebellions in southern Italy when Garibaldi liberated the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies and, after a plebiscite, surrendered them to annexation by Piedmont-Sardinia. Victor Emmanuel was declared king of a united Italy in 1861. Venetia was added to the kingdom after Austria’s defeat at the hands of Prussia in 1866 and Rome in 1870, when French troops were recalled during the Franco-Prussian War.

Friedrich Engels (1820–1895): German socialist, social agitator, and friend of Karl Marx. Engels published The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844 while working as a manager in a factory in Manchester. He organized revolutionary movements throughout western Europe in the late 1840s and collaborated with Marx in the famous 1848 Communist Manifesto. Engels was a key figure in both the First and Second Internationals and spent much of his life after Marx’s death editing his friend’s works in Das Kapital while himself elaborating on the theory of historical materialism.

Erich von Falkenhayn (1861–1922): German minister of war from 1906 to 1915 and head of the German general staff from 1914 to 1916. His tenure saw early German victories in the east balanced by stalemate in the west, concluding in 1916, when he was removed from duty following the terrifying consequences of his Verdun campaign.

Franz Ferdinand (1863–1914): Archduke of Austria and heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne. His suggestion for the incorporation of a proposed Slavic kingdom into the Dual Monarchy enraged Serbian nationalists, and his assassination in Sarajevo in June 1914 set Austria-Hungary and Serbia at odds, eventually precipitating the First World War.

Jules Ferry (1832–1893): French politician. As minister of public instruction (1879–1880 and 1882), Ferry made primary education free, compulsory, and open to all, while lessening religious influence in France’s public school.
system. As prime minister (1880–1881 and 1883–1885), he oversaw French imperialist pursuits in Tunis, Madagascar, Indochina, and the Congo and Niger River basins.

**Johann Gottlieb Fichte** (1762–1814): German philosopher. Educated in theology and a student of Kant, Fichte posited the existence of a universal ethical volition emanating from a single, omniscient entity and, though antisemitic, became increasingly identified with liberal and nationalist struggles. His 1808 *Addresses to the German Nation* called on all German people to discover their special spiritual unity, as opposed to French cultural domination.

**Charles Fourier** (1772–1837): French philosopher. A utopian and believer in the intrinsic goodness of man, Fourier propounded the idea of the *phalanstery*, a contrived community of 1,500 to 2,000 people that could be self-sufficient, with work divided into specialized fields, and allow for a harmonious environment denied by contemporary society immersed in cutthroat capitalism.

**Frederick the Great (II)** (1712–1786): King of Prussia (1740–1786). A close friend of Voltaire and admirer of the arts and music, Frederick was one of Europe’s eminent figures of the 18th century. He obtained Silesia in the war of Austrian Succession (1740–1748) but saw Berlin occupied by Austrian and Russian forces in 1760 when Silesian suzerainty prompted war again. The Peace of Hubertusberg (1763) with Russia permitted him to expand Prussian frontiers into Austria and Poland. Frederick was recognized for his military brilliance while commanding possibly the world’s greatest army during his reign. His domestic reforms were equally worthy: He strengthened sectors of the army, the educational and legal systems, and the transportation network, while remaining relatively tolerant in matters of religion.

**Frederick William II** (1744–1797): Nephew of Frederick the Great and king of Prussia from 1786–1797. Lacking the sagacity of some of his predecessors, he allied against French revolutionary forces in a coalition of conservative, counterrevolutionary European monarchies but acquiesced to the treaty of Basel (1795) with France as a result of fiscal shortcomings and insurrectionary movements in Prussian-held Poland. His personal indulgences exacerbated the kingdom’s financial difficulties and made him the object of resentment.

**Sigmund Freud** (1856–1939): Austrian psychiatrist and founder of psychoanalysis. Freud became famous for his collaboration with Josef Breuer and their practice of the cathartic method, a hypnotic state in which one is able to recall a previous psychological trauma that has been repressed and is responsible for present hysteria. He later abandoned this method in favor of free association, a technique that identifies a causal nexus between sensitive material stored in the unconscious and similar elements in the conscious. His insistence on the prevailing influence of childhood sexuality or a correlative Oedipus complex isolated him from eminent psychologists of his time. He nonetheless revolutionized his field of study and continues to do so today. Some of his works include *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900), *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* (1905), and *The Ego and the Id* (1923).

**Heinrich von Gagern** (1799–1880): German statesman. As a member of the Hessian Parliament, he was an outspoken proponent of German unification and was later made president of the Frankfurt Parliament, a body formed by political liberals throughout the German Confederation to pave the way for unification. He preached the importance of Prussian and Austrian cooperation within a unified German entity and warned of dire consequences if such cooperation was not forthcoming.

**Léon Gambetta** (1838–1882): French politician. Elected to the Chamber of Deputies in 1869 and renowned for his anticlericalism, he became an outspoken figure in the provisional government that succeeded the fall of the empire in 1870. As interior minister, Gambetta organized a government of national defense against the Prussian siege, but his platform of continued struggle was not accepted by the rural population, which sided with Thiers and acquiesced to Prussian demands. The rest of Gambetta’s career was devoted to the establishment of the Third Republic and its constitution, as well as attempts to reconcile warring parliamentary factions.

**Mohandas Gandhi** (1869–1948): Eminent Indian activist and politician. Harboring an ascetic commitment to nonviolent expressions of civil disobedience as a righteous weapon against tyranny, Gandhi led an organized protest against persistent injustices toward the Indian minority in South Africa, bringing him broad fame in his home country. After a 22-year hiatus there, he returned home to spearhead the Indian nationalist movement, directing the Indian National Congress for much of the rest of his life. Along with Mohammad Ali Jinnah, he was instrumental in the granting of Indian independence in 1947 by the British. He remains a martyred paragon for reasoned and responsible resistance long after his assassination in 1948.
Giuseppe Garibaldi (1807–1882): Italian revolutionary leader. Garibaldi participated in the failed Piedmontese rebellion against Austria in 1848 and the unsuccessful Roman uprising of 1849. He broke with Mazzini and his dream of a unified Italian republic in favor of the more feasible option of a united Italy under Victor Emmanuel II. He led the conquest of the Kingdom of the Two Siciles in 1860 with a thousand followers and delivered the kingdom to the rule of Victor Emmanuel II.

David Lloyd George (1863–1945): British politician. A liberal and anti-imperialist in Parliament after 1890, Lloyd George won fame from the left for his welfare reform proposals. He was minister of war in 1916 before becoming prime minister later that year; he pursued an aggressive war policy and helped unify allied forces under Marshal Ferdinand Foch. Lloyd George represented British interests at the Paris Peace Conference amidst the more assertive proposals of Clemenceau and Wilson. He was responsible for the treaty that established an independent Irish Free State in 1922.

Giovanni Giolitti (1842–1928): Italian statesman and prime minister on five separate occasions from 1892 to 1921. Giolitti introduced social and agrarian reforms after the turn of the century and brought universal male suffrage to Italy in 1912. He sponsored the Libyan conquest, helped bring about an accord with Yugoslavia after World War I, and bears the stigma of having aided the fascists in their rise to power in the early 1920s.

William Gladstone (1809–1898): British politician and leading figure of the liberal party in England during much of the second half of the 19th century. Gladstone became a member of Parliament in 1833 and was made undersecretary of war and colonies in 1835 by Sir Robert Peel. He split with the Tory party after the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 and served four separate terms as prime minister, during which time, he improved relations with Catholic Ireland; revamped parts of the army, educational system, and judiciary; and expanded male suffrage with the Reform Bills of 1884 and 1885.

Johan Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832): German poet, writer, and scientist. Goethe’s genius knew no bounds. A student of both law and biology, he was the leading figure of the German Sturm und Drang movement in the late 18th century and chief minister of the state of Weimar during the 1770s and 1780s. He is best known for his groundbreaking epic poem Faust (1808), his unique take on the 16th-century legend.

Olympe de Gouges (1748–1793): French revolutionary feminist and author of The Rights of Women (1791). In this treatise, she argued that the law must represent the general will of the people, of which women were an indispensable part. She fought for educational opportunities, property rights, and equal divorce rights.

Sir Edward Grey (1862–1933): British foreign secretary from 1905 to 1916. In the face of a mounting German threat, he consistently backed France diplomatically and aligned Britain with Russia in the Entente of 1907, clearly positioning the English in opposition to the aggressiveness of Wilhelm II.

Jules Guesde (1845–1922): French Marxist and leader of the Parti Ouvrier Français (French Workers’ Party). He firmly rejected political compromise in his pursuit of socialist reforms, maintaining the necessity of a proletarian revolution to end exploitative capitalism.

Francois Guizot (1787–1874): French politician and historian. Guizot was a history professor before participating in the July Revolution, which served as his springboard into a political career. He implemented reforms in the French educational system and served as prime minister several times, including from 1847–1848. He firmly embraced France’s bourgeois character during the July Monarchy but did not favor expanding the franchise.

Douglas Haig (1861–1928): British general. Haig directed the disastrously ineffective British offensives at the Battles of the Somme in 1916 and Ypres in 1917, despite horrifying results in previous offensive efforts and intelligence reports portending the same.

Keir Hardie (1856–1915): Scottish labor spokesman and politician. A background in coal mining introduced Hardie to union politics. He formed the Scottish Labor party in 1888 and was made a member of Parliament in 1892. A year later, he established the Independent Labor Party, which with the nascent Fabian Society, was a precursor in the formation of the Labor Representation Committee in 1900, later renamed the Labor Party in 1906.

Baron Georges Hausmann (1809–1891): French architect and municipal designer. Responsible for the renovation of Paris under Napoleon III. He widened city streets to mitigate traffic congestion; rerouted city and public transportation; and constructed parks, monuments, and countless other amenities.
Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831): Eminent German philosopher. Schooled in theology, Hegel spent time as a professor at Jena, Heidelberg, and Berlin, writing on history, religion, and ethics. He is known as the father of dialectics, whereby opposing ideas are rationalized and synthesized into a logical conclusion. He held that history could be described as a spirit, or Geist, in perpetual flux (with human progress as manifestation of a spiritual self-realization), becoming increasingly less alienated from itself. Hegel had a profound influence on future generations of students, among them Marx and Sartre.

Heinrich Heine (1797–1856): Eminent German poet who immersed himself in history and literature, Heine was a member of the Romantic, Saint-Simonian, and Young Germany movements. Inspired by the folk and Romantic German traditions, as well as by his Jewish and Christian backgrounds (he had converted from Judaism to Christianity), his colorful prose is illustrated in such works as Die Harzreise (1826), Buch der Lieder (1827), and Reisebilder (1827–1831).

Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744–1803): German philosopher and clergymen. A student of theology and Kantian philosophy, he was best known for his work in comparative religion, mythology, philology, and nationalist thought, while also propounding the theory of a distinctly epochal nature of historical development in his Outlines of the Philosophy of Man (1784–1791).

Aleksandr Herzen (1812–1870): Russian writer and revolutionary agitator. A socialist, Herzen initially believed that Russia should follow western paths to political reform. He spent much of his life abroad, where he endorsed liberal revolutionary causes in 1848–1849 and wrote extensively about his homeland. His most famous work, From the Other Shore (1855), explored the failed revolutions of 1848–1849 and expressed his belief that socialism could take hold in Russia because it was an outgrowth of the communal village lifestyle entrenched throughout her provinces.

Theodor Herzl (1860–1904): Father of the modern Zionist movement. Following the Dreyfus Affair, Herzl argued that Jews could never ingratiating themselves with European society successfully because of the pernicious anti-Semitism they would always encounter. He advocated the establishment of a national Jewish state that would provide a haven for the Jews dispersed about the world, in his book, Das Judenstaat (The Jewish State), and at early Zionist congresses he called.

Paul von Hindenburg (1847–1934): German field general and president of Germany from 1925–1934. Impressive victories on the eastern front in the First World War against Russian forces led to his appointment as commander of the German war machine in 1916, an authority he wielded with General Erich Ludendorff. His directives brought Russia to its knees in 1917 before superior Allied forces, strengthened by American intervention, overwhelmed the German lines. His tenure as president was relatively uneventful, executive authority being rather circumscribed in the new Weimar Republic, until a burgeoning national socialist movement and the prodding of close advisors convinced him to appoint Adolf Hitler chancellor in January 1933.

Victor Hugo (1802–1885): French novelist and poet. One of the great Romantics of his era, Hugo was best known for authoring Notre Dame de Paris (1831) and Les Miserables (1862), which like many of his works, combine the themes of love, despair, heroism, and tragedy. He supported liberal and democratic causes on behalf of the poor.

Thomas Huxley (1825–1895): Biologist and scientific apologist. The foremost proponent of Darwinian evolutionary theory, Huxley saw civilization as mankind’s triumph over evolution and believed that human ethics and reason set man apart from the rest of nature in the evolutionary process; at the same time, he went to great lengths to prove the human anthropological proximity to apes.

Aleksandr Izvolsky (1856–1919): Russian foreign minister from 1906–1910. In the wake of Russia’s humiliating defeat in the Russo-Japanese war of 1905, Izvolsky cultivated an accord with the British that settled disputes in Persia and Afghanistan—an agreement that fostered the creation of the Triple Entente of 1907 among France, Britain, and Russia. An attempt to gain Russian warship access to the Dardanelles in return for his conciliation in Austro-Hungarian annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina backfired when the Dual Monarchy refused to keep its end of the bargain.

Jean Jaurès (1859–1914): French socialist leader. Known for his public-speaking prowess and ability to cooperate effectively with friends and opponents, he saw socialism as a counter to virulent nationalism, economic exploitation, and immorality. His socialist programs were intended to co-opt many different classes beside the industrial
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proletariat. He championed the separation of church and state and individual civil liberties, allied himself with the Dreyfusard cause, and led an antiwar movement before being assassinated by a radical nationalist on the eve of war.

Joseph Joffre (1852–1931): Commander-in-Chief of the French army from 1911–1916. Joffre’s aggressive assaults at Ypres, the Champagne, and the Somme produced horrifying casualties. His inability to appreciate the futility of offensive operations in trench warfare and initial French setbacks at the Battle of Verdun in 1916 resulted in his dismissal by Prime Minister Aristide Briand in 1916.

Joseph II (1741–1790): Holy Roman Emperor (1765–1790), son of Maria Theresa and Emperor Francis I. A champion of the common folk and a nuisance to the Roman Catholic Church, he abolished serfdom and feudal dues in 1781; built hospitals, poorhouses, parks, and gardens; and even funded programs to provide food to the needy. He ended the practice of torture and the death penalty. His Patent of Tolerance (1781) allowed for broad freedom of worship throughout the Holy Roman Empire, but it was abandoned after his death.

Franz Joseph (1830–1916): Succeeded his uncle Ferdinand, upon his abdication in 1848, as emperor of Austria (1848–1916). His reign saw the loss of Austrian influence in Italy in 1859, and a defeat by the Prussians in 1866 relegated Austria to a subordinate position in central Europe. He yielded to Hungarian nationalist demands in 1867 with the creation of the Dual Monarchy and saw his country threatened for the next 40 years by Russian interests in the Balkans. Despite the fractious nature of his multinational empire, he was able to maintain order by repressing nationalist uprisings, making rare compromises (that is, Hungary in 1867), and keeping the loyalty of his army.

Karl Kautsky (1854–1938): German socialist and a leading adherent of Marxist doctrine in the Second International and German Social Democratic Party (SPD). Kautsky consistently opposed those, like Eduard Bernstein, who sought socialist reform by political means and insisted that capitalism would soon crumble under the weight of a united, revolutionary proletariat.

Aleksandr Kerensky (1881–1970): A socialist and labor party representative in the pre-war Russian parliament (Duma), Kerensky became head of a provisional government that assumed power after Tsar Nicholas II was forced to abdicate in February of 1917 amidst desertions in the army and food shortages in the cities. His determination to continue in the war and an inability to ameliorate the economic and food emergencies led to his overthrow by the Bolsheviks and their leader, Vladimir Lenin.

Rudyard Kipling (1865–1936): English writer and poet. Born in India and educated in England, Kipling’s works reflect a lifelong fascination with both extremes of the British Empire. He aggrandized the Brit as cunning, daring, and righteous in his attempts to tame the mysteries and energies of the Indian subcontinent. His most acclaimed works include The Jungle Book (1894), If (1910), Gunga Din (1892), and The White Man’s Burden (1899). He was England’s first Nobel Prize recipient for literature in 1907.

Horatio Kitchener (1850–1916): English soldier, politician, and colonial official. Kitchener was made governor of the Sudan after extended service as commander of the Egyptian army that saw the annihilation of Mahdist forces in the region, culminating in the famous Battle of Omdurman in 1898. He served in South Africa, where he was instrumental in the suppression of the Boers, before a troubled tenure as secretary of state for war during World War I.

Lajos Kossuth (1802–1894): Hungarian revolutionary. As a member of the Hungarian diet, Kossuth’s nationalist and liberal policies brought him popularity, but his opposition to Slavic and German nationalistic ambitions within Hungary brought resentment. A leader of the Hungarian revolution of 1848, he was named president of the breakaway Republic of Hungary (1849) before Austrian and Russian forces put down the uprising. He lived in exile for the rest of his life, hailed for his national and liberal ambitions.

