

MANONMANIAM SUNDARANAR UNIVERSITY

THIRUNELVELI- 627012

DDE, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY



HISTORY OF EUROPE (1789 A.D – 1945 A.D)

Study Material Prepared by

Dr. D. Latha Kumari, MA, M.Phil, B.Ed, Ph.D

Assistant Professor (T), Department of History

MS University, Tirunelveli- 12.

HISTORY OF EUROPE (1789 A.D – 1945 A.D)

UNIT: I - Europe from 1789-1870

French Revolution- Causes Course and Results – Napoleon Bonaparte – Administration- Wars- Continental system – Defeat and Decline. The Congress of Vienna – Its achievements- The Holy Alliance- Concert of Europe Revolution of 1830- Revolution of 1848- Napoleon III-Foreign Policy- Third Republic of France

UNIT: II - National Movement in Europe

Unification of Italy and Germany – Bismarck- Career and Achievements- The Eastern Question- The Greek War of Independence – The Crimean War- the Russo- Turkish War and the congress of Berlin – Young Turk Movement- the Balkan wars.

UNIT: III - European Alliances and the First World War

The Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente- First World War-Causes, Course and Results- Peace of Paris- League of Nations.

UNIT: IV – Dictators and the Enlightened Despot

Locarno Pact- Kellong Briand Pact – Russian Revolution – Fascist Italy- Mussolini- Weimar Republic and its failure- Nazi Germany – Turkey under Mustafa Kamal Pasha.

UNIT: V - Europe since 1939

Second World war- Causes, Course and Results- U.N.O. Europe after the Second World war- Cold War-Variou Alliances in West and East- Europe Common Market- Domination of the two super powers in Europe.

BOOKS FOR REFERENCE:

1. Anthony Wood - Europe 1815-1960, Longman Group Ltd, 1988.

2. Charles Downer Hazen and S.P Verma - Modern Europe up to 1945, S. Chand & Company Ltd, 1984.
3. David Thomson - Europe since Napoleon, Penguin Books, 1977.
4. Grant A.J - Europe in the Nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Sixth edi. Longman Groups Ltd, London 1976.
5. Gokhale B.K. – Modern Europe 1858 – 1960, Himalaya Publishing House 1987.
6. Vidhyadhar Mahajan - History of Modern Europe since 1789, S. Chand & company Ltd, New Delhi 1981.

CONTENTS

1. The French Revolution (1789–1799)
2. Napoleon Bonaparte
3. The Continental System
4. Napoleon Bonaparte and His Internal Reforms
5. The Congress of Vienna
6. The Holy Roman Empire
7. The Reformation
8. Metternich System (1815-1848)
9. Charles X 1824–1830
10. The revolution of 1830
11. The Revolution of 1848
12. Napoleon III, Emperor of the French (1852-1870)
13. Unification of Italy and Unification of Germany
14. Eastern Question
15. Young Turk Movement of Turkey
16. Crimean War
17. World War – I

18. The League of Nations
19. The Russian Revolution
20. Fascism in Italy
21. Nazism in Germany
22. Second World War
23. The United Nations Organization
24. Cold War: it's Origin, Causes and Phases
25. European Common Market
26. The Rise of a two Superpower and its Effect on World Order.

History of Europe (1789-1945 A.D.)

1. The French Revolution (1789–1799)

Introduction

The French Revolution (1789–1799) was a period of ideological, political and social upheaval in the political history of France and Europe as a whole, during which the French polity, previously an absolute monarchy with feudal privileges for the aristocracy and Catholic clergy, underwent radical change to forms based on Enlightenment principles of republicanism, citizenship, and rights. These changes were accompanied by violent turmoil, including executions and repression during the Reign of Terror, and warfare involving every other major European power.

The Revolution was originally a popular uprising against the absolute power of the king and against the privileges and wealth of the elite, and was perpetrated in the name of liberty, equality and fraternity. In reality it led to the loss of liberty, dictatorship and nationalism. The revolution was based on a hatred of tradition and desire to use the power of

the state to create a new order. People were given new identities as citizens of the state. To crush the resistance to revolution and the new order about 18,000 - 40,000 people were executed. The revolution was unable to establish a durable system of governance, and in the following century, France would be governed variously as a republic, a dictatorship, a constitutional monarchy, and two different empires and under a dozen different constitutions. Subsequent events caused by the revolution include the Napoleonic wars, the restoration of the monarchy, and two additional revolutions as modern France took shape. The longer term European consequences include the counter-enlightenment and Romantic Movement in Germany which arose in reaction to the imposition of French rationalist culture. This was accompanied by the reunification of Germany as a defensive measure against a future Napoleon. French revolutionary ideas also inspired and influenced Marxist revolutionary movements such as the Bolsheviks in Russia who followed the pattern established in France of large scale executions of the enemies of the people by impersonal government organs.

In France, not everyone sympathized with or supported the Revolution and no single, dominant or shared vision of governance developed. There were too many monarchists to have a republic and too many republicans to have a monarch. What the Revolution did emphasize was the concepts of being a citizen with rights and of that nation as belonging to its citizens, who are not merely subjects of a ruler who more or less “owns” the state. The French revolution put nationalism on the political map.

Causes

Historians disagree about the political and socioeconomic nature of the Revolution. Less than one interpretation, the old aristocratic order of the Ancient Regime succumbed to an alliance of the rising bourgeoisie, aggrieved peasants, and urban wage-earners. Another interpretation asserts that the Revolution resulted when various aristocratic and bourgeois reform movements spun out of control. According to this model, these movements coincided with popular movements of the new wage-earning classes and the provincial peasantry, but any alliance between classes was contingent and incidental. However, supporters of both models identify many of the same features of the Ancient Regime as being among the causes of the Revolution.

Socio- Economic Causes

Social and economic factors were: The social and psychological burdens of the many wars of the eighteenth century, which in the era before the dawn of nationalism were exclusively the province of the monarchy. The social burdens caused by war included the huge war debt, made worse by the monarchy's military failures and ineptitude, and the lack of social services for war veterans.

A poor economic situation and an unmanageable national debt both caused and exacerbated by the burden of a grossly inequitable system of taxation. The Roman Catholic Church, the largest landowner in the country, which levied a harsh tax on crops known as the dime. While the dime lessened the severity of the monarchy's tax increases, it nonetheless served to worsen the plight of the poorest that faced a daily struggle with malnutrition. The continued conspicuous consumption of the noble class, especially the court of Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette at Versailles, despite the financial burden on the populace. High unemployment and high bread prices, causing more money to be spent on food and less in other areas of the economy; Widespread famine and malnutrition, which increased the likelihood of disease and death, and intentional starvation in the most destitute segments of the population during the months immediately before the Revolution. The famine extended even to other parts of Europe, and was not helped by a poor transportation infrastructure for bulk foods. In addition to economic factors, there were social and political factors, many of them involving resentments and aspirations given focus by the rise of Enlightenment ideals.

Political Causes

Resentment by the ambitious professional and mercantile classes towards noble privileges and dominance in public life (with a clear picture of the lives of their peers in the Netherlands, present-day Germany, and Great Britain etc.); Resentment of manorialism (seigneurialism) by peasants, wage-earners, and, to a lesser extent, the bourgeoisie; Resentment of clerical privilege (anti-clericalism) and aspirations for freedom of religion; Continued hatred for (perceived) "Papist" controlled and influenced institutions of all kinds, by the large Protestant minorities; Aspirations for liberty and (especially as the Revolution progressed) republicanism; Hatred toward the King for firing Jacques Necker and Anne Robert Jacques Turgot, Baron de Laune (among other financial advisers) who represented and fought for the people. Finally, perhaps above all, was the almost total failure of Louis XVI and his advisers to deal effectively with any of the problems listed above.

French political philosophy

The causes listed above did not determine the course and outcome of the revolution. What affected the decisions that were made the assumptions and ideals of the participants. The revolution and the course that it took were affected by the ideas of the French Enlightenment. Pre-revolutionary France was a complicated and very illogical place without common laws or institutions of government. In theory the king was the source of all law and administrative authority reigning by the grace of God. In practice he was hemmed in by a multiplicity of customs and interests which made it almost impossible to change anything. For years intellectuals had been discussing how to change and regenerate French society but they did not have the power to make much difference as all power was in the hands of the nobility. They had little practical experience of government. This tended to make their discussions even more abstract and idealistic. Unlike England, in France there was no national or even regular local parliaments where ideas and policies could be debated and reforming laws passed and implemented.

Descartes

The pre-eminent French philosopher was Descartes. He extolled reason as the criterion of truth and rationality as the standard by which everything was to be judged. Descartes was a brilliant mathematician whose inspiration came from Euclidean geometry which enabled complex structures to be built up from simple axioms. The nature of geometry is that there is only one right answer to a problem. All other answers are false. This is why Descartes thought that reason was independent and not a social construction. He and his successors believed that the social order, like geometrical order, was the product of design and could thus be redesigned by intelligent people. In this way human society could be made anew. This is why Abbé Sieyès exhorted the French Revolutionary Assembly to "act like men just emerging from the state of nature and coming together for the purpose of signing a social contract." The idea driving this movement was that it is possible and right to overthrow an existing order, by force if necessary, on the grounds of abstract principles rather than existing laws. Tradition and custom had no authority. This was quite different from the English and American rebellions which sought to make government respect the law, especially the old ones. Descartes was not attracted by the messiness of Athenian democracy but instead took Sparta as his model.

He said her greatness "was due not to the pre-eminence of each of its laws in particular... but to the circumstance that, originated by a single individual, they all tended to

a single end." The goal was not to create a society based on laws which secured people's freedom to pursue their own legitimate purposes. Instead it was to create a society where everyone followed the purposes determined by the ruler. Sparta was also the ideal of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Robespierre, and Saint Just. This widely accepted assumption made establishing and accepting dictatorial rule very likely.

Rousseau

Rousseau was the most influential political philosopher in France. He believed that human beings were born sinless but were corrupted by society. This was in contrast to the traditional Christian view that people are born selfish and need to be socialized into good behaviour by the family and other social institutions. Rousseau thought that all that is required for people to realize their full human potential was to change the social conditions. The agent to achieve this perfection is government. To begin this process, everyone in the society has to subscribe to a new social contract. In order to be free, every individual has to surrender his rights to a collective body and obey the general will. The state is vested with total power, which is legitimate because it has the consent of the majority. The general will, by definition, is always right and reflects the real interests of every member of society. So anyone who disagrees with the general will is mistaken and acting contrary to his own best interests. It is the ruler's responsibility to correct him and force him to act for his own benefit, to force him to be free. What is supremely important is the whole, of which an individual is merely an expendable a part.

Since the French monarchy had already centralized all power in itself, as epitomized by the statement of Louis XIV, all that needed to happen was to seize that power and use it for the benefit of society, to make people free. Again this was quite different to the Anglo-American attempt to secure freedom by limiting the power of the state and decentralizing power as much as possible. The irony is that despite the fact that the most intelligent people were involved in the French revolution at every stage, there actually was neither plan nor anyone capable of making one. Instead once the initial steps had been taken, the internal logic of the train of events that had been set in motion unfolded. An astute observer of human nature and affairs like Edmund Burke was able to predict what would follow with uncanny accuracy. Another important element in French political culture was its anti-clericalism. France was a Catholic country and the church was immensely powerful. It had a monopoly of public worship and Protestants had no civil rights. It controlled the educational system, poor

relief, hospital provision, and had extensive powers of censorship. The pulpit was used by the secular authorities for announcements and keeping the king's subjects docile and obedient. There developed a strong anti-clerical reaction to the intolerance and obscurantism of the church.

Voltaire

Voltaire (1694 – 1778) travelled to England during the height of the deist movement and brought back to France many new ideas from the free thinkers he met. Although many Englishmen adopted certain deist ideas that were compatible with a free Christianity, in France they were accepted as reinforcing the anti-clericalism of the age. The Jesuits who carried the intellectual weight of the Church had been suppressed by Louis XV, and so the radical deist ideas encountered little opposition. Voltaire disseminated these ideas to become the leading satirist of the Catholic Church mocking it continually. His views were widely accepted among intellectuals. Traditional Christian values and virtues were rejected in favour of the supremacy of human reason.

The Revolution's economic ideas were dominated by the Physiocrats, who preached the virtues of laissez-faire economic freedom. To achieve this they advocated a powerful interventionist role for government to sweep away the many obstacles to a natural economic order. These ideas, along with materialism and atheism, were disseminated by the Encyclopaedia edited by Denis Diderot (1713 – 1784) and Jean le Rond d'Alembert (1717 – 1783) and affected the general tenor of society. This influenced the course of the revolution and its actions against the church. In keeping with this philosophy, in its most radical and destructive phase the revolutionaries tried to make a complete break with the past and create an entirely rational society purged entirely of Christianity. 1792 was declared to be "Year I" and a new calendar with a ten-day week was introduced. A "Religion of Reason" based on deism was established and people were given a new identity as citizens of the State. Loyalty to the State was the citizens' highest duty and aspiration. In this way the revolution aimed to change people's beliefs, identity, and values.