Alfred Krupp (1854–1902): Son of Friedrich Krupp (1787–1826). Inherited his father’s steel plant and greatly increased its productive capacity by incorporating modern technology. The company flourished in the arms and mining industries and was largely responsible for Prussian and German military might from the time of unification to the Second World War.

Marquis de Lafayette (1757–1834): French general and politician. Despite his country’s neutrality, Lafayette espoused the colonist cause in the American Revolution in 1777, earning the position of major general in the Continental Army. In France, he was a member of the Assembly of Notables in 1787 and the Estates General in 1789. He was made commander of the National Guard after the fall of the Bastille and tried to mediate between radicals and conservatives. Lafayette was set to fight the Austrians but, after attempting to defend the monarchy in
Paris in 1792, fled and was captured by the Habsburg armies. He was liberated by Napoleon in 1797 and lived in retirement during the empire, reentering politics as a liberal member of the Chamber of Deputies during the Restoration. He helped facilitate an orderly transition during the Revolution of 1830.

**Ferdinand Lasalle** (1825–1864): German socialist and founder of the first Independent Workers Party in the German Confederation. His party had little clout but was a precursor of the German Social Democratic Party (SPD), formed in 1875, which would come to wield influence in German politics.

**Leo XIII** (1810–1903): Succeeded Pius IX as pope from 1878–1903. Leo was more amenable than his predecessor, making it a goal of his to reconcile the Catholic Church with modern science and thought. He brought about an end to the *Kulturkampf* in 1887; encouraged Catholic participation in secular, republican states; exalted the teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas; opened the Vatican archives to all; and encouraged scientific and intellectual exploration. His famous encyclical, *Rerum Novarum* (1891), refuted socialism, castigated the evils of capitalist exploitation, and reaffirmed the importance of the church in all aspects of life.

**Leopold II** (1835–1909): Succeeded Leopold I as king of the Belgians from 1865–1909. He backed Henry Morton Stanley’s explorations of Africa’s Congo River basin, presided over the Berlin Congress of 1884–1885 (which outlined basic regulations for the colonization of the African continent), and proclaimed the establishment of the Congo Free State under his personal dominion. Operations in the Congo brought him wealth, until allegations of extortion, exploitation, and scandal forced him to cede control to the Belgian government in 1908.

**Ferdinand de Lesseps** (1805–1894): French statesmen and engineer. He oversaw the construction and financing of the Suez Canal (1859–1869) and was president of the company constructing the Panama Canal before its dissolution due to lack of funding amidst widespread corruption charges.

**Friedrich List** (1789–1846): German economist. A professor of economics at Tübingen and a politician in Württemberg, List advocated a system of close trading partnerships among the numerous German states and, as such, was instrumental in the formation of the *Zollverein*, the German customs union. He also pressed for the implementation of protective tariffs for nascent industries.

**David Livingstone** (1813–1873): As the first European to extensively explore the African interior, Livingstone sought to eradicate native slaving operations by creating missionary outposts along the continent’s major waterways. His adventures familiarized him with such natural marvels as Lake Tanganyika and Victoria Falls in his ongoing pursuit of the Nile’s origins.

**Louis XIV** (1638–1715): King of France (1643–1715), with his mother, Anne of Austria, serving as regent and advised by Cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin until 1661. Absolute monarchy, justified by divine right, was at its zenith during his reign, which was identified by a centralized bureaucracy to facilitate tax collection and an aggressive foreign policy bent on expansion. He sought religious uniformity for France, actively rooting out non-Catholic influences and persecuting the Huguenots, going so far as to rescind the Edict of Nantes in 1685. His Palace at Versailles and patronage of the arts and literature added to his unique renown and influence.

**Louis XV** (1710–1774): King of France (1715–1774) with Phillip II, the duke of Orléans, serving as regent until 1723. He married Marie Leszcynska of Poland, prompting France’s involvement in the War of Polish Succession. He presided over France’s involvement in the Seven Years War (1756–1763), which with the Treaty of Paris, resulted in the loss of much of France’s empire. His domestic extravagance, iniquitous tax system, and war spending played a part in setting the table for the French Revolution of 1789.

**Louis XVI** (1754–1793): Grandson and successor to Louis XV as king of France (1774–1792). He married Austrian Archduchess Marie Antoinette in 1770. Reserved and demure, he relied on ministers for advice. His rule was plagued by financial difficulty that had many of its root causes in the Seven Years War and the American Revolution. His unwillingness to change the format and function of the Estates General in 1789 led to the proclamation of the National Assembly by the Third Estate. He was caught trying to flee France and forced to sign the Constitution of 1791 that substantially curbed his powers. He was later tried by the Convention and guillotined in January of 1793.

**Louis XVIII** (1755–1824): Brother of Louis XVI and king of France (1814–24). Restored to the throne in 1814 by the powers after the fall of Paris and again in 1815 after Napoleon’s defeat at Waterloo, his reign was moderate at first, including a tolerant policy toward revolutionaries and the granting of a constitution. Under the direction of
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royalist ministers, he became more reactionary as new legislation increased the privilege of the aristocracy while abridging civil liberties.

Louis-Philippe (1773–1850): King of the French (1830–1848). Louis-Philippe fled France during the revolution and lived in exile until the Bourbon Restoration, when he returned as a liberal opponent to the monarchy. With the help of the Marquis de Lafayette, he was appointed king of the French after the July Revolution of 1830. His regime was characterized by bourgeois prominence and apathy toward the poor. He oversaw the conquest of Algeria and patronized Belgian independence. Bourbon legitimists and suffrage movements made his tenure precarious throughout the 1840s, until his abdication in 1848 following the February Revolution.

Erich Ludendorff (1865–1937): German general. Instrumental in the decisive German offensives on the eastern front, Ludendorff saw his authority greatly enhanced after fellow General Paul von Hindenburg’s appointment as commander-in-chief of German forces in 1916 and used the authority to direct subsequent operations against Allied positions in the west. A participant alongside Adolf Hitler in the Beer Hall Putsch of 1923, he adopted virulent anti-Semitic and Aryan supremacist sentiments in the post-war years, becoming an exponent of national socialist rhetoric during the 1920s.

Rosa Luxemburg (1871–1919): European social revolutionary. Luxemburg was a key figure in the Polish and German social democratic parties and in the Second International, where she opposed the reformist socialism of Bernstein and insisted on the revolutionary toppling of bourgeois capitalism. She founded, with Karl Liebknecht, the Spartacus Party in 1916, which would become the German Communist Party after December 1918. She was killed after her arrest for participating in the Spartacist revolt of January 1919 in Berlin.

Thomas Macaulay (1800–1859): English historian and political writer. A regular contributor to the Edinburgh Review, Macaulay was elected member of Parliament in 1830 as a Whig and became known for his speaking prowess. He was a member of the supreme council of the East India Company (1834–1838) and improved the educational system and instituted a legal code in India. He was secretary of war (1839–1841) and member of Parliament again from 1839–1847 and 1852–1856. A progressive, Macaulay preached the necessity of parliamentary reform, especially in 1832, to avoid the revolutionary unrest that had shaken continental Europe.

Thomas Malthus (1766–1834): English economist. Malthus is known for his 1798 Essay on the Principle of Population, in which he portends the plight of mankind caused by population growth that human means of subsistence cannot accommodate. Only such inhibitors as famine, warfare, disease, and sexual abstinence, he argued, keep population and subsistence levels in accord.

Fillippo Marinetti (1876–1944): Italian poet and founder of futurism, an artistic movement that exalted speed, youth, war, the synthesis of man and machine, and recklessness, while vilifying women, the aged, and various establishment intellectual entities, all the while sharing theoretical ties to fascism.

Karl Marx (1818–1883): German socialist. Marx obtained his Ph.D. from the University of Jena (1841) and almost instantly concerned himself with the welfare of the poor and the need for radical political and social reform. He coauthored, with his lifelong friend and fellow socialist Friedrich Engels, such classic works as The German Ideology (1846), The Communist Manifesto (1848), and Das Kapital (1867), and was a salient factor in the founding of the First International in 1864. His economic studies convinced him of the inevitable swelling of the proletarian class as a result of exploitation by the propertied class and called for worker solidarity for the eventual overthrow of bourgeois society. His theory of historical materialism argued that any epoch, and all of history, could be described by the particular economic relationships and needs existing at a given time so that any aspect of society was merely a manifestation of its economic character.

Ferdinand Maximilien (1832–1867): Emperor of Mexico (1864–1867) and brother of Austrian Emperor Franz Joseph. Maximilien served in the Austrian navy and was governor general of Lombardy-Venetia (1857–1859) before acquiescing to Napoleon III and conservative Mexican aspirations for an imperial order in Central America. His liberal leanings and the execution of loyal Benito Juarez followers alienated him from conservatives and liberals alike. When Napoleon III recalled French forces aiding the beleaguered emperor in 1866, he was captured by Mexican revolutionaries and executed.

Giuseppe Mazzini (1805–1872): Inspirational Italian nationalist, political writer, and revolutionary. Mazzini founded the Young Italy movement, which sought a united, representative government for the Italian peninsula. He
participated in several revolutionary uprisings throughout Italy that supported a sovereign national identity, stemming from the democratic participation of the people.

**Klemens von Metternich** (1773–1859): Austrian diplomat. Widely referred to as the “Coachman of Europe” for his shrewd political mind, Metternich was named Austrian foreign minister in 1809 and spent much of his career working to mediate between French and Russian interests, while employing all means to improve Austria’s standing in Europe. He fought to keep Austrian influence in Italy paramount, while remaining opposed to German unification, preferring Austrian preeminence in the German Confederation. He was the mouthpiece of conservative, monarchical Europe from 1815–1848.

**John Stuart Mill** (1806–1873): British philosopher, economist, and political writer. Educated by his well-known and demanding father, James Mill, John Stuart Mill served as a clerk in the East India Company while contributing to journals on political theory and economics. He married prominent feminist Harriet Taylor in 1851 and published his most famous work, *On Liberty*, in 1859. Mill followed this with pieces on utilitarianism and positivism in the tradition of his father and Jeremy Bentham. He exalted empiricism and inductive rationalism and took up the causes of broader suffrage, female rights, and labor rights. He served as member of Parliament from 1865–1868.

**Alexandre Millerand** (1859–1943): French politician. As a socialist in the Chamber of Deputies, Millerand was censured and eventually expelled from the Socialist Party for his relatively rightist stance on labor. He served as minister of war twice (1912–1913 and 1914–1915) and was made prime minister in 1920, all the while becoming increasingly conservative and nationalistic. He was elected president in 1920 but because of a hostile leftist majority in the Chamber, was forced to resign in 1924.

**Helmuth von Moltke** (1848–1916): Chief of the German general staff from 1906–1914. Ignoring the advice of his predecessor, Alfred von Schlieffen, Moltke weakened the right flank of the initial German offensive on Paris and, thus, left the German forces inadequate for a conclusive push at the Battle of the Marne, just 35 miles outside the French capital.

**Nicholas I** (1796–1855): Brother of and successor to Alexander I as tsar of Russia (1825–1855). Nicholas crushed the Decembrist uprising of 1825 upon his ascent to power and helped improve the lot of the peasants slightly through modest legislation. His regime was identified with the suppression of the press; rigid control of education; a strong, centralized police force; and close association with the Orthodox Church. He sniffed out the Polish insurrection of 1830–1831 and aided the Austrian repression of Hungarian rebels in 1849. A victory over the Turks at Navarino (1827) brought territories along the Black Sea, but a defeat in the Crimean War (1853–1856) ended Russian hopes for a broad influence in the Balkans.

**Nicholas II** (1868–1918): Tsar from 1894–1917, he was an autocratic ruler who opposed the liberal aspirations of his subjects, rejecting political reforms petitioned by the *zemstvos*. As a result of industrial unrest, bad harvests, and the disastrous Russo-Japanese war, Nicholas II was a prime cause of the Revolution of 1905. Despite being forced to summon a Duma, he tried to rule absolutely, eventually naming himself supreme commander of the Russian Armies. In 1917, he was forced to abdicate, and in 1918, he and his family were murdered by Bolshevik forces.

**Friedrich Nietzsche** (1844–1900): Influential German philosopher. Nietzsche rejected western bourgeois rationalism and Christian influence as enervating and decadent. He venerated the ideological *superman* for his strength, social-Darwinist aspirations, and apathy toward those who fettered his “will to power.” Nietzsche saw morality as subjective, amenable to the instincts of competing persons.

**Florence Nightingale** (1820–1910): English nurse and social activist. Nightingale achieved fame for her brave service during the Crimean War. She set up schools for the training of nurses in Britain and agitated for more quality hospitals, while helping to make nursing a more respected profession. She became the first woman to be awarded the British Order of Merit in 1907.

**Robert Owen** (1771–1858): British socialist. After early success in the cotton and textile industries, Owen achieved fame for the establishment of the New Lanark community in Scotland, a utopian experiment that also provided homes, schools, and good working environments with the aim of social unity and economic efficiency. He was revered by the working class for encouraging trade unions and cooperatives.

**Thomas Paine** (1737–1809): A writer and political theorist, Paine spent much of his life in England and America and penned *Common Sense* (1776), arguing that the American colonies no longer needed England. His *Rights of Man* (1791–1792) was a rejection of Burke’s *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790) and a defense of
democracy. Paine was a member of the National Convention in France in 1792 but was imprisoned by the Jacobins during the Terror. His anticlericalism and castigation of George Washington later alienated him from the public.

**Viscount Henry John Palmerston** (1784–1865). English Statesman. A Tory and secretary of war (1809–1828), Palmerston split with his party over parliamentary reform and became foreign minister under Earl Grey. He helped obtain Belgian independence and preserve Ottoman presence in the Balkans by forming a coalition against Egypt’s Muhammed Ali. He was home secretary from 1852–1855, when he succeeded George Aberdeen as prime minister. Palmerston oversaw British operations in the Crimean War and put down the Sepoy Rebellion of 1857–1858 in India.

**Emmeline Pankhurst** (1858–1928). British feminist and a leader of the women’s suffrage movement of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Pankhurst founded the women’s Social and Political Union, whose members prosecuted a militant political and social campaign for women’s rights that consisted of property destruction and hunger strikes.

**Charles Stewart Parnell** (1846–1891): Irish nationalist and exponent of Home Rule and land reform. Parnell’s unwavering championship of the Irish cause in Parliament brought the admiration of his countrymen, notably the belligerent Fenian Society, devoted to the independence of Ireland. As president of the National Land League, he endorsed the boycott to induce reform in Irish land legislation. Though influential in Parliament, Gladstone’s proposed Home Rule Bill in 1886 was rejected amidst a divided liberal vote.

**Sir Robert Peel** (1788–1850): British politician. Chief secretary for Ireland (1812–1818), where he opposed Catholic emancipation, and home secretary twice from 1822 to 1830, where he reformed the penal system and reorganized the London police force. Peel opposed parliamentary reform but warmed to the idea in his Tamworth Manifesto, in which he accepted the Reform Acts, signaling a split in the conservative right. As a Tory prime minister (1841–1846), he was instrumental in the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, which catered to landed interests at the expense of the urban poor; he then resigned amidst discord within the party.

**Phillipe Pétain** (1856–1951): French general in World War I and chief of state of unoccupied Vichy France during World War II. Renowned for his defense during the Verdun campaign, Pétain was rewarded with a promotion to commander-in-chief in 1917. He succeeded Paul Reynaud as prime minister in May of 1940 and quickly moved to sign an armistice with Germany, weeks after the commencement of armed combat. As head of Vichy France, he collaborated with the Nazi regime, introducing a largely reactionary “national revolution.” After the war, he was tried and convicted of treason and spent the rest of his life behind bars.

**Pablo Picasso** (1881–1973): Spanish painter and sculptor, widely regarded as one of the 20th century’s greatest artists. Some of Picasso’s most famous contributions include his work during the morose Blue Period (1901–1904), which focused on the poor; the more sanguine Rose Period (1905–1906); and his abstract Cubist pieces, a product of his post-impressionistic and African influences. His *Les Demoiselles d’Avignon* (1907) and *Female Nude* (1910) are some of his most recognizable Cubist illustrations. His highly symbolic *Guernica* (1937) is a lasting memory of the Spanish Civil War.

**William Pitt the Younger** (1759–1806): A lawyer, member of Parliament, and Chancellor of the Exchequer, Pitt became prime minister of Great Britain in 1874. He instituted new taxes and reduced expenditures to reduce public debt. He brought Parliament authority in India and tried to avoid the French revolutionary wars until France declared war on Britain in 1793. His tenure saw British victories at sea (Trafalgar, the Nile), continental failures, and the burden of counterrevolutionary financing.

**Pius IX** (1792–1878): Pope from 1846–1878. Despite granting the Papal States a constitution, Pius was forced to flee Rome during the 1848 revolutions and returned under French protection in 1850. He refused to recognize Victor Emmanuel II’s annexations of the Papal States (1860) and Rome itself in 1870. He is known for his 1864 encyclical *Syllabus of Errors*, a rejection of secularization, a denunciation of liberalism and progress, and an affirmation of the church’s preeminent position.

**Raymond Poincaré** (1860–1934): French statesman. Elected to the Chamber of Deputies in 1887, he served as prime minister and foreign minister before succeeding Armand Fallières as president of France from 1913–1920. Poincaré increased the length of military service and bound France to more concrete diplomatic alliances with Russia and Britain before World War I. He appointed Georges Clemenceau prime minister in 1917 to resuscitate the French war effort and pushed for a draconian peace settlement after German surrender. He was appointed prime
minister in 1922 and, upon German failure to meet its reparations payments, ordered the occupation of the Ruhr a year later. When a fiscal crisis compelled his return to the premiership from 1926–1929, Poincaré boldly devalued the franc to 20 percent of its 1914 value, raised taxes, and reduced government expenditures to make the franc reflect its diminished value in the post-war economy.

Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809–1865): French writer, one of the fathers of European anarchist thought. Advocated a society centered on *mutualism*, whereby economic, political, and other issues would be discussed and resolved amongst small associations, thus relieving the need for strong, centralized government. Like some of the utopians, he believed in the moral potential of the human race and foresaw the day when government would be unnecessary.

Joseph Radetzky (1766–1858): Austrian army commander and a fixture of the counterrevolution in the Austrian empire. Despite desertions and low morale, his armies won key victories at Custozza (1848) and Novara (1849) that stabilized the Austrian hold on northern Italy and forced the abdication of Charles Albert of Piedmont-Sardinia. He was made governor of upper Italy from 1849 to 1857.

Ernest Renan (1823–1892): French historian. His theological and historical backgrounds converged to produce profound explorations of theological doctrines in unique historical contexts. Renan argued that the Bible should be read and criticized like any other document and questioned the divinity of Jesus, preferring to view him as a unique historical figure in a particular epoch.

Cecil Rhodes (1853–1902): Colonial British official and businessman. Rhodes established the De Beers Mining Company in South Africa in 1880 and, after being made a member of Parliament in Cape Colony in 1881, was the chief exponent of British conquest in the region. As prime minister of Cape Colony after 1890, he ensured the disenfranchisement of local Africans and supported the Jamison raid of 1895 in his pursuit of a unified South Africa under British sovereignty.

David Ricardo (1772–1823): British economist. Ricardo is best known for his 1817 *The Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*, in which he presented his theory of the iron law of wages, arguing that they tend to fix themselves at or near subsistence level. Also credited with the theory of comparative advantage, he spent a good deal of time musing on the apparent correlation between a good’s value and price level.

Maximilien Robespierre (1758–1794): An admirer of Rousseau, Robespierre was a member of the Estates General of 1789, a leading figure of the Jacobin club, and an elected member of the Paris Commune of August 1792. He was an important player in the power jockeying that took place between the Girondins and Jacobins and was elected to the Committee of Public Safety, where he played a paramount role during the Reign of Terror. Amidst further threats of purges and disillusionment with the committee during the Terror, he and his Jacobin followers were ousted from power during the Thermidor uprising that was backed by the majority in the convention and guillotined on July 27, 1794.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778): Swiss-French philosopher, political theorist, and writer. A fixture of the Enlightenment tradition, Rousseau argued that men were intrinsically good but were corrupted by the vices of modern civilization. He was concerned with the moral righteousness of man and a believer in the sanctity of individual freedom and self-sacrifice toward the common good. Freedom, he proffered, was found in self-denial, made manifest in a social contract that gives sanction to the community or state.

Count Henri Saint-Simon (1760–1825): French philosopher. Greatly inspired by Adam Smith and the onset of the Industrial Revolution, he believed that society should be run by scientists and businessmen to achieve efficiency and progress. Father of the Saint-Simonian movements, a philosophy well ahead of its time, portending the socialist and feminist movements of the latter part of the 19th century.

Siegfried Sassoon (1886–1967): English poet and writer. His poetry recounts the horror of war in lurid depictions of trench warfare on the western front.

Sergei Sazanov (1861–1927): Russian foreign minister from 1910 to 1916. Fearing a loss of Russian prestige should the nation acquiesce to bullying again and lacking in the sagacity required of his position, Sazanov advocated a hard-line stance toward Austro-Hungarian pursuits in the Balkans. He eventually convinced Nicholas II to respond firmly to the Dual Monarchy’s declaration of war on Serbia by a mass mobilization that all but precluded any chance for reconciliation.
**Friedrich von Schiller** (1759–1805): Great German poet, historian, and writer of the Romantic era and contributor to the German Sturm und Drang movement. Along with Goethe, Schiller is considered one of the fathers of the German literary outpourings of the 19th century. Schooled in medicine, he spent time in theater at Manheim (1783–1784) and as a history professor at Jena (1789). His works embrace the magnanimous and sublime in the human experience, the dreamer at odds with depravity and impediments to spiritual liberty.

**Sir Walter Scott** (1771–1832): Scottish writer and poet. One of the great storytellers of the Romantic period, his most famous works include *The Waverly Novels* (1814–1819) and *Ivanhoe* (1820). Known for his colorful heroes and lyric prowess, he brought historical events to life in his works.

**Percy Bysshe Shelley** (1792–1822): Revered English poet of the Romantic era, he attended Oxford, eloped at 19, and spent many years agitating for social reform. His poetry exalted love, beauty, and the Enlightenment principles of progress and reason. *Prometheus Unbound* (1820), *Adonais* (1821), and *Epipsychidion* (1821) are some of his more famous achievements.

**Abbé Emmanuel Sieyès** (1748–1836): A clergyman before the revolution, Sieyès turned statesman during it and was popular for attacking noble and clerical privileges. He was elected deputy from the Third Estate to the Estates General in 1789 and was involved in the penning of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen and the Constitution of 1791. After isolating himself from the political spotlight during the Terror, Sieyès joined the Directory in 1799 and assisted Napoleon in his coup of 18 Brumaire. He became a senator in the subsequent empire.

**Adam Smith** (1723–1790): Scottish economist. Attended Glasgow and Oxford and authored the famed *Wealth of Nations* (1776) that extolled the practice of specialization in production and laissez-faire economic policies as in the best interests of the population as a whole.

**Georges Sorel** (1847–1922): French philosopher and writer. A Marxist, Sorel was one of the leading exponents of revolutionary syndicalism, whereby industrial production is inhibited by strikes, walkouts, sabotages, and so on in the hope of elevating the trade union to economic and social predominance. His most famous piece, *Reflections on Violence* (1908), is an exaltation of physical force to topple the bourgeois order. Even the myth of an imminent general strike, he argued, could unite the proletariat and foment revolution.

**Charles Maurice de Talleyrand** (1754–1838): Initially a clergyman, Talleyrand became an eminent French statesmen and diplomat. He represented the clergy at the States-General in 1789 but was excommunicated by the pope in 1791. Following the fall of the monarchy in 1792, he spent time in England and America before returning to France to become foreign minister in 1797; he aided Napoleon’s coup of 18 Brumaire and helped bring about the Concordat with the Vatican (1801). A constitutional monarchist at heart, Talleyrand was often at odds with Napoleon, preaching restraint. He represented France at the Congress of Vienna and resigned after the second Bourbon restoration.

**Harriet Taylor** (1807–1858): English feminist. Taylor preached the desirability of the equality of the sexes and sought the elimination of female oppression before the law and through greater educational opportunities. She married John Stuart Mill in 1851, after her first husband’s death.

**Adolphe Thiers** (1797–1877): French politician and historian. Thiers was prime minister under the July Monarchy but was dismissed for aggressive foreign policies that were inconsistent with those of his boss. An opponent of Napoleon III’s emperorship, he criticized French policies leading up to the Franco-Prussian War. After the defeat, he was made head of the provisional government and negotiated a peace with Bismarck and put down the Paris Commune uprising of 1871. Thiers was made president of the French Third Republic in 1871 but resigned two years later when he lost parliamentary support.

**Heinrich von Treitschke** (1834–1896): German historian and fervent nationalist. A liberal member of the Reichstag during his early political career, he became increasingly conservative and nationalistic in the latter stages of his life. Deeply anti-Semitic, he advocated a militant German foreign policy that would elevate the nation to world preeminence, befitting inherent German greatness.

**Flora Tristan** (1803–1844): French feminist, socialist. Agitated for feminist and worker rights and fought for the cooperation of men and women in socialist pursuits, arguing that their fate was linked.
Ivan Turgenev (1818–1883): One of the great Russian writers of the 19th century and proponent of Russian westernization. He attacked the evils of serfdom and concerned himself with the social and political problems plaguing Russia at the time.

Queen Victoria (1819–1901): Queen of England from 1837 to 1901. Was a fervent imperialist and popular for the concern she maintained for her imperial subjects. Her relationships with various prime ministers ran hot and cold, with Benjamin Disraeli being her favorite. The Victorian Era, as the 19th century in Britain has been dubbed, was characterized by a heightened morality and prevailing male and female roles within society, endorsed by the queen.

Richard Wagner (1813–1883): German composer, nationalist, and virulent anti-Semite. As musical director at the Dresden theatre, Wagner was influenced by Beethoven and the German and Italian Romantic traditions. He was involved in the revolutions of 1848 in Dresden and spent much of the remainder of his life working on his five-part masterpiece, Der Ring Des Nibelungen, based in part on a series of medieval European legends.

Max Weber (1864–1920): German sociologist, writer, and economist. One of history’s first sociologists, he was concerned with German social and economic issues. He explored such variables as religion, culture, wealth, and nationality and how they shaped their societies. His systematic approach to the social sciences led to the formulation of archetypes, which he used with economic data to compare different communities and predict their composition and development.

Arthur Wellesley Wellington (1769–1852): English soldier and politician. Served as both division commander and major general in India before being elected member of Parliament in 1806. Wellington assumed command of British, Portuguese, and Spanish forces during the Peninsular War (1808–1814) and helped defeat Napoleon at Waterloo. A Tory in Parliament, he was made prime minister in 1828 and served as foreign secretary in the Peel government from 1834–1835.

Wilhelm I (1797-1888): King of Prussia from 1861–1888 and emperor of the German state from 1871–1888. A military traditionalist in the Prussian mold, Wilhelm I appointed Otto von Bismarck prime minister to strengthen the army and bypass legislative opposition. His reign saw victories against Denmark (1864), Austria (1866), and France (1870–1871). His coronation in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles made him emperor of unified Germany. Because Wilhelm was known for his warmongering, conservative domestic pursuits, most Prussian and, ultimately, German policy was dictated by Bismarck during his reign.

Wilhelm II (1859–1941): King of Prussia and German emperor from 1888 to 1918. A traditional conservative, Wilhelm II claimed that liberalism weakened the state. He dismissed his chancellor, Otto von Bismarck, whose own visions for Germany were inconsistent with the emperor’s imperial and naval aspirations, which threatened Britain and France and led to their entente cordiale of 1904. Wilhelm II isolated Germany by patronizing Austro-Hungarian hegemony in the Balkans at the expense of Russia and further soured hopes of reconciliation with France when the Moroccan crises were precipitated. German military failures in 1918 led to his forced abdication in November of that year.

Woodrow Wilson (1856–1934): President of the United States from 1913 to 1921. Wilson was initially averse to U.S. involvement in World War I, but unbridled German submarine operations prompted a declaration of war in April 1917. His 14-point peace proposal at the Paris Peace Conference proclaimed the importance of national self-determination and proffered a League of Nations that would regulate international conflicts. He opposed the harsh proposals of Clemenceau, advocating a more lenient reparations policy. Severely ill, Wilson failed to gain Senate approval either for Versailles or for the League.

Alfred Windischgratz (1787–1862): Austrian army commander. He put down the insurrections of 1848 in Vienna and Prague. To placate revolutionaries, he helped usher out Emperor Ferdinand in favor of Franz Joseph but was later denoted for his military failures during the Hungarian uprisings of 1849.

Mary Wollstonecraft (1759–1797): Leading feminist and author. She is best known for her groundbreaking A Vindication of the Rights of Women (1792), in which she argued that women should have the right to vote, hold office, and have equality in marriage. Wollstonecraft spent much of the French Revolution in Paris and died in 1797 after giving birth to Mary Shelley, future wife of Percy Bysshe Shelley and author of Frankenstein (1818).

Emile Zola (1840–1902): Prolific French writer. Zola’s novels revealed an inclination toward a scientific social criticism, in which French life was probed. Many of his works followed the predicament of the poor and screamed for reform. He is best remembered for his article J’Accuse, a biting indictment of the army and government during the Dreyfus Affair, earning him praise and rebuke.
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The Long 19th Century:
European History from 1789 to 1917

Scope:
How, when, and where did the modern world take form? What did this mean for peasants, workers, the middle class, aristocrats, women, and minorities? Why did an era that began with the idealism of the French Revolution and the power of the Industrial Revolution reach closure during World War I—the greatest tragedy of modern European history? Did nationalism and imperialism inevitably lead in such a direction?

These are some of the issues we will encounter, as we move from the impact of the French and Industrial Revolutions, 1789–1848, into the “unifications” of Italy and Germany in the 1850s and 1860s, followed by the spread of industrialism and nationalism into the furthest reaches of Europe toward the end of the century. By that time, British and French predominance was eclipsed by a rapidly modernizing Germany, Austria-Hungary was struggling to survive as a multinational empire, Russia was facing the stresses of inadequate modernization, the United States and Japan were beginning to play roles in an emerging world balance of power, and almost all of Africa and much of Asia had been gobbled up in a final spasm of imperial expansion. Moreover, the European great powers, organized in alliances and enmeshed in an arms race, confronted increasingly dangerous international crises. Although more people in Europe lived better than ever before, Europe had become a dangerous place.

During these lectures, I will concentrate on the political and diplomatic history of the great powers—Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia, and Italy—but always in the context of deeper economic, social, and cultural forces. Each segment of the course will begin with general overviews, as needed, then proceed to national histories. The course will conclude with the events that led to World War I and the devastating impact the Great War had on contemporaries and the following generation. Although Lenin, Stalin, Mussolini, and Hitler were neither inevitable nor likely candidates for national leadership in prewar Europe, they were rooted in their national cultures, children of their age. What had gone wrong?

This course can be experienced on many levels. I assume no prior knowledge, no professional vocabulary—just interest, curiosity, and, one hopes, passion. The more you give, the more you will get. Course readings have been selected carefully and tested on generations of students. This course is dedicated to my family, friends, teachers, former students—and to you. I hope you enjoy it!
Lecture Twenty-Five
Bismarckian and Wilhelminian Germany

Scope: If Otto von Bismarck’s major domestic goals after 1870 were the maintenance of the prerogatives of the monarchy and the aristocracy, he was prepared to use almost any means to meet these goals, except sharing real power with others. Thus, Bismarck allied with the National Liberals against the Catholics in a *Kulturkampf* (cultural struggle) for most of the 1870s and beyond. He broke with the Liberals in 1879, when they wanted to share power, allying with the Conservatives, introducing protective tariffs, and attacking the Socialists, now his major “disloyal” internal enemy. Bismarck used both the carrot and the stick—imaginative social insurance schemes and repression; neither prevented the growth of the Socialist Party. Despairing over rising parliamentary opposition, by 1890, Bismarck was considering abolishing parliament; instead, he was fired by brash new Kaiser Wilhelm II, who wanted to manage his own domestic and foreign policy.

Numerous problematic cultural and political tendencies that Bismarck had monitored got more out of control under Wilhelm, such as militarism, imperialism, and more extreme and racialist nationalism. Wilhelm’s frequently strident rhetoric, uncontrolled by the chancellors who served him before World War I, inflamed Germany’s domestic and international situation. Though intelligent, Wilhelm was crude, whimsical, bullying, and easily unstrung. By 1912, the Socialists had become the single largest political party, and German foreign policy seemed more bellicose as well.

Outline

I. Given the personalities involved, it is easy to separate the pre-war history of Germany into two components, the Bismarckian and the Wilhelminian.

A. Although under Bismarck, Germany experienced political stability, economic growth second only to the United States, and tremendous scientific and cultural creativity, this was not true with respect to political culture.

   1. Bismarck had no intention of sharing decision making; the German Empire’s limited constitutionalism was a means, not an end.

   2. As with foreign policy, Bismarck often overshot the mark with respect to perceived enemies and undertook cures that were worse than the disease.

   3. During most of the 1870s, allied with the moderate National Liberal Party, Bismarck’s main domestic policy was the *Kulturkampf*, or cultural struggle, against the Catholic Church, the (Catholic) Center Party, and Polish Catholics in east Prussia.

   4. Fearing that they constituted a state within a state and were subject to meddling by the Vatican, Bismarck passed anti-Catholic laws and campaigned publicly against their role in society.

   5. In 1872, the Jesuits were expelled, while between 1873–1875 in Prussia, the state was given more control of education, bishops were deprived of disciplinary powers, civil marriage became mandatory, and a number of religious orders were dissolved.