In its Jacobin phase, the revolution is best understood as an effort to establish citizenship as the dominant identity of every Frenchman-against the alternative identities of religion, estate, family and region. Citizenship was to replace religious faith and familial loyalty as the central motive of virtuous conduct. Indeed, citizenship, virtue, and public spirit were closely connected ideas, suggesting a rigorous commitment to political activity on

behalf of the community-patria, not yet nation. In Jacobin ideology, citizenship was a universal office; everyone was to serve the community”

Estates-General of 1789

The immediate trigger for the Revolution was Louis XVI's attempts to solve the government's worsening financial situation. In February 1787, his finance minister, Lomenie de Brienne, convened an Assembly of Notables, a group of nobles, clergy, bourgeoisie, and bureaucrats selected in order to bypass the parliaments. Calonne asked this group to approve a new land tax that would, for the first time, include a tax on the property of nobles and clergy. The assembly did not approve the tax, instead demanding that Louis XVI call the Estates-General. On August 8, 1788, the King agreed to convene the Estates-General in May of 1789. By this time, Jacques Necker was in his second turn as finance minister.

As part of the preparations for the Estates-General, cahiers de doléances (books of grievances) were drawn up across France, listing the complaints of each of the orders. This process helped to generate an expectation of reform of some kind. There was growing concern, however, that the government would attempt to gerrymander an assembly to its liking. In order to avoid this, the Parliament of Paris proclaimed that the Estates-General would have to meet according to the forms observed at its last meeting. Although it would appear that the magistrates were not specifically aware of the "forms of 1614" when they made this decision, this provoked uproar.

The 1614 Estates had consisted of equal numbers of representatives of each estate, and voting had been by order, with the First Estate (the clergy), the Second Estate (the nobility), and the Third Estate (middle class and peasants) each receiving one vote. Almost immediately the "Committee of Thirty," a body of liberal Parisians, began to agitate against voting by order, arguing for a doubling of the Third Estate and voting by headcount (as had already been done in various provincial assemblies, such as Grenoble). Necker agreed that the size of the Third Estate should be doubled, but the question of voting by headcount was left for the meeting of the Estates themselves. Fuelled by these disputes, resentment between the elitists and the liberals began to grow. Pamphlets and works by liberal nobles and clergy, including the Comte d'Antraigues and the Abbé Sieyès, argued the importance of the Third Estate.

When the Estates-General convened in Versailles on May 5, 1789, lengthy speeches by Necker and Lamington, the keeper of the seals, did little to give guidance to the deputies, who were sent to separate meeting places to credential their members. The question of whether voting was ultimately to be by head or by order was again put aside for the moment, but the Third Estate now demanded that credentialing itself should take place as a group. Negotiations with the other two estates to achieve this, however, were unsuccessful, as a bare majority of the clergy and a large majority of the nobility continued to support voting by order.

National Assembly (1789)

On June 10, 1789 Abbes Sieyes moved that the Third Estate, now meeting as the Communes (English: "Commons"), proceed with verification of its own powers and invite the other two estates to take part, but not to wait for them. They proceeded to do so two days later, completing the process on June 17. Then they voted a measure far more radical, declaring themselves the National Assembly, an assembly not of the Estates but of "the People." They invited the other orders to join them, but made it clear they intended to conduct the nation's affairs with or without them. In an attempt to keep control of the process and prevent the Assembly from convening, Louis XVI ordered the closure of the Salle des Etats where the Assembly met. Weather did not allow an outdoor meeting, so the Assembly moved their deliberations to a nearby indoor tennis court, where they proceeded to swear the Tennis Court Oath (June 20, 1789), under which they agreed not to separate until they had given France a constitution. A majority of the representatives of the clergy soon joined them, as did 47 members of the nobility. By June 27 the royal party had overtly given in, although the military began to arrive in large numbers around Paris and Versailles. Messages of support for the Assembly poured in from Paris and other French cities. On July 9th the Assembly reconstituted itself as the National Constituent Assembly.

The storming of the Bastille, July 14, 1789

By this time, Necker had earned the enmity of many members of the French court for his support and guidance to the Third Estate. The queen, Marie Antoinette, the younger brother of Louis, the Comte d' Artois, and other conservative members of the king's Privy Council urged Louis to dismiss Necker. On July 11, after Necker suggested that the royal family live according to a budget to conserve funds; Louis fired Necker, and completely reconstructed the finance ministry at the same time. Many Parisians presumed Louis's actions

to be the start of a royal coup by the conservatives and began open rebellion when they heard the news the next day. They were also afraid that arriving Royal soldiers had been summoned to shut down the National Constituent Assembly, which was meeting at Versailles, and the Assembly went into nonstop session to prevent eviction from their meeting place once again. Paris was soon consumed with riots, anarchy, and widespread looting. The mobs soon had the support of the French Guard, including arms and trained soldiers, because the royal leadership essentially abandoned the city.

On July 14, the insurgents set their eyes on the large weapons and ammunition cache inside the Bastille fortress, which also served as a symbol of tyranny by the monarchy. After several hours of combat, the prison fell that afternoon. Despite ordering a cease fire, which prevented a mutual massacre, Governor Marquis Bernard de Launay was beaten, stabbed and decapitated; his head was placed on a pike and paraded about the city. Although the Parisians released only seven prisoners (four forgers, two noblemen kept for immoral behaviour, and a murder suspect), the Bastille served as a potent symbol of everything hated under the Ancient Regime. Returning to the Hotel de Ville (city hall), the mob accused the *prevot des marchands* (roughly, mayor) Jacques de Flesselles of treachery; his assassination took place en route to an ostensible trial at the Palais Royal.

The King and his military supporters backed down, at least for the time being. Lafayette - famous for also fighting in the American Revolutionary War - took up command of the National Guard at Paris. Jean-Sylvain Baillet-Latour, president of the Assembly at the time of the Tennis Court Oath, became the city's mayor under a new governmental structure known as the *commune*.

The King visited Paris, where, on July 27 he accepted a tricolored cockade, as cries of *Vive la Nation* "Long live the Nation" changed to *Vive le Roi* "Long live the King." Necker was recalled to power, but his triumph was short-lived. An astute financier but a less astute politician, Necker overplayed his hand by demanding and obtaining a general amnesty, losing much of the people's favour. He also felt he could save France all by himself, despite having few ideas. Nobles were not assured by this apparent reconciliation of King and people. They began to flee the country as *émigrés*, some of whom began plotting civil war within the kingdom and agitating for a European coalition against France. By late July, insurrection and the spirit of popular sovereignty spread throughout France. In rural areas, many went beyond this: some burned title-deeds and no small number of chateaux, as part of a general agrarian

insurrection known as "la Grande Peur" (the Great Fear). In addition, plotting at Versailles and the large numbers of men on the roads of France as a result of unemployment led to wild rumours and paranoia (particularly in the rural areas) that caused widespread unrest and civil disturbances and contributed to the Great Fear.

Toward a Constitution

On August 4, 1789 the National Constituent Assembly abolished feudalism, in what is known as the August Decrees, sweeping away both the seigniorial rights of the Second Estate (aristocrats) and the tithes gathered by the First Estate (clergy). In the course of a few hours, nobles, clergy, towns, provinces, companies, and cities lost their special privileges. Looking to the Declaration of Independence of the United States for a model, on August 26, 1789, the Assembly published the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen. Like the U.S. Declaration, it comprised a statement of principles rather than a constitution with legal effect. The National Constituent Assembly functioned not only as a legislature, but also as a body to draft a new constitution. Necker, Mounier, Lally-Tollendal and others argued unsuccessfully for a senate, with members appointed by the crown on the nomination of the people. The bulk of the nobles argued for an aristocratic upper house elected by the nobles. The popular party carried the day: France would have a single, unicameral assembly. The King retained only a "suspensive veto"; he could delay the implementation of a law, but not block it absolutely.

On October 5, 1789 the people of Paris, mainly working women, marched on Versailles in what was the Women's March on Versailles. The women were responding to their anger at the harsh economic situations they had to face such as bread shortages while the King and his court held banquets such as that for the royal guards on October 1, 1789. They were also demanding an end to Royalist efforts to block the National Assembly and for the King and his administration to move to Paris in hopes for the poverty to be addressed. On October 6, 1789, followed by 20,000 National Guards, the King and the royal family moved from Versailles to Paris thus legitimizing the National Assembly. The Assembly replaced the historic provinces with 83 departments, uniformly administered and approximately equal to one another in extent and population. Originally summoned to deal with a financial crisis, by late 1789, the Assembly had focused on other matters and only worsened the deficit. Honore Mirabeau now led the move to address this matter, with the Assembly giving Necker complete financial dictatorship.

Revolution and the Church

The Revolution brought about a massive shifting of powers from the Roman Catholic Church to the state. Under the Ancient Regime, the Church had been the largest landowner in the country. Legislation enacted in 1790 abolished the Church's authority to levy a tax on crops known as the dime, cancelled special privileges for the clergy, and confiscated Church property. To no small extent, the Assembly addressed the financial crisis by having the nation take over the property of the Church (while taking on the Church's expenses), through the law of December 2, 1789. In order to rapidly monetize such an enormous amount of property, the government introduced a new paper currency, assigned, and backed by the confiscated church lands. Further legislation on 13 February 1790 abolished monastic vows. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy, passed on July 12, 1790 (although not signed by the King until December 26, 1790), turned the remaining clergy into employees of the State and required that they take an oath of loyalty to the constitution. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy also made the Catholic Church an arm of the secular state.

In response to this legislation, the archbishop of Aix and the bishop of Clermont led a walkout of clergy from the National Constituent Assembly. The pope never accepted the new arrangement, and it led to a schism between those clergy who swore the required oath and accepted the new arrangement ("jurors" or "constitutional clergy") and the "non-jurors" or "refractory priests" who refused to do so. The ensuing years saw violent repression of the clergy, including the imprisonment and massacre of priests throughout France. The Concordat of 1801 between Napoleon and the Church ended the de-Christianisation period and established the rules for a relationship between the Catholic Church and the French State that lasted until it was abrogated by the Third Republic via the separation of church and state on December 11, 1905.

Factions within the Assembly began to clarify. The aristocrat Jacques Antoine Marie de Cazales and the abbe Jean-Sifrein Maury led what would become known as the right wing, the opposition to revolution (this party sat on the right-hand side of the Assembly). The "Royalist democrats" or monarchies, allied with Necker, inclined toward organizing France along lines similar to the British constitutional model; they included Jean Joseph Mounier, the Comte de Lally-Tollendal, the comte de Clermont-Tonnerre, and Pierre Victor Malouet, comte de Virieu. The 'National Party', representing the centre or centre-left of the assembly, included Honore Mirabeau, Lafayette, and Bailly; while Adrien Duport, Barnave and Alexandre Lameth represented somewhat more extreme views. Almost alone in his radicalism on the left was the Arras lawyer Maximilien Robespierre. Abbe Sieyes led in

proposing legislation in this period and successfully forged consensus for some time between the political centre and the left. In Paris, various committees, the mayor, the assembly of representatives, and the individual districts each claimed authority independent of the others. The increasingly middle-class National Guard under Lafayette also slowly emerged as a power in its own right, as did other self-generated assemblies.

Intrigues and radicalism

The Assembly abolished the symbolic paraphernalia of the Ancient Regime, armorial bearings, liveries, etc., which further alienated the more conservative nobles, and added to the ranks of the émigrés. On July 14, 1790, and for several days following, crowds in the Champ de Mars celebrated the anniversary of the fall of the Bastille; Talleyrand performed a mass; participants swore an oath of "fidelity to the nation, the law, and the king"; and the King and the royal family actively participated. The electors had originally chosen the members of the Estates-General to serve for a single year. However, by the time of the Tennis Court Oath, the communes had bound themselves to meet continuously until France had a constitution. Right-wing elements now argued for a new election, but Mirabeau carried the day, asserting that the status of the assembly had fundamentally changed, and that no new election should take place before completing the constitution. In late 1790, several small counter-revolutionary uprisings broke out and efforts took place to turn all or part of the army against the Revolution. These uniformly failed.

The army faced considerable internal turmoil: General Bouille successfully put down a small rebellion, which added to his (accurate) reputation for counter-revolutionary sympathies. The new military code, under which promotion depended on seniority and proven competence (rather than on nobility), alienated some of the existing officer corps, who joined the ranks of the émigrés or became counter-revolutionaries from within. This period saw the rise of the political "clubs" in French politics, foremost among these the Jacobin Club: according to the Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1911 ed., one hundred and fifty-two clubs had affiliated with the Jacobins by August 10, 1790. As the Jacobins became more of a broad popular organization, some of its founders abandoned it to form the Club of '89. Royalists established first the short-lived Club des Impartiaux and later the Club Monarchique. The latter attempted unsuccessfully to curry public favour by distributing bread. Nonetheless, they became the frequent target of protests and even riots, and the Paris municipal authorities finally closed down the Club Monarchique in January 1791.