   6. Besides strengthening the Center Party by giving it more discipline and solidarity, leading to electoral gains in 1877, the anti-Catholic campaign upset many Protestant conservatives.

   7. Simultaneously, the National Liberals were demanding more of a say in policy, while the Social Democratic Party also won 12 seats in 1877.

   8. With the accession of more liberal Pope Leo XIII in 1878, Bismarck shifted gears, toning down the *Kulturkampf*, reaching an alliance with the Conservative Party, and making the Socialists his new bête noire.

   9. This political reconfiguration also involved economic policy changes that would have a European-wide impact. Bowing to pressure from Junker agrarians and industrial concerns in the face of the moderate European depression from 1873 to 1893, Bismarck introduced a protective tariff in 1879, cementing the marriage between “rye and steel.” Bowing further to Conservatives’ concerns, Bismarck acknowledged that Germany ought to be a Christian state and did nothing to counter the upsurge of anti-Semitic forces in the early 1880s.

B. Bismarck’s anti-Socialist campaign was two-pronged.
1. It included repression, causing the Social Democratic Party to go underground, crippling unions, and leading to the immigration of a number of leftists. This testifies to the constraints on civil liberties in Bismarckian Germany.

2. Second, realizing that industrialization would lead to workers’ grievances, Bismarck passed pioneering social legislation in sickness (1883), accident (1884), and old-age insurance (1889), giving Germany Europe’s most well-developed social net.

3. With the Center Party, the anti-Socialist legislation strengthened the “heroic” socialists, whose popular vote tripled between 1878 and 1890, when they achieved 35 seats in the Reichstag; indeed, by 1912, they had approximately 4.2 million votes and 110 seats.

4. Although the Social Democrats adopted a Marxist platform in 1891, their parliamentary practice and that of Germany’s unions was moderate.

5. Ironically, the political system Bismarck had developed led to his undoing, in 1890, when Kaiser Wilhelm II and Bismarck came to loggerheads.

6. Although socialists and unions continued to gain, Bismarck wanted to combat them and to continue Germany’s close relationship with tsarist Russia.

7. Frustrated by the difficulty of managing parliament, Bismarck might have been considering some form of coup. Ready to set out on his own, Wilhelm believed he could appeal to all Germans’ tendencies and create national solidarity; moreover, he favored closer relations with Austria than with Russia. Still Europe’s most powerful statesman, Bismarck resigned in March 1890, closing an era.

II. Entitling her chapter on the Wilhelminian epoch “Neroism Is in the Air,” Barbara Tuchman captures the essence of the tragic years leading to World War I.

A. There was a huge contrast between Germany’s efficient bureaucracy; industrial, scientific, and technological precociousness and overall educational achievements and the continued immaturity of its aristocratic/militarist political culture.

B. Except for calling off the anti-Socialist campaign in the Reichstag, in 1890, there was little further significant domestic legislation.

C. Incredibly, the second greatest industrial/economic power in the world accumulated a large deficit before World War I, because its elites supported a massive arms and naval buildup but were unwilling to pay inheritance, land, and income taxes.

D. By that time, it was also increasingly difficult to control the Reichstag; the Socialists received one-third of the votes and 110 seats in the 1912 election, while a number of extra-parliamentary pressure groups, such as the Agrarian League, the Colonial League, the Pan German League, and the Navy League, also made their feelings evident.

E. Meanwhile, the kaiser, who had a knack for political and diplomatic gaffes and affairs, exacerbated the nationalist, Darwinian, and bombastic tendencies so powerful in many of the leagues.

F. The worst mistake was the move toward a policy of Weltpolitik (“world politics”), a place in the sun, leading to five naval bills between 1898 and the war, finally converting pro-German sentiment in Britain to pro-French sentiment and a mild Anglo-French entente into a de facto alliance, out of the need to maintain the balance of power in Europe in the face of German threats.

G. British Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary Lord Salisbury minuted a dispatch from Berlin, in which the kaiser had reported of hostile French intentions toward Britain: “I think I have heard some of that before.”

H. The kaiser could simply not be trusted to act responsibly; events such as the Kruger telegram (1896), the Daily Telegraph affair (1908), and the Zabern affair (1913) were just the more public examples of the dangers of a nearly absolutist monarch in Europe’s dominant power.

I. The following combination of conditions proved to be lethal during the final crisis leading to World War I: (1) a type of feudalistic romanticism that actually mirrored some of the worst militaristic, Social Darwinian, and racialist excesses of the late-19th-century German elite and popular culture, (2) an “encirclement psychosis,” brought about largely by the self-destructive nature of German diplomacy, forcing Germany to rely on the unstable Austro-Hungarian Empire, and (3) a commitment to a military plan predicated on a two-front war.
J. No wonder that many great scholars, including Germans, rightly or wrongly, see the primary cause of the Great War as emanating from Berlin—from Germany’s drive toward domination in Europe, or the effective collapse of the German system of government, or in the need to confront domestic gridlock (and especially fears of the left) by powerful foreign policy successes.

K. Indeed, some of these same forces, exacerbated and radicalized by World War I and in the far more traumatized environment of the Russian Revolution and the Great Depression, brought Adolf Hitler into power in January 1933.

Essential Reading:
L. C. B. Seaman, *From Vienna to Versailles*, pp. 120–139.

Supplementary Reading:

Questions to Consider:
1. Why does Germany seem to have been a nation of such contrasts during this era?
2. Analyze the change in politics and tone between the Bismarckian and Wilhelminean eras.
Lecture Twenty-Six
Flawed States—Austria-Hungary and Italy

Scope: Although the Austro-Hungarian Empire and flawed Italian state did not have all that much in common, both were examples of “failed” nation states at the end of the century. In the case of the former, Laurence Lafore indicates: “But Austria-Hungary was not a nation state—and was incapable of behaving as such.” Difficult decisions that might have led to sharing of power with the Slavic minorities in the empire were blocked by the Magyar elite in Hungary, and if Vienna in 1900 was a splendid capital that could boast Gustav Mahler and Sigmund Freud, it was also a school of education for young Adolph Hitler.

In the case of Italy, the issue was not multinationalism but the impoverished peasants of southern Italy, millions of whom flocked to the United States at the turn of the century, while the conflict between church and state placed Catholics in a terrible bind. The Italian state created by Camillo di Cavour and his immediate successors in the 1860s required imaginative leadership but got little until the pre-war Giolitti era, during which Benito Mussolini was also learning his trade as a violent socialist leader.

Outline

I. By the late 19th century, two of the six European great powers, the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the state of Italy, were clearly on the bottom of the pile.

A. After being excluded from the affairs of the Germanic states in 1866, the Austrian monarchy reached a compromise with the Hungarian (Magyar) landed aristocratic elites to the east.
   1. Known as the Ausgleich, or dualism, this agreement created two anomalies.
   2. This was a dual monarchy, combining two independent, equal states under one ruler, with one army and joint ministries for foreign policy, military affairs, and finance, but with each having separate parliaments and separate cabinets.

B. In an age of expanding nationalism, neither of the two dominant groups, the Germans in Austria or the Magyars in Hungary, constituted half of the population in their own sphere.
   1. By 1900, this empire of some 50 million included more than a dozen other ethnic groups, while of the two dominant groups, each accounted for less than 10 million.
   2. The Austro-Hungarian Empire was a multinational empire, not a real nation, and the Ausgleich was a compromise between two dominant ethnic groups against the interests and will of other minorities. The fact that the Czechs sent a delegation to a Pan-Slav Congress in Russia in 1867 was a warning, but it was not as dangerous as the agitation among southern Slavs in Hungary on the eve of World War I, motivated by many grievances and aroused by the nationalist propaganda emanating from bordering Serbia.

C. What made the compromise even more dangerous was the unwillingness of the Hungarian magnates, even more than the German elites, to countenance any real ethnic reform or power-sharing in their region.
   1. Adding further tensions, even between the two dominant groups, was the fact that the western Austrian half experienced greater industrialization, with a more normative late-19th-century variegated social structure, while the Hungarian half was more rural.
   2. In Austria, liberal legislation was passed in the decade following the Ausgleich, including reforms in education, the judiciary, civil liberties, Jewish emancipation, civil marriage, and secularization of education. Around 1900, trade unions were legalized, social insurances passed, and universal male suffrage was granted in 1907.
   3. At the same time, Austrian political culture could be rough and tumble, sometimes pitting class against class, ethnic group against ethnic group, and a modernist urban worldview against a romantic, anti-urban populist mentality.
   4. If Karl Lueger, the populist and openly anti-Semitic mayor of Vienna between 1897–1907, could jest, “I decide who is a Jew,” this was the age in which both Sigmund Freud and Adolf Hitler strolled through Vienna, representing what might be called Germanic cultural schizophrenia.
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5. In Hungary, in which 40 percent of the land was dominated by huge estates and nearly 20 percent was still owned by the church, only 25 percent of men held the right to vote, and forced Magyarization of education and major state institutions continued.

D. What still held the empire together, on the eve of World War I, was the person of Franz Joseph, the army, the church, the bureaucracy, decent economic conditions for segments of the population, and inertia.
1. However, Franz Joseph could not live forever, and the collapse of Austro-Russian cooperation in the Balkans, following the Bosnian crisis of 1908–1909, put the empire at risk.
2. It was not unusual for European diplomats to privately consider what would happen if the empire collapsed, while Austrian elites, particularly in the military, were willing to risk all to prevent this from happening.

II. If Austria-Hungary faced the nearly impossible task of creating a nation state out of a multinational empire, the new Italian nation, a Piedmont writ large, also faced problems of national integration and did not do a much better job of it.

A. Following Cavour’s death and hampered by a jealous monarchy, the “Italian” political elite functioned, until around 1900, according to a system of political musical chairs known as trasformismo.
1. For the most part, the goal was to stay in power, regardless of which ministry one held; the country faced endemic political instability.
2. Sadly, post-“unification” Italy needed more than the imposition of Piedmontese administrative procedures, taxes, and conscription, especially in the underdeveloped, overpopulated south.
3. Worse, much government policy was nationalist, imperialist, and militarist, the costly and self-defeating attempt to make Italy a great power based on more than its Roman and Renaissance past and to fashion integration out of foreign policy success, rather than from reform and modernization.
4. Thus came a tariff war with France, following a quarrel over Tunisia in the early 1880s and the humiliating defeat of Italy’s army at the hands of the Ethiopians at the Battle of Adowa in 1896, leading to popular Prime Minister Francesco Crispi’s fall and more political instability.
5. As L. C. B. Seaman indicates: “Only if words are used in the narrowest and most legalistic sense is it permissible to say that Italy was united in 1860 [and for decades thereafter]; for the new regime was rejected spiritually and politically by the more pious Catholics, and rejected physically to the point of open warfare by the southern peasants.”
6. Following the debacle in Ethiopia, Italy even endured a two-year military dictatorship (martial law) under General Luigi Pelloux (1898–1900), before once again returning to civilian rule.

B. For the better part of the next 15 years, Italy experienced positive developments, even if some holdovers from the past intensified.
1. Under the leadership of Giovanni Giolitti, for much of the 1900–1914 era, Italy experienced economic expansion, education reforms, factory regulatory measures, the liberalization of trade union laws, and less censorship; this culminated in the granting of nearly universal male suffrage in 1912.
2. Another positive trend was the lifting of the papal ban on participating in Italian political life, leading, in 1913, to the founding of a Catholic political party, the Populari Party.
3. These developments were counterbalanced by corruption in Italian politics (elections, for example) and by political radicalization, especially among nationalists and elitists.
4. What many shared was violent language and uncompromising programs, whether it was the popular figures Corradini and d’Annunzio on the right or Benito Mussolini, then on the left.
5. Eminent philosophers, such as Vilfredo Pareto and Gaetano Mosca, called for heroic elites, while young artists, led by Filippo Marinetti, issued a Futurist Manifesto in 1909, exalting the glories of war and adventure.

C. These attitudes, combined with great-power pretensions and jealousies, encouraged Italy to go to war with Turkey in 1911 over Tripoli (Libya), igniting the Balkan Wars between 1912–1914 that pushed Europe to the brink of war.
1. If Italy initially took a pass on war in 1914, nationalist, imperialist, and irredentist sentiments led Italy into the war in 1915.
2. Following the war, her economy in shambles, her nationalists enraged by scant rewards, her cities and countryside destabilized, and five short-lived coalitions unable to get control of events between 1919–
1922, Italy’s elites allowed Benito Mussolini, now an ultra-nationalist, to attempt to create stability, convinced they could remove him from office if he went too far.

3. Although Italy faced severe problems throughout, many of her gravest problems were self-inflicted, not that she was alone in this category.

**Essential Reading:**
Laurence Lafere, *The Long Fuse*.

**Supplementary Reading:**
Alan Sked, *The Decline and Fall of the Habsburg Empire, 1815–1918*.

**Questions to Consider:**
1. Compare and contrast the problems and challenges faced by these two states.
2. To what extent did government itself exacerbate or ameliorate these issues?
Lecture Twenty-Seven
Russia, Turkey, and the Balkans

Scope: Although the era of Alexander II saw a beginning of civic, educational, and economic reforms, his assassination in 1881 led to the return of a policy of orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationalism on the part of his successors, Alexander III (1881–1894) and Nicholas II (1894–1917). Yet Russia could not escape from its role as a great power. This mandated economic modernization, which was disruptive and created concentrations of unruly workers in larger urban centers, without allowing Russia to catch up with rapidly industrializing Germany or Japan. In 1904–1905, this led to both a humiliating defeat and to the near overthrow of the regime during the Russo-Japanese War, followed by an era of pseudo-constitutionalism. Worse, Russia’s defeat in the Far East led nationalists to turn their attention to the Balkans, where they placed additional pressure on the hard-pressed Ottoman Empire and further stimulated the ambitions of the newly independent, irredentist Balkan nations, Serbia, in particular. This rendered direct Russian conflict with Austria-Hungary far more likely, a recipe for disaster.

Outline

I. Although Alexander II’s reforms represented promise, the two last Russian tsars, Alexander III (1881–1894) and Nicholas II (1894–1917) returned mostly to the policies of Tsar Nicholas I (autocracy, orthodoxy, and nationalism), except when forced to do otherwise.

A. Alexander III curtailed the rights of zemstvos and town councils, increased censorship and police, and dropped any constitutional initiatives.

B. These policies were initially worsened under Nicholas II, including severe anti-Semitic policies and pogroms (anti-Jewish riots). Severe repression was supported by the tsar’s closest advisor and head of the Holy Synod, Konstantin Pobedonostsev.

C. At the same time, Russia’s prophetic finance minister and later prime minister, Count Sergei Witte, recognized that Russia had to industrialize, that revolution would occur either from above or below.

1. With the French happy to provide loans, especially after the conclusion of the Franco-Russian Alliance, Russia began a process of rapid industrialization and urbanization, especially with respect to railroads and military initiatives.

2. However, this placed the regime at greater risk, as hundreds of thousands of new workers streamed into cities and factories, with inadequate facilities and little state regulation, while rural overpopulation continued in a nation of more than 125 million.

3. What also made this more dangerous was the rapid growth of constitutional and revolutionary groups and illegal unions. Among these groups were moderate liberals, democrats, several forms of social democrats (Bolsheviks and Mensheviks), social revolutionaries, and other protesters.

4. With endemic near starvation, especially during drought and crop failures, rural protest was also common.

D. Although industrial productivity increased greatly, Witte’s enemies, recognizing that his policies would change the traditional, conservative nature of Russia, ousted him in 1903, hoping to use nationalism and imperialism to bolster the regime.

E. Unfortunately, Russian provocations in Manchuria, threatening Japanese interests, led to the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905), during which Russian armies and navies were trounced by “racial inferiors.”

F. Amidst war-induced domestic hardships, leading to strikes, and the regime’s mishandling of a January 1905 workers’ protest near the Winter Palace, led by Father Gapon, Russia began to collapse during 1905.

1. Faced by further military setbacks and mutinies and spreading unrest (a Peasant Union and the first Soviets emerged), Tsar Nicholas II concluded peace (September) and issued the October Manifesto, breaking the force of the revolutionary movements.

2. Although not intending a truly constitutional regime, the government reorganization brought freedom of the press, speech, and assembly; a national parliament (Duma); and a western-style Council of Ministers.
3. When the dust settled, the police were unleashed, unions were repressed, and successive Dumas were either dissolved or undermined.
4. Conservative forces rallied and organized, while Father Grigori Rasputin rose to power at court in 1907 through his growing sway over Tsarina Alexandra.

G. In the context of a mélange of forces, including reactionary and revolutionary terrorist organizations, waves of anti-Jewish pogroms (Beilis ritual murder trial, 1911–1912), and the arrest of parliamentarians, Count Peter Stolypin, an agrarian Count Witte, achieved agrarian reforms, only to be assassinated in 1911, perhaps by the regime.

H. On the eve of World War I, while rebuilding its military and expanding its railroads, Russia was seething with discontent.

I. Having been double-crossed by Austria and threatened by Germany during the Bosnian crisis of 1908–1909 and thereafter in the Balkans, Pan-Slav nationalists took pride in Russia’s recovery.

II. The region adjacent to Russia was more unstable because the Ottoman Empire and the Balkan region were in disarray during much of the 19th century.

A. Mostly on the defensive from the early 18th century, facing conflict with its powerful Austrian and Russian enemies, and overextended throughout the Balkans and North Africa, the Ottoman Empire was the sick man of Europe. The “eastern question” was understood to mean what would be done with, to, or for the Ottoman Empire.

B. The issue was complicated by the strategic position of Constantinople, dominating the passage from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean and essential for British and French trade routes, and by growing nationalism among misgoverned Christian subjects in the Balkans, leading to rebellions and the quest for independence.

C. Complicating the issue was that the Balkan states, once independent, were neither well governed, well developed economically or culturally, nor willing to be satisfied with their boundaries.
1. Treachery, rebellion, and warfare, either with the Ottoman Empire or between the Balkan states, became endemic to the region.
2. From the wars over Greek independence in the 1820s, to the Crimean War in the 1850s, to the Russo-Turkish War of the late 1870s, the Armenian massacres and Greco-Turkish War of the 1890s, and finally, the Italian-Turkish and successive Balkan Turkish and Balkan-Balkan Wars of 1911–1913, the region was unstable.
3. During most of the century, Britain, France, and sometimes Austria attempted to stabilize the Ottoman Empire and to prevent Russian gains.
4. Britain was the most consistent, although its adventures in Egypt and its occasional support for embattled Christian communities worked against Turkish stability.
5. Once the Franco-Russian alliance was formed, the French placed solidarity with Russia above support for Ottoman interests.
6. Although Germany became the dominant pro-Turkish voice by the end of the century, the best hope for stability occurred when Austria and Russia cooperated to “keep the Balkans on ice,” as between 1897 and 1908.
7. There were also a number of Ottoman attempts at constitutional reform and self-strengthening.
8. Military reorganization attempts were usually more successful; indeed, the empire made a good showing against the Russians in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878, giving the western powers time to intervene.
9. Attempts at constitutional or economic reform were undermined by the disinclination of the sultans to yield power, by the multinational and multi-religious nature of the empire (like Austria and Russia), and by the spendthrift nature of the regime, leading to indebtedness to western creditors.
10. By the time of the Young Turk Rebellion, a nationalist military coup in 1908 that greatly reduced the powers of Sultan Abdul Hamid II and initiated reform, the Ottoman Empire had lost the bulk of its European territories.
11. Following a long struggle, Greece became independent in 1831.
12. Following numerous insurrections, Serbia gained autonomy in 1829, guaranteed by the Treaty of Paris in 1856, and complete independence in 1878, as did Montenegro and Rumania in 1878.
13. Bulgaria’s fate was more complicated; caught between Turkey and Russia, it became virtually independent in 1878 and completely so in 1908. Albania, also on the Adriatic, became independent in 1913, further blocking Serbia’s quest for access to the sea.

14. All of these small mini-states suffered from economic underdevelopment, illiteracy, instability, and irredentist claims on others’ territory.

15. Serbia, in particular, saw itself as the Piedmont of the Balkans, destined to liberate the South Slavs in the Austro-Hungarian Empire and to reclaim Bosnia-Herzegovina and Albania.

16. In this turbulent region, cooperation among the great powers was essential if peace and stability were to have any chance.

Essential Reading:

Supplementary Reading:
Mark Mazower, *The Balkans: A Short History.*
Bernard Lewis, *What Went Wrong? The Clash between Islam and Modernity in the Middle East.*
Joshua A. Sanborn, *Drafting the Russian Nation: Military Conscription, Total War, and Mass Politics, 1905–1925.*

Questions to Consider:
1. What seem to have been the main forces of instability in these regions from 1870–1914?
2. To what extent did the tsarist elites exacerbate Russia’s severe problems, and what other choices could they have made?
Lecture Twenty-Eight
Bismarck Dominates Europe, 1870–1890

Scope: Otto von Bismarck dominated the diplomatic agenda of Europe during the two decades following the final creation of the German Empire in 1870–1871. Functioning proactively, out of fear that the defeated French would seek revenge, he created a series of unstable defensive agreements with Austria and Russia during the 1870s and 1880s. And when these “Emperors’ Leagues” collapsed as a result of Austro-Russian tensions, mainly in the Balkans, Bismarck reached more permanent alliances with Austria in 1879, to which were added Italy and Rumania in 1881 and 1883. These agreements were supplemented with another somewhat contradictory agreement with Russia in 1887, leaving France isolated.

Although the Bismarckian alliance system was defensive and Bismarck sought security and peace rather than expansion, his use of a complex and perhaps unnecessary system of alliances, several mini-war scares, and occasional economic blackmail left a dangerous legacy: Later German leaders lacked his genius and sense of proportion in terms of respecting the balance of power.

Outline

I. Having “united” Germany, defeating and humiliating France in 1870–1871, Bismarck realized that Germany was largely a satiated power. Bismarck’s conservative goals, internally and externally, made him very different from Napoleon or Hitler.

II. However, as in domestic politics, Bismarck was an innovator; fearing France, Bismarck sought to isolate her by agreements with Austria and Russia in the 1870s and an intricate series of alliances from 1879–1890. After 1890, without Bismarck’s steady hand, the legacy of these alliances proved hazardous.

A. Throughout these agreements, Bismarck sought to align Germany with at least two of the other great powers and to balance Austria and Russia.

B. In the early 1870s, Bismarck reached a loose diplomatic agreement, the Three Emperors’ League, with Austria and Russia, soon to discover that even this agreement was hard to maintain.

1. In what came to be known as the “War Scare of 1875,” when it seemed Germany might be considering a preventive war, both Russia and Britain let Bismarck know that they did not want a further diminution of France.

2. Far more significant was the Russo-Turkish War, stimulated by Turkish repression of a Bulgarian rebellion in 1876.

3. Neither Austria nor Britain would tolerate the considerable gains Russia imposed on Turkey in the Treaty of San Stefano (1877); Bismarck stepped in as an “honest broker” at the Congress of Berlin.

4. However, in the crunch, Bismarck backed Austria, leaving Russia angry because the imposed Treaty of Berlin denied Russia most of her gains.

5. The Three Emperors’ League was dead, and it was clear that balancing Austria and Russia in the Balkans was difficult.

C. Still, this is what Bismarck wanted, and he raised the stakes, concluding a defensive diplomatic and military alliance with Austria in 1879.

1. The Dual Alliance set the tone of European diplomacy until World War I.

2. Not only did Russia return to the fold, joining a new Three Emperors’ League in 1881, but Italy joined the Dual Alliance in 1882 (now the Triple Alliance), while Rumania associated in 1883.

3. Italy’s adhesion allowed Bismarck to keep her from France and keep Austria and Italy at peace.

4. Although the early 1880s saw some Bismarckian moves in the colonial direction and Berlin served as the diplomatic center of Europe during the Congress of Berlin (1884), dealing with the rules of the colonial race, the second half of the 1880s saw threats to Bismarck’s accomplishments, both from France and in the Balkans.

5. Russian bullying of client state Bulgaria in 1885 led to tensions with Austria, ending the Three Emperors’ League; revanchist sentiments in France, accentuated by General Georges Boulanger and provoked by Bismarck for parliamentary advantage, caused concern as well.
6. Undaunted, in 1887, Bismarck helped broker several Mediterranean agreements among Italy, Austria-Hungary, and Britain, providing for the status quo in the Mediterranean and Black Seas (against both France and Russia); these were followed by the Russo-German Reinsurance Treaty.

III. If Bismarck seemed able to manipulate his rivals with the genius of his statecraft, he was unable to do so with Kaiser Wilhelm II, who accepted Bismarck’s “resignation” in 1890; he was also unable to manipulate the opinions of later historians.

A. Although most credit Bismarck with genius in his attempt to preserve what he had built, by peaceful means if possible, and recognize that he understood the value of the balance of power for Europe, most also credit his alliances as one of the long-term causes of World War I.

B. These alliances were too complicated, leading more to a growth in tension than to concord or concert. Sooner or later, once Germany chose Austria as her ally, France and Russia were likely to come together; with the demise of Bismarck’s rule, the Franco-Russian Alliance became a reality between 1891 and 1894.

Essential Reading:
L. C. B. Seaman, From Vienna to Versailles, pp. 120–129.

Supplementary Reading:

Questions to Consider:
1. What were Bismarck’s main diplomatic goals, and how well did he achieve them?
2. Conversely, what seem to have been the negative repercussions associated with his policies?
Lecture Twenty-Nine
The “New” Imperialism

Scope: Although forms of domination, empire, and “imperialism” are as old as civilization, and much of the history of western civilization from the late 15th century through the mid-19th century saw almost continuous colonial activity, European imperialism from the 1880s until about 1905 was remarkable for its intensity, tone, scope, and impact. Spurred on, sometimes haphazardly, by national pride, Social Darwinian, and racist assumptions; the search for economic growth and strategic security; Christian conscience; and human adventure and greed and made possible by the radically superior European technological advantage, the “race” for empire was fueled by the European competitive state system and was often popular among the European public.

Taking place throughout much of Africa, but also extensively in Asia, and involving a number of colonial wars, or “pacifications,” imperialism fueled European tensions, militarism, and a reconfiguration of the alliance system and functioned as a safety valve for competing nation states. Ironically, the only two larger imperial wars between substantial powers occurred between industrialized, “non-European” powers, the United States and Japan versus Spain and Russia, respectively. At the same time, the bulk of Europe’s imperial conflicts were temporarily resolved by compromises and partitions at the expense of Africans and Asians.

Outline

I. Although expansionism, leading to the domination of one civilization over another (imperialism), is as old as organized history, the causes, nature, and impact of this process often differ.

II. European civilization, from the late 15th century to the late 18th century, especially in the west, was interconnected with discovery, exploration, and conquest. This led to colonial empires on the part of Portugal, Spain, Holland, England, and France throughout Latin America, North America, India, Indonesia, islands and continents in the Pacific Ocean, and parts of coastal Africa.
   A. Motivated by the trilogy of gold, God, and glory, Europeans established outposts and empires worldwide, uprooting or destroying cultures and civilizations and imposing European economic and cultural-religious domination. Indeed, the slave trade, resulting in the deaths of millions of Africans; the destruction of such well-established civilizations as those of the Aztecs and the Incas; and millions of natives’ deaths from disease or forced labor (especially in silver and gold mining) are events most Europeans and North Americans would prefer to forget.
   B. One major element that lent early-modern European powers their dynamism was the economic exploitation of empires, with the British Empire eventually winning the lion’s share of the spoils.
      1. How ironic that the English middle class/aristocratic synergy, leading to constitutionalism and greater tolerance, was partly based on harsh and murderous exploitation of others, especially “people of color.”
      2. As the great 18th-century British prime minister William Pitt explained, “When your trade is at stake, you have no retrenchment. You must either defend it or perish.”

III. However, the era of European history from the late 18th century until the 1880s is thought of as a relatively non-imperial age.
   A. True, European powers continued to expand, as the French did in Algeria, Southeast Asia, and Senegal, while the British consolidated their control over India and expanded in South Africa, the Russians fought wars of conquest to the east and south, and the “Americans” conquered a continent.
   B. With the British loss of the 13 colonies, followed by colonial losses in the Americas by France, Portugal, and Spain (wars of independence), the average European and the elites turned their attention to the immediate concerns of the French Revolution and Napoleonic era, the Industrial Revolutions, and the forces of constitutionalism and nationalism. To the industrial British, free trade, rather than direct domination, seemed the way to go, even if imposed by force, as in the Anglo-French wars against China in the 1840s and 1850s.
IV. How, then, does one explain the “new imperialism” of the late 19th century? What were its causes and impact?

A. Between 1880 and 1905 or so, the European great powers (except for Austria-Hungary), joined by Japan, the United States, and some smaller powers, claimed virtually every chunk of “unclaimed” or conquerable territory in Africa, Asia, Southeast Asia, and the Pacific Islands. At times, the powers merely expanded their economic advantage in these areas, as Germany did in the Near East (Turkish Empire).

B. What was new was the pace of this competitive expansion and the vastness of the territories occupied; the variety of forms of domination and the extent of control achieved; the public acceptance of the process and its centrality to many European leaders and elites; the number of powers involved and the impact on European and world diplomacy; and the radical impact the expansion had on colonized areas.

C. Indeed, contemporaries and countless scholars have attempted to understand the causes of this expansion.
   1. Sometimes, imperialism is defined in ways associated with its perceived causes, creating a legacy of lasting historical debate.
   2. Vladimir Lenin, writing in the midst of World War I in 1916, proclaimed imperialism the inevitable “monopoly stage of capitalism,” leading almost inevitably to war.
   3. Joseph Schumpeter, writing in 1919, stressed irrational sociological and psychological forces, holdovers from past aristocratic domination—indeed, contrary to rational capitalism—calling imperialism “the objectless disposition on the part of the state to unlimited forcible expansion.”
   4. A generation later, William Langer returned to a nuanced, multi-pronged approach, pointing out the need for a case-by-case study of the multiple causal factors involved but concluding that imperialism is “synonymous with the appropriation by the western nations of the largest part of the rest of the world.”
   5. Most scholars stay closer to Langer, emphasizing nationalism and the striving for great-power status in a competitive state system and in a world impregnated with Social Darwinian and racial conceptions. Also in play are economic forces, including the shock of the European depression, from the early 1870s to the early 1890s, and the return of protective tariffs, which seemed to make the control of colonies essential.
   6. Other factors were the use of imperialism for domestic purposes, often as a substitute for democratic or social reform, a kind of bread-and-circuses tribal satisfaction, playing to our primitive nature.
   7. And, one must include the huge advantage industrial and technological modernization now provided.

D. If scholars debate the causes, they also disagree on the impact of expansion.
   1. Many scholars, both earlier and later, consider imperial conflict a major cause of World War I, because it led to hostility; stimulated the arms race, especially the Anglo-German naval race; and reinforced Social Darwinian elements in Europe. Other scholars consider imperialism to have been a kind of safety valve for overflowing European energy, indicating that most extra-European conflicts were settled by compromise and that the immediate sources of the war were in Europe and grew more intense after the imperial race ended, after 1905.
   2. When Russia was checkmated by Japan in Asia, in 1904–1905, she shifted her focus back to the Balkans, soon conflicting with Austria, the only great power that did not seek an extra-European colonial empire; indeed, this was the most incendiary issue in Europe.
   3. However, even if imperial adventures may have acted as a safety valve, this could not go on forever. Tensions, alliances, arms races, and all sorts of antagonisms resulted, making it more likely that a war would be European-wide and global. The most obvious case was the negative impact Germany’s new imperial world politics and navy had on its relationship with Britain and France.

E. Turning to its impact on the areas in question, especially Africa and Asia but also the Near East (all of largely Islamic North Africa, Muscat, as well as Persia, Afghanistan, and Tibet), imperialism was disruptive to traditional cultures, forcing them to confront modernization at an enormous disadvantage and leaving severe problems that are evident today.
   1. Because the forms of control (annexations, protectorates, control by commissions, extraterritoriality) were far more direct, the pace of change in dominated areas was also accelerated.
   2. Although this situation often brought medicine, railroads, schools, and Christianity, sometimes dispensed by dedicated colonial ministers and selfless missionaries, several well-known colonial proverbs speak more to the point: “When the Europeans arrived, they had the Bible and we had the land; now we have the Bible and they have the land”; “The Europeans who brought the pencil also brought the eraser.”
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3. Surely, this last imperial phase, continued after World War I by means of mandates in the Middle East (formerly under Turkey), accelerated the creation of a global community but one of conflict and resentment.

4. I would, perhaps, amend the statement M. S. Anderson offers in his concluding comments concerning imperialism in his otherwise judicious study *The Ascendancy of Europe, 1815–1914*: “It is almost equally difficult, however, for a European not to feel pride in the sheer energy and confidence which underlay the increasing Europeanization of the world during this period, or in the faith and idealism which, at least in part, inspired it.” If a measure of pride is understandable, it must be balanced with shame and sadness that European expansion was so callous, unreflective, and destructive. Perhaps it could not have been otherwise, but western triumphalism is not called for.

5. Some recent scholars also see the roots of the Holocaust partly in the disregard for the humanity of the “other” in this phase of European Social Darwinian expansion, while others link it to the barbarism of World War I itself; indeed, these are not mutually exclusive developments.

**Essential Reading:**


**Supplementary Reading:**


David Levering Lewis, *The Race to Fashoda*.

Basil Davidson, *The Black Man’s Burden*.