Amidst these intrigues, the Assembly continued to work on developing a constitution. A new judicial organization made all magistracies temporary and independent of the throne. The legislators abolished hereditary offices, except for the monarchy itself. Jury trials started for criminal cases. The King would have the unique power to propose war, with the legislature then deciding whether to declare war. The Assembly abolished all internal trade barriers and suppressed guilds, master ships, and workers' organizations: any individual gained the right to practice a trade through the purchase of a license; strikes became illegal. In the winter of 1791, the Assembly considered, for the first time, legislation against the émigrés. The debate pitted the safety of the State against the liberty of individuals to leave. Mirabeau carried the day against the measure.

Flight to Varennes

Louis XVI, opposed to the course of the Revolution, but rejecting the potentially treacherous aid of the other monarchs of Europe, cast his lot with General Bouille, who condemned both the emigration and the assembly, and promised him refuge and support in his camp at Montmedy. On the night of June 20, 1791 the royal family fled the Tuileries wearing the clothes of servants, while their servants dressed as nobles. However, the next day the King was recognized and arrested at Varennes (in the Meuse department) late on June 21. He and his family were paraded back to Paris under guard, in the same disguise they wore in their escape. Petion, Latour-Maubourg, and Antoine Pierre Joseph Marie Barnave, representing the Assembly, met the royal family at Epernay and returned with them. From this time, Barnave became a counsellor and supporter of the royal family. When they reached Paris, the crowd remained silent. The Assembly provisionally suspended the King. He and Queen Marie Antoinette remained held under guard.

Completing the Constitution

With most of the Assembly still favouring a constitutional monarchy rather than a republic, the various groupings reached a compromise which left Louis XVI little more than a figurehead: he had perforce to swear an oath to the constitution, and a decree declared that retracting the oath, heading an army for the purpose of making war upon the nation, or permitting anyone to do so in his name would amount to de facto abdication. Jacques Pierre Brissot drafted a petition, insisting that in the eyes of the nation Louis XVI was deposed since his flight. An immense crowd gathered in the Champ de Mars to sign the petition. Georges Danton and Camille Desmoulins gave fiery speeches. The Assembly called for the municipal

authorities to "preserve public order." The National Guard under Lafayette's command confronted the crowd. The soldiers first responded to a barrage of stones by firing in the air; the crowd did not back down, and Lafayette ordered his men to fire into the crowd, resulting in the killing of as many as 50 people. In the wake of this massacre the authorities closed many of the patriotic clubs, as well as radical newspapers such as Jean-Paul Marat's *L'Ami du Peuple*. Danton fled to England; Desmoulins and Marat went into hiding.

Meanwhile, a renewed threat from abroad arose: Leopold II, Holy Roman Emperor, Frederick William II of Prussia, and the King's brother Charles-Philippe, comte d'Artois issued the Declaration of Pilnitz which considered the cause of Louis XVI as their own, demanded his total liberty and the dissolution of the Assembly, and promised an invasion of France on his behalf if the revolutionary authorities refused its conditions. If anything, the declaration further imperilled Louis. The French people expressed no respect for the dictates of foreign monarchs, and the threat of force merely resulted in the militarization of the frontiers. Even before his "Flight to Varennes," the Assembly members had determined to debar themselves from the legislature that would succeed them, the Legislative Assembly. They now gathered the various constitutional laws they had passed into a single constitution, showed remarkable fortitude in choosing not to use this as an occasion for major revisions, and submitted it to the recently restored Louis XVI, who accepted it, writing "I engage to maintain it at home, to defend it from all attacks from abroad, and to cause its execution by all the means it places at my disposal." The King addressed the Assembly and received enthusiastic applause from members and spectators. The Assembly set the end of its term for September 29, 1791.

If the post American Revolutionary War Constitutional Convention was a success, the French Constitutional Assembly was, by comparison, a failure. The former produced an enduring document; the latter could not do so. There was not enough of a shared vision of how the "new society" should be governed. The "old regime" had been deposed but those who rebelled had not considered what they were going to replace it with.

Legislative Assembly (1791–1792)

Under the Constitution of 1791, France would function as a constitutional monarchy. The King had to share power with the elected Legislative Assembly, but he still retained his royal veto and the ability to select ministers. The Legislative Assembly first met on October 1, 1791, and degenerated into chaos less than a year later. In the words of the 1911

Encyclopaedia Britannica: "In the attempt to govern, the Assembly failed altogether. It left behind an empty treasury, an undisciplined army and navy, and a people debauched by safe and successful riot."The Legislative Assembly consisted of about 165 Feuillants (constitutional monarchists) on the right, about 330 Girondists (liberal republicans) and Jacobins (radical revolutionaries) on the left, and about 250 deputies unaffiliated with either faction. Early on, the King vetoed legislation that threatened the emigres with death and that decreed that every non-juring clergyman must take within eight days the civic oath mandated by the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. Over the course of a year, disagreements like this would lead to a constitutional crisis, leading the Revolution to higher levels.

War (1792–1797)

The politics of the period inevitably drove France towards war with Austria and its allies. The King, the Feuillants and the Girondins specifically wanted to wage war. The King (and many Feuillants with him) expected war would increase his personal popularity; he also foresaw an opportunity to exploit any defeat: either result would make him stronger. The Girondins wanted to export the Revolution throughout Europe and, by extension, to defend the Revolution within France. Only some of the radical Jacobins opposed war, preferring to consolidate and expand the Revolution at home. The Austrian emperor Leopold II, brother of Marie Antoinette, may have wished to avoid war, but he died on March 1, 1792. France declared war on Austria (April 20, 1792) and Prussia joined on the Austrian side a few weeks later. The invading Prussian army faced little resistance until checked at the Battle of Valmy (September 20, 1792), and forced to withdraw. However, by this time, France stood in turmoil and the monarchy had effectively become a thing of the past.

On the night of August 10, 1792, insurgents, supported by a new revolutionary Paris Commune, assailed the Tuileries. The King and queen ended up prisoners and a rump session of the Legislative Assembly suspended the monarchy: little more than a third of the deputies were present, almost all of them Jacobins. What remained of a national government depended on the support of the insurrectionary Commune. When the Commune sent gangs into the prisons to try arbitrarily to butcher 1400 victims, and addressed a circular letter to the other cities of France inviting them to follow this example, the Assembly could offer only feeble resistance. This situation persisted until the Convention, charged with writing a new constitution, met on September 20, 1792 and became the new de facto government of France.