**Questions to Consider:**

1. What seem to have been the main causes of the late-19th-century race for empire?

2. What impact did it have on European diplomacy and politics, as well as on colonized areas?
Lecture Thirty
The Diplomacy of Imperialism, 1890–1907

Scope: Before Bismarck’s dismissal in 1890, Germany was the center of a complex and contradictory net of alliances and understandings that included virtually all European great powers and some of the smaller ones. However, barely 15 years later, the Bismarckian system unraveled, leaving Germany linked dangerously to the unstable Austro-Hungarian Empire and only marginally linked with an Italian ally, while finding herself encircled by a Franco-Russian alliance (concluded 1891–1894) and a Franco-British-Russian entente (concluded 1904–1907). This diplomatic revolution was apparent during the First Moroccan Crisis (1905–1906), which came to an embarrassing conclusion for Germany during the international Algeciras Conference (1906), at which only Austria-Hungary supported German claims. Sadly, much of the blame for this reversal must be placed at the feet of Wilhelm II and his diplomatic and military advisers, whose challenge to much of the rest of Europe is best symbolized by Germany’s un-Bismarckian policy of Weltpolitik, naval expansionism, and muscular blackmail of both France and Russia (1908–1909). Geostrategic reasons enabled France, Russia, and Great Britain to reach agreements in the face of the German challenge. Moreover, France and Britain and Britain and Russia had so many colonial disagreements that compromise over something substantial was possible and in their self-interest. Bismarck’s worst nightmare was finally realized: Germany was surrounded by a larger number of powers and tied tightly to unstable Austria-Hungary.

Outline

I. If Germany was the main factor in European diplomacy between 1870–1890, a different kind of Germany “dominated” this era as well.
   A. Although Germany’s continued economic and military (including naval) precociousness was obvious, none of its chancellors had Bismarck’s sense of perspective or the ability to constrain Kaiser Wilhelm II.
   B. Germany’s pursuit of imperialistic expansion, known as Weltpolitik (“world politics”), in Africa, Asia, and the Near East (actually becoming the dominant power in Ottoman affairs around 1900); her naval-building challenge to Britain and her saber-rattling treatment of France (the First Moroccan Crisis, 1905–1906) permitted a diplomatic revolution, capably pursued by French Foreign Minister Théophile Delcassé (1898–1905), and Germany’s isolation, except for her Austrian ally, by 1906.
   C. The extent of this transformation could not have been perceived until near the end of this period, even though republican France and arch-conservative Russia formed a defensive military and diplomatic alliance between 1891 and 1894.
      1. Although this alliance was one of Bismarck’s greatest fears, all it did was begin to redress the imbalance of power in Europe, until Russia’s defeat by Japan in 1904–1905.
      2. It also forced the German General Staff to plan a two-front war, leading to the Schlieffen Plan (1905), later to have disastrous consequences.

II. On the surface, until 1904, things seemed to be going Germany’s way.
   A. As Europe’s attention shifted to the Ottoman Empire, the first Armenian massacres (1895–1896) and the rebellion in Crete (1896), leading to a Greco-Turkish War (1897), allowed Germany to become powerful at the Porte, helping to block European intervention and gaining economic advantage.
   B. A French attempt to challenge Britain in Africa, at Fashoda, to force Britain to end her 1882 occupation of Egypt, brought Britain and France to the brink of warfare in 1898–1899, leading to a French humiliation and the desire to seek revenge.
   C. Thereafter, gold and greed got the British over their heads in a war against the Dutch Boers in the Transvaal (part of South Africa). Between 1899 and 1902, the British army was tied down subduing the fundamentalist Dutch settlers, at great expense, while Britain’s imperial competitors enjoyed an orgy of gleeful criticism, soft blackmail, and imperial expansion.
      1. Indeed, with German tempting, Britain seemed poised to abandon “splendid isolation” for an alliance, only to be rebuffed by Germany.
2. Coming on the heels of the first two German Naval Laws (1898–1900), which set Germany on a course of competition with Britain, this diplomatic debacle undermined pro-German sentiment in Britain, preparing the way for pro-French sentiment instead.

3. First, the British reached an alliance with Japan, in 1902, expecting to use Japan to prevent Russian expansionism in Asia.

4. Not only were the Russians pressing in on Britain’s sphere in Persia, Afghanistan, and Tibet (inching toward India), but they were doing the same in China, especially in Manchuria (also sought by Japan).

5. However, during the Boer War, the kaiser also made a faux pas with France, tempting Déclassé with the prospect of embarrassing the British with an international conference over the Boer War (and perhaps Egypt as well) but expecting France to agree to a treaty guaranteeing the territorial status quo in Europe, that is, accepting the loss of Alsace-Lorraine.

6. This was the last time Déclassé considered agreement with Germany, forcing him to seek better relations with Britain to obtain compensation for the British occupation of Egypt.

D. Having first brought about a reconciliation with Italy between 1900–1902, in which Italy promised France support in Morocco in return for French support over Tripoli (Libya), Déclassé, pressed by Ambassador Paul Cambon in London, sought a colonial reconciliation with Britain worldwide.

1. What forced the pace and raised the stakes was the Japanese attack on Russia in February 1904, which could have degenerated into a war between France and Britain.

2. Before concluding a colonial settlement, the key segment of which was French support for Britain in Egypt in return for British support of France’s growing occupation of Morocco, the British and French, abused by Germany, decided not to seek German approval and offered each other diplomatic support.

E. The delayed-action German response to the Anglo-French *entente*, the First Moroccan Crisis (1905–1906), soon converted colonial settlement into a virtual diplomatic alliance with military implications.

1. Having first uttered no protest, once the Japanese defeat of Russia made the Franco-Russian Alliance temporarily useless, Kaiser Wilhelm challenged the French in Morocco, visiting Tangier in March 1905 and demanding an international conference.

2. The outgunned Delcassé was forced to resign, knowing his own Prime Minister Maurice Rouvier was dealing with the Germans, although the Germans then mistakenly bullied Rouvier as though he were Delcassé. The upshot was not the collapse of the *entente cordiale*, as Germany desired, nor a “cut” for Germany. Rather, in late 1905 and early 1906, Anglo-French military talks began, while at the Conference of Algeciras (January–June 1906), only Austria supported the German stance—the United States and even Italy supported the French.

3. Then, in 1906–1907, the French helped broker an Anglo-Russian colonial *entente*; it now seemed that Germany was encircled but for its alliance with Austria, although the circle was flimsy.

4. Equally serious, the kaiser had now brought widespread distrust on Germany.

Essential Reading:
L. C. B. Seaman, *From Vienna to Versailles*, pp. 130–156.

Supplementary Reading:
Continue reading Bartlett and/or Rich.

Questions to Consider:
1. How does one explain the major change in German diplomacy after the fall of Bismarck?
2. What were the major causes and components of the diplomatic revolution that occurred during these years?
Lecture Thirty-One
Europe in Crisis, 1908–1914—Outbreak of War

Scope: Although the formation of the Triple Entente in 1907 presented the Dual Alliance with a challenge, it need not have led to war. What made war more likely was attempted Russian movement in the Balkans, following its checkmate by Japan in the Far East. In what turned out to be a botched Austro-Russian maneuver to strengthen both of their positions in the Balkans against a potentially resurgent Turkey, Austria’s annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina—without compensation for Russia—in order to contain the growth of Serbia, led to a fierce Austro-Russian crisis. This Bosnian crisis could have led to a European-wide war, except that Russia, weak from its recent military defeat, backed down in the face of German support for Austria.

Both the content and tone of Germany’s diplomacy—its support for Austria and its threats to France during a Second Moroccan Crisis in 1911, while continuing to put off Great Britain in an exacerbated naval race—enhanced the threat of war. The more Germany’s “enemies” seemed to coalesce, the more strident Germany’s support for Austria became, because Austria’s great-power status was linked to having done with Serb irredentist claims to the Slavic borderland segments of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

By 1912, the era of Austro-Russian cooperation in the Balkans, which functioned so well between 1897–1908, seemed like a distant memory; diplomatic crises were becoming more frequent and dangerous, owing to a sense that war was likely and to the domestic implications of each crisis. A series of wars between the Balkan states and Turkey (1912–1913), set off by a colonial war between Italy and Turkey in 1911, and then between the Balkan states themselves, brought matters to a greater pitch of tension. The last remnants of “concert” diplomacy temporarily calmed spirits during negotiations in London (1913), but only at the cost of further Russo-Serb humiliations. All the powers were focusing on diplomatic and military preparedness, and patience was in short supply.

Outline

I. Although one can see a number of dangerous tendencies in European diplomacy and culture by 1907, it was during the succeeding seven years that the die was cast, and the decision to risk a wider war was made.

A. As Laurence Lafore emphasizes in *The Long Fuse*, the main problem that led to the war in 1914 concerned an increasingly severe conflict between Austria-Hungary and the irredentist state to her southeast, Serbia. Settling this conflict once and for all was viewed as essential by the Habsburg elites and their German allies; they would even risk a wider war if necessary.

B. While not negating this contention entirely, other scholars have emphasized the dangerous and incoherent nature of German diplomacy, its political system, and leadership and/or Germany’s decision to achieve dominance in Europe by provoking a war seen likely to happen anyway before Russia was able to recover from its defeat in 1904–1905.

C. The entire nature of European culture and its historical experience in the decades before 1914 must be factored in, including extreme nationalism, militarism, the alliance system, imperialism, a wider culture impregnated with violent Social Darwinian and racialist assumptions, and the tragically mistaken belief that even a wider European conflict would be short, glorious, and cost effective (that is, the short-war illusion).

D. Although many of these forces were in play by 1907, they had not reached a critical point, unless one accepts the view that Germany would provoke a world war sooner or later. After 1900, “coping” with Germany was clearly a difficult but not impossible task; pre-World War I Germany, though greatly conflicted, does not appear to have been suicidal.

II. A careful analysis of what changed after 1907 is essential, particularly with respect to the Balkan region, source of the immediate Austro-Serb conflict that disintegrated into World War I.

A. Until 1908, the hopeful situation in the Balkans was the Austro-Russian decision to seek stability there.
B. Given the nature of the alliance system, Russo-Austrian “concert” in the unstable Balkans was essential in preventing a wider war.

C. As of 1907, two situations that had made the quest for stability desirable were undermined.
   1. Checkmated by Japan in the Far East, Russian nationalists, wanting to use foreign policy to buttress the monarchy, switched their attention to the Ottoman Empire and the Balkans.
   2. By 1907, the Austro-Serb conflict had degenerated into a near free-for-all, with the Austro-Hungarians determined to checkmate Serbia before the Serbs disrupted the empire itself.

D. The situation that provoked the fateful Austro-Russian conflict began in 1908 as an attempt at concerted action, but not of a stabilizing kind.
   1. Following a reformist, nationalist military coup in the Ottoman Empire (July 1908), the Austrians and Russians agreed (in September) to make their gains in concert before the Ottomans were able to reassert their authority. The Austrians would annex the Slavic provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, cutting Serbia off from the sea, while the Russians would obtain the right to station warships in the Black Sea (and to pass through the Straits).
   2. What began as a concert degenerated into a crisis in October, as the Austrians apparently double-crossed the Russians, annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina without awaiting Russian action.
   3. Outraged, the Russians called for an international conference; the Austrians, backed by Germany, refused, humiliating Russia.
   4. During the crisis, the kaiser made things worse by a convoluted interview to the British Daily Telegraph, claiming he had helped Britain in the Boer War and shielded Britain from the anti-British sentiments of many Germans.
   5. A wider war could have broken out in 1908–1909, except none of the parties was prepared, politically or psychologically.

III. Although 1914 was relatively calm, until the final crisis from late June to early August, matters had continued to worsen between 1909–1913.

A. Seemingly successful attempts to improve Franco-German relations (1909–early 1911) collapsed when the Germans provoked a Second Moroccan Crisis (July–November 1911), hoping to achieve territorial compensation (a diplomatic victory) and/or to break the Anglo-French entente, instead gaining some low-value territory while strengthening Anglo-French bonds.

B. Following a failed British attempt to defuse the Anglo-German naval race in early 1912 (the Haldane mission), the British and French shared military secrets and discussed strategies, simultaneously reaching secret naval agreements, essentially mandating conflict with Germany along France’s Atlantic coast or in the Mediterranean, if either country was at war with Germany.

C. An Italian war with Turkey over Tripoli led to the Balkan Wars in 1912–1913, during which the region was destabilized, while Serbia and Russia were humiliated (Albania was created, blocking Serbia from the Adriatic).

D. By 1914, the situation was inflammatory.
   1. The Austrians wanted a showdown with Serbia to break her diplomatic independence or to destroy her.
   2. The “encircled” Germans, in order to save their only “dependable” ally and to achieve their goals, vague or concrete, were ready to back Austria or push her, believing, in a worst-case scenario, that Russia and France were still beatable rather easily, although the gap was fast closing. Many believed war would come; some wanted it.
   3. The French feared the collapse of their Russian alliance if they did not support her forcefully; the French military was confident and tired of backing down.
   4. The Russians were vengeful and angry, unwilling to accept further humiliation, and believed their army was ready.
   5. The British wanted peace but knew they could not allow France to be crushed.
   6. All the powers were facing financial and political pressures from a perpetual arms race, while many diplomats, fatigued by the crises, were losing their trust in diplomacy.

E. Following the assassination of Austrian heir-apparent Franz Ferdinand by Serbian nationalist-terrorists, Austria-Hungary, backed and encouraged by Germany, decided for war, localized if possible.
1. When the Austro-German decision-makers decided not to accept the Serbs’ conciliatory response to the Austrian ultimatum (July 25), with Austria declaring war on Serbia, the die was cast.

2. Given the time-based imperatives of the Schlieffen Plan, by 1913 Germany’s only operational option, British attempts to intervene were bound to fail.

3. Russia backed Serbia, Germany backed Austria, France backed Russia, and Germany invaded Belgium—though neutral, the fastest route to France—allowing Britain to declare war.

4. As British Foreign Secretary Lord Grey said: “The lights are out in Europe: I do not believe we will see the light in our day.”

**Essential Reading:**

**Supplementary Reading:**
Continue reading Bartlett, Rich, and/or Taylor.
Begin reading David Fromkin, *Europe’s Last Summer: Who Started the Great War in 1914*?

**Questions to Consider:**
1. Why were the diplomatic crises during this era more dangerous than those that occurred earlier?
2. What impact did these crises have on the policies and expectations of the great powers?
Lecture Thirty-Two
The Origins of World War I

Scope: When Serbian nationalists assassinated Archduke Franz Ferdinand in June 1914, they presented Austria-Hungary and Germany with an issue that could be used to justify war, by then, seemingly necessary for the survival of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and, therefore, for German security, as well. In that view, running the risk of a Europe-wide war for regional pacification seemed worth taking, given that Russia and Serbia, and even the other entente powers, had backed down before.

A serious treatment of this decision requires a multi-tiered review of the longer-term forces, assumptions, and recent crises that were central to Europe’s history before 1914. Among the forces analyzed by historians who have studied World War I are: nationalism; the alliance system; militarism; violence-laden cultural assumptions, including Social Darwinism; domestic political considerations; imperialism; and the impact of nearly 15 years of increasingly frequent crises. More studies focus on the multinational structure of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in a hyper-nationalist age and the unprofessional nature of post-Bismarckian German diplomacy, supporting Austria and frightening everyone else. Other scholars suggest that, given the short-war illusion (the belief that even a general war would be relatively brief), military leaders were more exigent than dispirited diplomats and that the technically based time schedules, especially the Schlieffen Plan, hamstrung serious diplomatic procedures. Indeed, many European leaders and a considerable segment of the public took the final steps to war too lightly; Europeans would rue these days forever.

Outline

I. In seeking the underlying and immediate causes of World War I, historians analyze a variety of developments, then focus on the final crisis of June–July 1914.

II. Unfortunately, the underlying causes read like a litany of much that was askew in European civilization.

   A. Perhaps the most dangerous feature is that European nationalism became more exclusivist, Darwinian, and even racist, even as it spread eastward and into the Balkans, and became mass based.
      1. Nationalism was the dominant religion of the century; it became something like a tribal team sport.
      2. Not only did nationalism motivate elite behavior, but it could be used to justify incautious policies or to co-opt the masses as a substitute for reform.

   B. Making this more dangerous was militarism.
      1. Although the growth in universal military conscription following the Franco-Prussian War also integrated the masses into the nation, it enhanced nationalism and brought power to the military, the most powerful symbol of the nation.
      2. With the increasingly technological nature of warfare, military affairs became the domain of supposed or real experts, the highest caste in society.
      3. In the decades before the war, military expenditure increased radically, because of the arms race, and military plans were developed with specific war models.
      4. The German Schlieffen Plan, especially, narrowed flexibility in time of crisis and placed military “imperatives” above political ones. Once war was likely and perhaps even desirable, military necessity and timetables took precedence.

   C. Because the military elite was more politicized and nationalist and believed that it could “solve problems” better than politicians, military pressure became a powerful force.
      1. This was true among all of the great powers, but more so in monarchies, where the upper military elite was inseparable from the regime.
      2. Nationalism and militarism were imbued with Darwinian and racialist cultural assumptions.
      3. Competition and struggle were dominant motifs among educated elites, and war was seen by many as the ultimate test of manhood, leading to spiritual growth and creativity.
      4. With the short-war illusion, the belief that conflict would be decisive and glorious (as in the Franco-Prussian or Austro-Prussian Wars), war could be seen as a cost-effective problem-solving tool.
5. It is probably not a coincidence that the British, having experienced the brutal Boer War (1899–1902), were least taken with this illusion.

6. In a non-clinical way, one can say that European culture had become somewhat schizoid: Layer after layer of society had been given greater individual rights, including women, children, and Jews; however, struggle, war, and death were seen as glorious experiences.

7. Elements of an earlier liberal, universalist worldview, privileging tolerance, rationality, and compromise, were in decline.

D. The nationalistic, militaristic, Darwinian worldview was evident in the imperialist mania between the 1880s and 1905.

1. What could have been more schizoid in nature? With railroads, the Bible, and modern medicine came war and domination; this was tribal sport at its best.

2. Imperialism was not only a function of nationalism, Darwinism, racism, and militarism, but it exacerbated these tendencies.

3. It led to a number of international crises while facilitating the development of the Anglo-French _entente cordiale_ (1904) and the Anglo-Russian _entente_ (1907), as well as hardening the Austro-German Dual Alliance after the First Moroccan Crisis (1905–1906).

4. Although one can debate whether imperialism was a primary cause of the war or a temporary safety valve (and both could even apply), it played a central role in the alliance system.

E. As with imperialism, the alliance system functioned in a variety of ways, and it changed over time.

1. Bismarck’s alliances were defensive and made it unlikely that France would provoke a war of revenge. However, these alliances were too complicated and forced excluded nations to be dependent or to form counter-alliances.

2. Even when the blocs came into existence by 1907, as a function of imperial concerns, international crises, and the Anglo-German naval race, the alliances did not necessarily lead to war. The fact that the Austro-German alliance functioned decisively during the Austro-Russian Bosnian Crisis (1908–1909) helped prevent an immediate war between Austria and Russia.

3. However, during the five years before World War I, the alliances “hardened,” with increasingly binding military implications, making it almost inevitable that war between single members of each bloc would lead to a European war.

4. Each successive international crisis placed the alliances under greater pressure; neither side could see one of its partners broken.

5. Given the peculiar and increasingly unstable structure of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (and of tsarist Russia), this brings us to the most immediate (but also long-term) forces and situations that led to both the Austro-Serb War and World War I.

F. If the tsarist empire was multinational and multi-religious, at least there was one dominant national group; in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, two dominant groups, still a minority of the population (about 40 percent), ruled the others.

1. Making this far more dangerous was Hungarian unwillingness to “lighten up” with the South Slavs, while neighboring Serbia, viewing itself as the Piedmont of the Balkans, sought to destabilize the Austro-Hungarian Empire and expand to the Adriatic Sea.

2. The Austro-Hungarians had twice blocked Serbia’s westward advance, by annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina (1908) and creating Albania (1913), with German support and Russian humiliation, but their military elite and many political leaders had come to believe that Serbia had to be broken. The assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand by Serbian nationalist/terrorists, while visiting Bosnia in 1914, was a perfect opportunity.

G. With the encirclement psychosis among the German military and political elite after Germany’s isolation during the 1906 Algeciras Conference, except for Austria-Hungary, Germany began to support the more radical actions of its sole ally. What Bismarck most feared had come into being—the “tail was wagging the dog”—and the Dual Alliance had become more offensive.

1. Eschewing a policy of trying to undermine the Triple Entente with honey, Germany strengthened it with threats and crises, simultaneously coming to believe that the great-power status of the Austro-Hungarian Empire had to be preserved at all costs.
2. On the eve of World War I, the German military (backed by much of the political elite), placing all its bets on the two-front Schlieffen Plan, had come to believe that a larger showdown war was likely and that it should come before Russia had fully recovered from its defeat by the Japanese.

3. For the German military, the kaiser, and his advisers, the assassination was an opportunity; Serbia would be radically weakened, one way or another, or Germany’s Russian and French enemies would be taught a lesson in a popular war. Either way, the kaiser and his generals hoped Britain would stay out, although the German ambassador in London disagreed.

H. By 1914, neither the Russians nor the most involved French politicians and military leaders were willing to back down, because a showdown seemed likely and they also believed they would win quickly.
   1. Angered and humiliated by recent German and Austro-Hungarian actions, pressed by Pan-Slavist sentiment, and fearing domestic backlash, Russia held her ground.
   2. Angered by German blackmail, hoping to obtain revenge and Alsace-Lorraine, and fearing that failure to support Russia could disrupt the Franco-Russian alliance, France held its ground and did not discourage Russia.

I. All the wrong cards fell into place, including Germany’s invasion of neutral Belgium, allowing Britain to decide for war with little discussion; the rest is history.

Essential Reading:
Modris Eksteins, *Rites of Spring*, pp. xiii–94.

Supplementary Reading:
Finish reading Fromkin.

Questions to Consider:
1. What were the main long-term developments that made World War I more likely?
2. Does it seem that war could have been avoided during these years, and how?
Lecture Thirty-Three

The Great War—A Military Overview

Scope: Given the strength of the combatants, the only possibility that World War I might have ended quickly was the Schlieffen Plan, calling for a decisive German victory in France, followed by German defeat of Russia. When the Schlieffen Plan failed, at the First Battle of the Marne (September 1914), the powers entered into terra incognita. Following a race to the sea in the west, the battle settled into stalemate trench warfare, punctuated, from early 1916, by a series of battles of industrial slaughter, such as Verdun, the Somme, the Nivelle offensive, and the final German thrusts in the west in spring 1918.

On the eastern front, battles of movement were still possible, especially between the German and Russian forces, including German victories at Tannenberg and the Masurian Lakes. Finally, superior German generalship and industrial capacity helped bring on the Russian Revolutions of 1917 and their exit from the war in March 1918.

Other history-changing battles were fought in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East and in the air and on the sea, while every sinew of industrial/technical organization was focused on ghastly new weapons. In the end, the war was decided in the west, not because the Allies were superior but because a German miscalculation, introducing unrestricted submarine warfare in 1917, led to American entry in the war. The fact that the Russian Revolutions and American entry occurred in 1917 signifies the birth of a “new world order,” even before the guns fell silent in November 1918; Old Europe had virtually committed suicide.

Outline

I. Although a consideration of the mega-battles of World War I would be a fascinating enterprise, our emphasis will be on the battles and military decisions that determined the outcome of the war and best represent its nature and impact.

A. The most important battle was the First Battle of the Marne in France in September 1914, leading to a stalemate.
   1. Following the German defeat of invading Russian forces at the Battle of Tannenberg in late August and the German advance through Belgium and France against the Franco-British forces, the Schlieffen Plan seemed to be working. Only the French victory at the Marne saved the day, as Barbara Tuchman has indicated, “determining not that Germany ultimately would lose or the Allies ultimately would win the war but [that] the war would go on.”
   2. What followed in the west was the race northward to the sea, in attempted outflanking movements, followed by the digging of, at first, hasty trenches all along the front.
   3. Next came what Raymond Aron called the “hyperbolic nature” of the war, following the “technical surprise,” the realization that none of the estimates—for needed guns, shells, material, fuel, or food—was vaguely sufficient. In the west, the two sides were roughly equivalent in industrial capacity; that meant unleashing a more rapacious industrial war machine on Europe’s youth and middle-aged men.
   4. Generals had had no experience in managing millions of troops in this kind of war; defensive weapons turned out to be superior to offensive weapons.
   5. Machine guns, barbed wire, trenches, and fortifications forced attacking armies to suffer dreadful losses for scant gains.
   6. Murderous bombardments conducted to soften the enemy gave notice of attack, preventing surprise.
   7. What was left was to introduce ghastlier weapons, the Germans generally taking the lead (flamethrowers, several forms of poison gas, submarine warfare, dirigibles, and airplane encounters) and the Allies quickly following, except for tanks, which the British introduced.

B. Bereft of any alternative and attempting to break the stalemate, General Eric von Falkenhayn “secretly” introduced another method of warfare that came to symbolize the western front—and whose name evokes horror—Verdun.
   1. Choosing a place the French had to defend for historic reasons, the Germans intended to “bleed the French white.”
2. In a series of attacks, lasting from February 1916 until the late fall of that year (relieved somewhat by the equally grotesque British Somme offensive [July–November 1916] to reduce pressure on the French), the French were bled, but so were the Germans. The French lines and spirit held, buoyed by the prudent general Philippe Pétain.

3. Many hundreds of thousands of lives were lost, with an equivalent number of wounded (the British suffered 23,000 deaths and 25,000 wounded on the first day of the Somme offensive).

4. These battles were the Auschwitz of World War I.

5. Other theaters of the war saw deadly engagements, although of a different type.

6. The Gallipoli campaign of 1915, pitting mainly the British, Australian, and New Zealander forces against the Turks in an attempt to take Constantinople, was a disaster for the Allies.

7. The Russians, meanwhile, were suffering defeats in a war of movement in the East (Masurian Lakes [February 1915], Galicia [May 1915]), with their only major victory coming during the early Brusilov offensive (June 1916).

8. The Russians were under-armed, underfed, and frequently poorly led.

9. With their armies and their home front collapsing simultaneously (the tsarist regime fell in March 1917; the Bolshevik coup occurred in November 1917), the Russians and Germans signed an armistice in December 1917 and a peace in March 1918, both at Brest-Litovsk.

10. Although Brest-Litovsk was a Punic peace, requiring German forces to remain in the east, this still freed up troops for the western front, for what Generals Hindenburg and Ludendorff hoped would be their final offensive.

11. This would have been conceivable, except for the gamble the German military imposed on the civilians in February 1917, reintroducing unrestricted submarine warfare, which led to America’s entry in the war in April.

12. With seemingly unlimited American supplies and an almost unlimited number of fresh, if untested, American troops, the great German spring offensive of 1918 was almost bound to fail. With America in, the Allies were bound to win; it was a question of time.

13. Fearing a collapse of their armies in August 1918 or revolution, Generals Hindenburg and Ludendorff demanded an armistice from their government, signed on November 11, 1918, by republican civilian authorities.

14. Before that time, civil war had broken out in Russia, British forces had routed the Turks in the Middle East, and the Austro-Hungarian Empire was struggling to survive, having reached an armistice with the Allies in early November.

II. Although most of Europe was at peace (or in the absence of war) by November 1918, it was the peace of the dead.

A. Of the approximately 65 million soldiers mobilized, somewhere between 9 and 10 million died, and easily double that number were wounded, many permanently maimed.

1. If the Russians and Germans suffered much higher losses, the French suffered by far the highest percent of irreplaceable losses. About half of French men between the ages of 20 and 32 in 1914 were killed in the war, with total French war dead of about 1,384,000; 63 percent of the 1914 graduating class of the prestigious St. Cyr Military Academy died during the war. In a real sense, France was never the same, at least not until well after World War II. The German losses were about 1.8 million out of a population of about 65 million.

2. The war worked in a reverse Darwinian mode; those most fit served and often died, particularly among the elites and the middle classes.

3. In addition to the dead and the physically maimed was the tragedy French poet Paul Valéry called the “wounding of the mind,” both among combatants and others.

4. In Erich Maria Remarque’s classic anti-war cry, All Quiet on the Western Front, the main character, Paul Baumer, reflects that reality prior to his death: “Had we returned home in 1916, out of the suffering and the strength of our experiences we might have unleashed a storm. Now [1918] if we go back, we will be weary, broken, burnt out, rootless, and without hope.”

B. Equally telling, however, were the responses of Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler, for whom the war had been a peak experience, leaving them thirsty for more.
1. Benito Mussolini was already in power in October 1922, while Adolf Hitler, in prison in 1924, wrote in *Mein Kampf*:

   I had the good fortune to fight in the first two offensives and in the last. These became the most tremendous impressions of my life…Once again the songs of the fatherland roared to the heavens along the endless marching columns, and for the last time the Lord’s grace smiled on His ungrateful children.

2. Extreme before, their minds were also wounded; the imbalance between many postwar pacifists and war-addicted extremists made Europe more unstable.

3. Many historians believe that industrial genocide implemented during World War I simply lowered the barrier. To many, human life lost much of its value; poison used on the battlefields would later be used in concentration camps.

4. As Freud feared, in an essay titled, “Thoughts for the Times on War and Death” (1915): “We cannot but feel that no event has ever destroyed so much that is precious in the common possessions of humanity….It strips us of the later accretions of civilization, and lays bare the primal man in each of us.”

**Essential Reading:**
Modris Eksteins, *Rites of Spring*, pp. 95–207.

**Supplementary Reading:**
Barbara Tuchman, *The Guns of August*.

**Questions to Consider:**
1. Why was it so difficult for either group of powers to win the war quickly, and what impact did this have?
2. Once the short-war illusion was exploded, why wasn’t an armistice reached?
Scope: Once the First Battle of the Marne determined that Germany would not win World War I quickly and combatants realized the war would consume greater quantities of resources than imaginable, the “war behind the war” became as decisive as the battlefield. The society that could place more men, material, food, and fuel on the battlefield was likely to triumph. Here, the two sides were relatively equal, and the intensity of conflict mounted, at least until Russia cracked in 1917, replaced by effective American power.

In the face of this crisis, combatants organized similar, massive home-front efforts, best explained, by historian Gordon Craig, as political centralization, economic regimentation, and thought control. State authority expanded, in the context of temporary political truces, while munitions tsars devised centralized mechanisms to increase productivity. Even in democratic states, propaganda and censorship eclipsed normal political discourse and civil liberties. Women took up men’s tasks, and some Russian women even saw combat.

Successful home-front mobilization, especially in Germany, France, and Great Britain, help explain the wartime performance of those nations, while less successful procedures in Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Italy led to failure on the battlefield. Win or lose, expanded government, accelerated social change, and new cultural assumptions could not be erased after the war, at least not for long. The “war behind the war” left a deep imprint on the postwar generation.

Outline

I. The stalemate during the early phase of World War I had as significant an impact on domestic developments as on the battlefield, leading to radical innovations.

II. Quickly realizing that domestic mobilization could determine the war, combatants, especially those equally matched in the west (Britain, France, and Germany), engaged in political centralization, economic regimentation, and thought control.

A. Each of these states proceeded along these lines in the context of its own political culture and needs.

B. Given that these were the most industrialized and integrated states, each with its advantages or disadvantages, neither side could gain radical advantage; the extension of state power and control escalated, paralleling the war.

C. With respect to political centralization, the path was more erratic, although states experienced “political truces” in the beginning of the war, which tended to break down by 1916 or 1917.

1. This was perhaps best represented by the kaiser’s assertion: “I recognize political parties no more; I recognize only Germans.” Still, political life in Germany in some ways followed its pre-war patterns but with telling twists: If the monarchy expanded its powers, by 1916, Germany became a military dictatorship under the control of Generals Hindenburg and Ludendorff. In 1918, amidst the shock and disarray that came with the realization that Germany had lost, following extreme privations and continued lies, and in the hopes that a liberal Germany would get better terms, the monarchy collapsed and a republic was proclaimed (November 1918), led by socialists and democratic forces.

2. In Britain, Liberal Party domination continued, but with a change of leadership in 1916. Before 1916, Liberal “coalition” Prime Minister H. H. Asquith had prosecuted the war, using a volunteer army. David Lloyd George, his successor, introduced military conscription, and his leadership was essential in developing the convoy system that helped keep Britain afloat during the “turnip winter” of 1916–1917.

3. France had a series of coalition cabinets, climaxied by the appointment of the powerful “tiger,” Georges Clemenceau, in November 1918, who both expanded government powers and maintained civilian authority over the military. Queried in Parliament concerning his policies, Clemenceau retorted: “I make war.”
4. In contrast, Russia saw the increasingly personalized rule of Tsar Nicholas II, influenced by his wife, Alexandra, herself under the control of faith healer Grigori Rasputin. Rasputin’s murder by a group of loyal aristocrats in December 1916 was a kind of forecast for the collapse of the tsarist regime.

D. With respect to economic regimentation, Britain, France, and Germany all saw a radical expansion of government control, including increased taxation, price controls, rationing, constraints on unions, and so on.

1. Most significant, however, were the appointments of munitions tsars (Socialist Albert Thomas in France, Liberal cabinet member David Lloyd George in Britain, and eminent industrialist Walter Rathenau in Germany).

2. All three developed boards or departments that coordinated the production of munitions and essential materials, working with industrialists and labor to enable their countries to stay in the war.

3. Given the Allied blockade, Rathenau’s tasks were the most difficult, although superior German industrial and scientific capacity accomplished “miracles” during the war. Moreover, not only did Germany have to make up for the deficit it suffered compared with the power of the British and French empires, but the United States was not really “neutral” economically even before entering the conflict, expanding trade and loans to the Allies way out of proportion to those afforded the Central Powers. In December 1916, Germany passed a law requiring either military or economic service from all males between the ages of 16 and 65.

E. A third area of shared wartime experience was thought control.

1. Pernicious but understandable, given the carnage, this involved not only press censorship but a propaganda campaign to demonize the enemy.

2. At least in the beginning of the war, these efforts were virtually unchallenged on the part of most citizens.

3. Not only did most German Social Democrats vote for war credits at the outset, but most French “suspects” on a special surveillance list volunteered for military service.

4. Even in Britain, with probably the strongest tradition of civil liberties, the Defense of the Realm Act (DORA, August 1914) was amended to include prosecution of defeatists.