The next day it abolished the monarchy and declared a republic. This date was later retroactively adopted as the beginning of Year One of the French Revolutionary Calendar.

National Convention (1792–1795)

Execution of Louis XVI

In the Brunswick Manifesto, the Imperial and Prussian armies threatened retaliation on the French population should it resist their advance or the reinstatement of the monarchy. As a consequence, King Louis was seen as conspiring with the enemies of France. January 17, 1793 saw King Louis XVI condemned to death for "conspiracy against the public liberty and the general safety" by a weak majority in Convention. The January 21 execution led to more wars with other European countries. Louis' Austrian-born queen, Marie Antoinette, would follow him to the guillotine on October 16. When war went badly, prices rose and the sans-culottes (poor labourers and radical Jacobins) rioted; counter-revolutionary activities began in some regions. This encouraged the Jacobins to seize power through a parliamentary coup, backed up by force affected by mobilising public support against the Girondist faction, and by utilising the mob power of the Parisian sans-culottes. An alliance of Jacobin and sans-culottes elements thus became the effective centre of the new government. Policy became considerably more radical.

Reign of Terror

The Committee of Public Safety came under the control of Maximilien Robespierre, a lawyer, and the Jacobins unleashed the Reign of Terror (1793-1794). At least 18,000 people met their deaths under the guillotine or otherwise, after accusations of counter-revolutionary activities. The slightest hint of counter-revolutionary thoughts or activities (or, as in the case of Jacques Hebert, revolutionary zeal exceeding that of those in power) could place one under suspicion, and the trials did not proceed scrupulously. On June 2, Paris sections encouraged by the enrages ("enraged ones") Jacques Roux and Jacques Hebert took over the Convention, calling for administrative and political purges, a low fixed price for bread, and a limitation of the electoral franchise to "sans-culottes" alone. With the backing of the National Guard, they managed to convince the Convention to arrest 31 Girondin leaders, including Jacques Pierre Brissot. Following these arrests, the Jacobins gained control of the Committee of Public Safety on June 10, installing the revolutionary dictatorship. On 13 July, the assassination of Jean-Paul Marat a Jacobin leader and journalist known for his bloodthirsty rhetoric by

Charlotte Corday, a Girondin, resulted in further increase of Jacobin political influence. Georges Danton, the leader of the August 1792 uprising against the King, having the image of a man who enjoyed luxuries, was removed from the Committee and on July 27, Robespierre, "the Incorruptible," made his entrance, quickly becoming the most influential member of the Committee as it moved to take radical measures against the Revolution's domestic and foreign enemies.

Meanwhile, on June 24, the Convention adopted the first republican constitution of France, variously referred to as the French Constitution of 1793 or "Constitution of the Year I." It was ratified by public referendum, but never applied, because normal legal processes were suspended before it could take effect. Facing local revolts and foreign invasions in both the East and West of the country, the most urgent government business was the war. On August 17, the Convention voted for general conscription, the *levee en masse*, which mobilized all citizens to serve as soldiers or suppliers in the war effort. On September 5, the Convention, pressured by the people of Paris, institutionalized, The Terror; systematic and lethal repression of perceived enemies within the country. The result was a policy through which the state used violent repression to crush resistance to the government. Under control of the effectively dictatorial Committee, the Convention quickly enacted more legislation. On 9 September, the Convention established *sans-culottes* paramilitary forces, the revolutionary armies, to force farmers to surrender grain demanded by the government. On September 17, the Law of Suspects was passed, which authorized the charging of counter-revolutionaries with vaguely defined crimes against liberty. On September 29, the Convention extended price-fixing from grain and bread to other essential goods, and also fixed wages.

The guillotine became the symbol of a string of executions: Louis XVI had already been guillotined before the start of the terror; Queen Marie Antoinette, the Girondins, Philippe Egalite (despite his vote for the death of the King), Madame Roland and many others lost their lives under its blade. The Revolutionary Tribunal summarily condemned thousands of people to death by the guillotine, while mobs beat other victims to death. Sometimes people died for their political opinions or actions, but many for little reason beyond mere suspicion, or because some others had a stake in getting rid of them. Most of the victims received an unceremonious trip to the guillotine in an open wooden cart (the *tumbrel*). Loaded onto these carts, the victims would proceed through throngs of jeering men and women.

Another anti-clerical uprising was made possible by the instalment of the Revolutionary Calendar on October 24. Against Robespierre concepts of Deism and Virtue, Hebert's (and Chaumette's) atheist movement initiated a religious campaign in order to dechristianize society. The climax was reached with the celebration of the Goddess "Reason" in Notre Dame Cathedral on November 10. The Reign of Terror enabled the revolutionary government to avoid military defeat. The Jacobins expanded the size of the army, and Carnot replaced many aristocratic officers with younger soldiers who had demonstrated their ability and patriotism. The Republican army was able to throw back the Austrians, Prussians, British, and Spanish. At the end of 1793, the army began to prevail and revolts were defeated with ease. The Vento's Decrees (February–March 1794) proposed the confiscation of the goods of exiles and opponents of the Revolution, and their redistribution to the needy.

Because dissent was now regarded as counterrevolutionary, extremist enrages such as Hebert and moderate Montagnard indulgent such as Danton were guillotined in the spring of 1794. On June 7 Robespierre, who had previously condemned the Cult of Reason, advocated a new state religion and recommended that the Convention acknowledge the existence of God. On the next day, the worship of the deistic Supreme Being was inaugurated as an official aspect of the Revolution. Compared with Hebert's popular festivals, this austere new religion of Virtue was received with signs of hostility by an amazed Parisian public. In 1794, Robespierre had ultra-radicals and moderate Jacobins executed; in consequence, however, his own popular support eroded markedly. On July 27, 1794, the Thermidorian Reaction led to the arrest and execution of Robespierre and Saint-Just. The new government was predominantly made up of Girondists who had survived the Terror, and after taking power, they took revenge as well by persecuting even those Jacobins who had helped to overthrow Robespierre, banning the Jacobin Club, and executing many of its former members in what was known as the White Terror. The Convention approved the new "Constitution of the Year III" on August 17, 1795; a plebiscite ratified it in September; and it took effect on September 26, 1795.

The Directory (1795–1799)

The new constitution created the Directories (English: Directory) and created the first bicameral legislature in French history. The parliament consisted of 500 representatives le Conseil des Cinq-Cents (the Council of the Five Hundred) and 250 senators le Conseil des Ancients (the Council of Elders). Executive power went to five "directors," named annually

by the Conseil des Ancients from a list submitted by the le Conseil des Cinq-Cents. With the establishment of the Directory, the Revolution might seem closed. The nation desired rest and the healing of its many wounds. Those who wished to restore Louis XVIII and the Ancient Regime and those who would have renewed the Reign of Terror were insignificant in number. The possibility of foreign interference had vanished with the failure of the First Coalition. Nevertheless, the four years of the Directory were a time of arbitrary government and chronic disquiet. The late atrocities had made confidence or goodwill between parties impossible. The same instinct of self-preservation which had led the members of the Convention to claim so large a part in the new legislature and the whole of the Directory impelled them to keep their predominance.

As the majority of French people wanted to be rid of them, they could achieve their purpose only by extraordinary means. They habitually disregarded the terms of the constitution, and, when the elections went against them, appealed to the sword. They resolved to prolong the war as the best expedient for prolonging their power. They were thus driven to rely upon the armies, which also desired war and were becoming less and less civic in temper. Other reasons influenced them in this direction. State finances had been so thoroughly ruined that the government could not have met its expenses without the plunder and the tribute of foreign countries. If peace were made, the armies would return home and the directors would have to face the exasperation of the rank-and-file that had lost their livelihood, as well as the ambition of generals who could, in a moment, brush them aside. Barras and Rewbell were notoriously corrupt themselves and screened corruption in others. The patronage of the directors was ill-bestowed, and the general maladministration heightened their unpopularity.

The constitutional party in the legislature desired a toleration of the nonjuring clergy, the repeal of the laws against the relatives of the emigres, and some merciful discrimination toward the emigres themselves. The directors baffled all such endeavours. On the other hand, the socialist conspiracy of Babeuf was easily quelled. Little was done to improve the finances, and the assignats continued to fall in value. The new regime met with opposition from remaining Jacobins and the royalists. The army suppressed riots and counter-revolutionary activities. In this way the army and its successful general, Napoleon Bonaparte eventually gained much power. On November 9, 1799 (18 Brumaire of the Year VIII) Bonaparte staged the coup of 18 Brumaire which installed the Consulate; this effectively led

to his dictatorship and eventually (in 1804) to his proclamation as Emperor (emperor), which brought to a close the specifically republican phase of the French Revolution.

Historical Analysis

The constitutional assembly failed for many reasons: there were too many monarchists to have a republic and too many republicans to have a monarch; too many people opposed the King (especially after the flight to Varennes), which meant that the people who supported the King had their reputation slashed. Despite the fact that post-Revolutionary France had its share of Emperors and Kings, perhaps the strongest notion that emerged from the Revolution was the concept of being a citizen. The Revolution is also credited with introducing the notion of nationalism into political discourse the idea that the nation belongs to its people.

Legacy of the French Revolution

The French Revolution made a lasting and mixed impact on France and the world. The most significant innovation was ideological, making abstract rational principles the ground for revolution and radical social change. This created instability as every new group of revolutionaries could claim it had as much right to impose its ideals as the group before. France has had about 11 constitutions since 1789. Respect for tradition, liberty and the achievements of previous generations was replaced by a "cult of change," progress and modernity. This outlook has been adopted up by revolutionaries around the world often with very destructive consequences for life, culture, social institutions and cultural artefacts. The Revolution was popular because people wanted freedom, but the result was a powerful State which was far more coercive and interfering than the old monarchy. Today the Revolution is an issue that still divides France with some defending it and others criticizing it. Around the world its interpretation is also contested as the extensive historiography shows. Conservatives such as Edmund Burke accepted that reform was necessary but regarded revolution as a mistake from which the Terror and dictatorship inevitably followed. The liberal approach to the Revolution such as that of Alexis de Tocqueville has typically been to support the achievements of the constitutional monarchy of the National Assembly but to disown the later actions of radical violence like the invasion of the Tuileries and the Terror. Socialists and Marxists such as Louis Blanc defend the revolution as an inevitable and progressive event. When China's Premier, Chou En Lai was asked in 1972 whether he thought the French

Revolution had been a good or a bad thing. He mused for a few moments and then replied "It's too early to tell."

End of Absolute Monarchy:

The French Revolution dealt a death-blow to absolute monarchies all over Europe. Even though the monarchy was restored for a period in France, from that point on there was constant pressure on European monarchs to make concessions to some form of constitutional monarchy that limited their powers. The ones that did not respond were all overthrown. Professor Lynn Hunt of UCLA regarded the creation of a new democratic political culture from scratch as the Revolution's greatest achievement. At the same time she also interpreted the political Revolution as an enormous dysfunctional family haunted by patricide: Louis as father, Marie-Antoinette as mother, and the revolutionaries as an unruly mob of brothers.

Demise of the Feudal System:

The Revolution held up equality as an ideal for all the citizens of France and forcibly eliminated the traditional rights and privileges of the aristocratic class. Some revisionist historians such as Alfred Cobban have recently argued that feudalism had long since disappeared in France; that the Revolution did not transform French society, and that it was principally a political revolution and not a social one as socialists had previously believed.

Rights:

The Revolution made a significant contribution to the theory of human rights even if there were gross violations in the first few years of the Revolution. The language of abstract rights that has come to dominate current political discourse has its roots in the French Revolution. These are not discrete clearly described rights that are circumscribed by law and custom but abstractions bestowed by the State which may undercut tradition, custom, law and traditional liberties.

Modernization:

The French Revolution originated the idea that ancient regimes should be "modernized" according to the principles of a rational state. Modernization extended to the military, the administrative system, and other aspects of French life, with effective results. The very idea of modernity can be traced to the revolution.

Administrative and judicial reforms:

These survive to this day as a positive legacy for France, having made the country's polity more rational and fair for all its citizens. The greater freedom and equality made society more meritocratic. The Civil Code remains the basis of French law and has influenced other European legal systems. Decimal and metric systems were first introduced in 1795 and have been adopted by much of the world. Freedom of religion particularly for Protestants and Jews. Wherever Napoleon's armies went, Jews were emancipated and given the opportunity to participate as equals in European society. Disestablishment of the Church Education and social welfare programs that had traditionally been provided by the Catholic Church declined dramatically with the Revolution's attack on the church. The state was unable to provide alternative provision for many decades. The revolution destroyed the "religious, cultural and moral underpinnings of the communities" in which ordinary French people lived.

Violence

The Revolution's anticlericalism led to the repudiation of Christian virtues and sentiments. The revolution injected hate into the political process. The violence that characterized the revolution was a response to the resistance it encountered. It was naive to expect the nobility to welcome the abolition of their ancient status and privileges especially as the reforms were enforced hastily, without negotiation or compensation. This use of violence and terror has been adopted by revolutionaries around the world who regard it as legitimate and unavoidable.