5. This essentially “ideological” warfare had both expected and unanticipated results: Not only did it undermine a mediated peace, but it also contributed to the harshness of the Treaty of Versailles. Because censorship prevented German parliamentarians from realizing they were losing, it made the “stab-in-the-back” theory, blaming the war’s loss on communists, socialists, and Jews, more credible. When more accurate information about the propaganda exaggerations emerged in the 1920s, it made even well-intentioned individuals less inclined to accept similar (but more truthful) claims during the 1930s and World War II.

III. All things considered, the effective prosecution of the war behind the war, especially in the west, facilitated the battlefield carnage and marked a further decline in the limits of the power of the state, expediting later experiments in both interventionist and totalitarian models of statecraft.

Essential Reading:

Supplementary Reading:
Stéphane Audoin-Rouzeau and Anette Becker, *Understanding the Great War*.
Martin Gilbert, *The First World War*.

Questions to Consider:
1. What is meant by “the war behind the war,” and why was it so significant?
2. What seem to have been the main legacies of domestic policies undertaken during the war?
Lecture Thirty-Five
The Impact of World War I—New World Disorder

Scope: Gauging the impact of World War I is difficult because it accelerated profound global changes, many of which are still “in process” today; indeed, World War I was to the 20th century what the French and Industrial Revolutions were to the 19th. This becomes apparent when we realize that World War I made World War II and the Holocaust possible without determining that they occur; many historians now analyze the 20th century’s “Thirty Years’ War.”

Although it is artificial, the best approach is to consider the war’s “impact” components separately, then combine them. Next to the 9–10 million war deaths, the most obvious results, validated by postwar treaties, were massive territorial changes—the collapse of four empires (German, Russian, Austro-Hungarian, Turkish)—and the appearance of a series of new or differently shaped states and mandates. Also evident in Paris were the decisive appearance of the United States and Japan and the absence of Germany and Bolshevik Russia.

No less profound was worldwide economic dislocation, symbolized by severe European inflation and American dominance; the United States was now the greatest creditor, while even Britain and France were debtors. The full impact of this change became clear in 1929, when the Wall Street Crash caused havoc.

The jungle of socio-cultural and psychological effects is more difficult to disentangle, while the impact on political ideology and “ordinary” political processes was dramatic. Indeed, while most British and French citizens became obsessively attached to a “never-again” mentality—also represented by Germans in Remarque’s All Quiet on the Western Front—Benito Mussolini’s warlike fascists governed Italy by 1922, while Adolf Hitler’s National Socialists were one of many war-obsessed German protest groups. And we have not yet spoken of Lenin or Stalin, the destabilization of relations between men and women, or the acceleration of nationalist and anti-colonialist movements worldwide. A new world disorder was in the making.

Outline

I. World War I was the prism through which at least the first half of the 20th century would evolve.

II. This becomes all the more understandable if one recognizes the connection between World War I and World War II: If the first did not determine the second, it made it a distinct possibility, so much so that many scholars now speak about them as a unified experience.

III. Although it is artificial to break down the war’s impact into separate categories, doing so helps us get a clearer picture of its scope.

A. Besides the human losses, physical and psychological, and the expansion of state authority, the next obvious areas to be considered are the war’s political and diplomatic ramifications.

1. Here, the most obvious developments were the structural and territorial changes associated with the collapse of four empires. Austria-Hungary, Russia, Turkey, and Germany all lost segments of their territories, sometimes massive, as in the case of the Habsburg Empire. Britain and France were the big “winners,” dividing up German territory in Africa and Turkish territory in the Middle East; Japan and Italy also made gains.

2. In the immediate aftermath, the changes in Europe were most dramatic, although the long-range impact of Turkish losses and British and French gains in the Middle East (the Mandate System, the Balfour Declaration encouraging a Jewish homeland in Palestine, 1917) make it clear that we are still feeling the impact of developments stemming from World War I.

3. Within Europe, a number of states experienced minor losses or gains, while the breakup of the German, Austro-Hungarian, and Russian Empires saw the rise of new or changed states, such as Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland (more than 30 million), known as the Balkanization of Eastern Europe. Large segments of Slavic lands in the Habsburg Empire were also attached to Serbia in the enlarged state of Yugoslavia (until the early 1990s).
4. Adding further instability—a kind of vacuum of power between revisionist Germany and revisionist Russia—these states had economic problems, large minorities, and claims on each other’s territories.

5. Making matters more complex was what Professor Hajo Holborn has called the “political collapse” of Europe: World War I was a pivotal transition between the European balance of power, transposed worldwide, and what came to be called the world political system, a halfway point to more complete globalization. World War I saw two extra-European powers, the United States and Japan, play a decisive role in determining Europe’s fate. Few recognized that this was a permanent alteration in power relationships, and the United States was unprepared to act as the world’s stabilizer. At the same time, the British and French did not realize that their positions in the world would never be the same.

6. Making this worse was the Bolshevik coup d’état, both for what it represented and what the Soviet Union’s diplomacy would be: The Bolshevik Revolution introduced a deep ideological component into diplomacy that had not existed since the religious wars between Protestants and Catholics. It is impossible to understand the rise of National Socialism or the success of Hitlerian diplomacy without realizing the threat Bolshevism posed to European (and American) elites, making the Soviet Union a pariah.

B. On the socioeconomic level, more difficult to analyze with equal certainty, the changes were equally profound.

1. The primary socioeconomic impact of the war was the destabilization of structures, norms, and patterns and the undermining of traditional values and assumptions.

2. Even the political emancipation of women in Britain, Germany, and the United States (and in the Soviet Union), part of a longer historical process but accelerated in some countries by the war, led to radical anti-feminist postures, especially among fascist-like movements. In France, there was an especially strong pro-natalist campaign, urging women to replenish France’s manhood.

3. An equally liberating, yet destabilizing struggle also accelerated in the British and French Empires and elsewhere, where the assumption of European cultural superiority was fractured by the nature of the war, after which many colonial troops expected more rapid advancement than the imperial powers would countenance.

4. This was also the case for the millions of front-line European soldiers who had risked everything for their nations and had come to have much less respect for authority; soldiers also had a greater sense of self-worth, expecting that their sacrifice would yield respect and decent jobs.

5. Here, precisely, was the rub: While expectations had been raised, the ability of the victors to satisfy them was undermined by the cost of the war, the way in which it had been financed, and the new global economic balance of power.

6. In 1914, Britain, France, and Germany were the world’s greatest creditor nations; now, they were the world’s greatest debtor nations—Britain and France because of debts owed to the United States and Germany because of reparations imposed by the Treaty of Versailles, partly to enable Britain and France to repay their debts.

7. Both the United States and Japan had captured many of the international markets previously dominated by Britain, France, and Germany, while the Soviet Union cancelled the loans the tsarist regime had received from the French.

8. The European combatants financed the war from loans, with financially responsible Britain paying for only 30 percent of these costs by increased taxation. The impact of these economic developments, plus some irresponsible postwar economic policies, led to severe inflation in France and to runaway inflation in postwar Italy and Germany.

9. Economically, the victors were among the vanquished. France recovered most successfully but still devalued its currency by 80 percent in 1928. Britain suffered less inflation but experienced chronic unemployment in the 1920s. Socioeconomic destabilization and runaway inflation helped bring Mussolini into power in October 1922, and devastating inflation in Germany during 1922–1923 ravaged the German middle class, severely undermining the Weimar Republic and creating a fertile environment for Adolf Hitler’s early career.

10. Although a measure of prosperity returned to segments of Europe, including Germany, when the United States intervened with large loans in 1924 (the Dawes Plan), this came to a screeching halt with the stock market crash of 1929. In 1932, the American political response to the Great Depression was F.D.R.; in 1933, the German political response was Adolf Hitler.
C. Another factor that conditioned German and European politics during the 1920s was the Treaty of Versailles, imposed by the victors in the spring of 1919 and thereafter, during the course of a worldwide influenza pandemic and political instability, also related to the Russian Revolution.

1. With respect to Germany, the treaty was draconian, because that nation was seen as the main cause of the war, the potential future destabilizer of the peace, and the defeated power most capable of paying for the costs; hence, the severe limits on Germany’s military and the huge reparations bill, $33 billion.

2. However, the Treaty of Versailles, including its reparations clauses, was a direct result of the war, particularly the way in which it was financed. The treaty was less draconian than either the Peace of Brest-Litovsk Germany imposed on Russia in March 1918 or the treaties, with large additional annexations in the west, that Germany intended to impose on the Allies.

3. The Treaty of Versailles was the logical result of the nature of World War I. Some semblance of an acceptable peace between Germany and France was finally achieved between 1924–1926, with the Dawes Economic Plan (1924), the Locarno Treaty (1925; mutual boundaries in the west; no further French intervention to compel reparations payments), and German entry into the League of Nations (1926).

4. When Germany joined the League, neither the Soviet Union nor the United States was a member, although President Wilson believed it was his signal accomplishment at Versailles. We were simply not prepared to play the role World War I had bequeathed us, and that added to the tragic impact of World War I itself.

Essential Reading:

Supplementary Reading:
Erich Maria Remarque, *All Quiet on the Western Front*.

Questions to Consider:
1. Why is World War I usually viewed as the greatest tragedy of modern European history?
2. Why did this war lead to such widespread destabilization in Europe and elsewhere?
Lecture Thirty-Six
Looking Back, Thinking Ahead

Scope: Historians will forever consider the might-have-beens of the long 19th century. What if Germany had developed a more responsible political system? What if Austria-Hungary had done a better job of national integration? What if Austria-Hungary and Russia had found a way to work in concert in the Balkans? Sadly, the what-ifs remain moot, while the results of World War I set much of the agenda for the next half-century: Lenin consolidated his power during the Russian Civil War, Mussolini was brought into power in October 1922, and Adolf Hitler rose to power in January 1933 in the midst of the Great Depression.

Yet this series of tragedies should not negate the fact that, in so many material and cultural ways, the long 19th century had been a time of progress and change and that many of the promises of the French Revolution and the possibilities of the Industrial Revolution had come to fruition. Following a more devastating European and World War (1939–1945) and the collapse of the Soviet Union (1989–1992), many European states were on the verge of achieving good things, at least when the demons of nationalism were under control.

Outline

I. Given that most scholars look at the 19th century as a time of progress in European and even world history, it seems inappropriate to end our course with the catastrophic outbreak and impact of World War I, the greatest tragedy in modern European history.

II. We need to return to some of the comments I made at the outset, in terms of how we define an era and what situational blinders color our appreciation of its meaning.

A. If we were to have taken a more conventional chronological approach to the century, say, from the Congress of Vienna (1814–1815) to the outbreak of World War I (1914), it was, at least for Europe, overwhelmingly a time of peace among the great powers. The Crimean War stands as the most costly exception, but one that pales when compared with either the Napoleonic wars or World War I.

B. Even if we begin with 1789 (the French Revolution and the early Industrial Revolution) and continue until 1917 or so (the two Russian revolutions and the American entry in the war, as well as the breakdown in the solidarity fronts in Britain, France, and Germany), we are still left with a long core era of remarkable peace. Compare this with the 17th century, which included the Thirty Years’ War (1618–1648) and the long reigns of Louis XIV (1661–1715) of France and Peter the Great of Russia (1682–1725), almost half of each spent in war.

C. Our analysis becomes more complicated when we turn to issues of ideology, class, gender, ethnicity or race, religion, and whether one considers oneself European. Still, for most Europeans, at least in terms of their material culture, the 19th century was an extended era of progress.

1. Using several basic indices that combine quality and quantity of life issues, on a macro–all European level, the overwhelming majority of Europeans were illiterate in 1800, while most (especially in western and central Europe) could read in 1900; the majority had no sense of constitutional or national rights in 1800, while most either enjoyed (or were about to enjoy) some form of both by 1900.

2. Although the aristocrats still lived best, most members of the expanding middle class lived better than ever, with more expected in the future.

3. The working class, or proletariat, which was the largest group in the most industrialized countries, sometimes suffered horribly and worked under difficult conditions everywhere. However, increasingly protected by unions, the vote, and some social welfare and gaining access to the increase in productivity and some leisure, most workers were doing better, even if they were not getting their fair share.

4. As for those who worked the land, in central and eastern Europe, most were serfs until the 1848–1861 emancipations, and most still worked under grueling, uncertain conditions, until some form of modernized agriculture and the transportation/communications revolutions broke down their isolation and dependency on nature. Life remained difficult for farm labor, even in the west, but at least there were urban outlets, emigration, and a greater measure of safety and security.
5. As for women, most were still virtual property in 1800 (including their children), while they had become civil beings in most of western and central Europe by 1900 and were about to gain political emancipation in the Protestant great powers and a different type of emancipation during the Bolshevik Revolution.

6. As for religious minorities, still depending very much on the country, the better part of religious equality was achieved in the 19th century, certainly in western and central Europe, even though enormous resentments and social exclusion remained.

7. Especially if we factor in science, technology, and the beginning of modern medicine, life was improving materially and culturally.

D. Still, not everyone would have agreed with these variables and how one weighs them, the process of change itself was destabilizing, perceptions did not always match reality, and several highly dangerous new developments were emerging.

1. Industrial society involved change and urbanization; not only did it create the new, but it uprooted the old. Those who favored tradition, localism, and a sense of community (Gemeinschaft) gradually gave way to the demands of markets, productivity, and a cash nexus (Gesellschaft).

2. The ideological, material, and scientific developments of the 19th century led to greater secularization and to a breaking down of barriers; many people were scandalized by such developments.

3. Within industrializing societies and between those industrializing at different paces, industrial modernization challenged power relationships of all types, pushing some groups or nations forward, while leaving others behind or disadvantaged.

4. Older elites were often dismayed by these developments, while the more numerous artisans and even newer white-collar groups often found themselves caught between large collectives—big business or unions.

5. And what about former outcasts, especially Jews, who seemed to benefit, sometimes jumping to the front of the line, challenging accepted cultural norms?

6. Of course, it was in the changed relationship between modernized and traditional societies, and especially between (western) Europe, the United States, and Japan (which caught up quickly) and the traditional civilizations of Africa, Asia, and somewhat later, the Middle East, that the gaps were greatest and the unsolicited attack of modernity most extreme.

7. Although Europeans abolished the slave trade and slavery in their empires, in most places during the pre-1850 era, the encroachment of industrial European power during the last decades of the century was without precedent, except during the first ages of Portuguese, Spanish, and Dutch expansion, mainly in the 16th century. It brought medicine, Christianity, and railroads, yet it was unwanted, sometimes opposed with futility, and profoundly destabilizing.

8. By what scales does one weigh the pluses and minuses of this westernization and globalization, and who has the right to judge?

E. Of course, it is here that European imperial expansion, based on “neutral” industrial and technological advantages, joined forces with the most dangerous 19th-century developments—hyper-nationalism, combined with Social Darwinism and “scientific” racism. As is often said, “Nationalism began like Sleeping Beauty and ended up like Frankenstein’s monster”; that is to say, it began as a liberal, universalist sentiment before becoming strident, survivalist, and racist.

F. When set in a competitive-state environment, in which the three most conservative great powers still set few checks and balances on their monarchs and in which the most powerful of them, Kaiser Wilhelm II, had delusions of grandeur, World War I was more likely than not. This was especially true after the Austro-Russo antagonism was added to the aftereffects of the Franco-Prussian War and the Anglo-German naval race.

G. Once the die was cast, given the relative balance in power between the two armed camps and the fact that they had all been preparing for the possibility of war as best as they were able, the stalemate in the west, at least, was also likely; as they say, the rest is history.

H. Thinking ahead, two of the most powerful analysts of the impact of 20th-century warfare on history, Raymond Aron and Barbara Tuchman, put it this way:

1. Aron: “The principal causes of the Second World War resulted from the prolongation of the first war and, above all, of the Russian Revolution and the Fascist reaction to it in Italy and Germany.”
2. Tuchman: “The deadlock [of the war], fixed by the failures of the first month, determined the future course of the war and, as a result, the terms of the peace, the shape of the interwar period, and the conditions of the Second Round.”

I. It was not a straight line, and it did not have to be. However, so many of the positive developments in Europe during the 19th century had been undermined, while so many of the negative ones were exacerbated, that the unimaginable came to pass—not only a second world war, of greater magnitude, but a second genocide, of immensely greater demonism.

1. By then, the European great powers, even with their remaining empires, had had enough; the fate of the earth, at least for a time, would be decided by the two superpowers, soon armed to the teeth with 50,000 nuclear weapons collectively.

2. Although our world isn’t exactly a joyride, we are fortunate to have survived the “short 20th century” (1914–1989 or 1917–1989), as well as we have and to have the leisure to ponder our troubled but fascinating past and our uncertain but exciting future.

Essential Reading:
P. M. H. Bell, *The Origins of the Second World War in Europe.*

Supplementary Reading:
Albert Camus, *The Plague*.

Questions to Consider:
1. In what ways did World War I seem to serve as the pivotal experience, at least for the first half of the 20th century?
2. Analyze the pluses and minuses of the “Thirty Years’ War” thesis.
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