War

The Revolutionary Wars and Napoleonic Wars convulsed and changed the map and future of Europe. The character of war itself was changed. France mobilized all its resources to fight the wars and other countries had to do the same to defend themselves and defeat France. This required a huge rise in taxation and expansion of the power of the state. The wars had a worldwide impact drawing in the colonies of both sides. These wars were also ideological and thus a precursor of the world wars of the next century.

Nationalism

French revolutionary principles were exported and imposed on much of Europe. It led to the rise of nationalism as one of the key principles of the revolution was that people

should think of themselves as citizens and have as their highest and sole source of identity the nation state. This fostered national hatred and conflict. Germany for example was 'tidied up'. Napoleon abolished the Holy Roman Empire and reduced the 396 principalities and free cities to 40. This imposition French rationalism and culture stirred up a reaction which poisoned Europe in the following century. The counter-Enlightenment with its rejection of abstract rationalism and emphasis on romanticism and blood ties blossomed in Germany, leading to a wounded German nationalism. Bismarck completed the unification so as to prevent the French, or anyone else, trampling over and humiliating Germany again.

Revolution

Revolutionaries for the past 200 years have regarded the French Revolution as a model to be emulated. Ever since there have been revolutionary figures hanging around plotting and waiting for the opportunity to seize power. These rebellions are against the supposed violation of abstract rights rather than existing laws. The revolution was a source of inspiration to radicals all over the world who wanted to destroy the ancient regimes in their countries. Some officers of the Russian Army that occupied Paris took home with them revolutionary ideas which fermented and directly contributed to the ideological background of the Russian Revolution. Historian François Furet in his work, *Le Passe d'une illusion* (1995) (*The Passing of An Illusion* (1999) in English translation) explores in detail the similarities between the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution of 1917 more than a century later, arguing that the former was taken as a model by Russian revolutionaries.

Secularization

The anti-clericalism and de-Christianization policies created a deep and lasting gulf in France pitting the two sides against each other. This had a social and political expression too. Socialists and trade unionists throughout continental Europe have tended to be atheists. The strict separation of church and state took traditional Christian values out of public life. Citizenship is still the only sort of identity recognized by the French State which has made it harder for France to integrate religious minorities such as Muslims who find their identity elsewhere.

Democracy

The revolution was carried out in the name of democracy and has spread the message to the world that the people are, or ought to be, sovereign. The French version of democracy

has had a tendency to become intolerant of dissent and totalitarian. The modern democratic terminology of left-wing and right-wing comes from the seating arrangements of two main groupings in the Constituent Assembly.

2. Napoleon Bonaparte

In 1795, a young military man by the name of Napoleon Bonaparte was ordered to put down the Parisian mob that was storming the Tuileries Palace. Napoleon, already in 1795, would demonstrate the combination of ambition and ruthlessness that would characterize his entire career. As the mob advanced on the Tuileries, Napoleon, without blinking an eye, ordered his troops to fire into the crowd. He had been born in Corsica, the second son in a gentry's family, and following the traditional aristocratic pattern, the second son winds up with a career in the military. During Napoleon's early life he attended military academies in France. These somewhat humble origins would be one of Napoleon's great calling cards; Napoleon would become a great champion of the self-made man. He would become the idol of a great many people, commoners who saw in Napoleon the possibilities of what a man of talent, what a man blessed with ability, with ambition, could do if he were unfettered by the structures of the old regime.

Napoleon's Early Military Victories

He was best known, however, for a string of very extraordinary military victories in 1796–97. In those years, he conquered all of northern Italy, forcing the Habsburgs to relinquish their territories there, and to seek control of the Netherlands as well. He also headed a military expedition to Egypt, seeking to weaken the British position there, and although his campaign in Egypt did not produce the results that he had hoped, he did achieve a series of very striking military victories. This was given very great coverage in France. This was not only a military expedition; he took, in effect, what we now would think of as a public relations staff that monitored his every move. These dramatic victories in Egypt and in northern Italy had made Napoleon a household name in France. By 1799, as the Directory continued to lose support and just was absolutely unable to inspire any sort of enthusiasm, Napoleon had become very well known and popular across all the country.

A Coup brings Napoleon to Power

In November of 1799, a number of the members of the Directory turned to Napoleon to help them establish some sort of stable government, capable of withstanding the recurrent

threats of renewed radicalism and revived royalism. Two members of the Directory approached Napoleon, plotted with him and his brother Louis, to overthrow the weak government and establish some form of stronger regime capable of charting a new course for France. This coup would take place on November 9, 1799. The new government that was established called for power to be shared by three consuls. You already see a kind of terminology that's not harkening back to the revolution, or even to the old regime, but consuls harkening back to the Roman Empire. Power was to be shared by a triumvirate, and Napoleon was to be first consul, *primus inter pares*, first among equals. Two things were already very clear about him at this point. One was his enormous ambition, and the other was his great charisma. One had seen this in his dealings with the troops his troops in northern Italy, his troops in Egypt and also, all sorts of contemporary evidence suggests that in dealing with people individually he exerted an enormous amount of charm, power, and charisma. It was hardly a mystery that he would very quickly outmanoeuvre his two partners in this triumvirate, as well as the legislative bodies of the regime.

Napoleon Tightens His Grasp on Power

In 1802, Napoleon had himself elected consul for life. And in a step that was really quite remarkable and was a preview of the way Napoleon wanted to reign, this step was to be ratified by a national plebiscite. The people were now called in to vote to ratify this step taken by the regime, taken by Napoleon. The outcome of the vote was 3,568,885 in favour, 8,374 against. One might suspect that there was a certain amount of manipulation and influence brought to bear on the outcome, but Napoleon was quite clearly very popular in France at this time. Portrait the Emperor Napoleon in His Study at the Tuileries by Jacques-Louis David 1812. During the coronation ceremony that crowned him Emperor, Napoleon broke with tradition and placed the crown upon his own head, rather than allow the Archbishop of Reims to place the crown on him. In 1804, he used a trumped up royalist plot to declare himself emperor. He claimed that there was a conspiracy to return the Bourbon monarchy, to overthrow the Revolution. Napoleon constantly talked about the Revolution, even the Republic at times and saw the great danger. But he always tried to present himself on the one hand as a military man, a man of affairs, a pragmatist in some ways, but also as the legitimate heir of the Revolution. Once again, this step was ratified by a plebiscite, and the first line of this new constitutional document read: "The government of the Republic is entrusted to an Emperor."

The Constitution of 1791 had been based on universal suffrage. In this sense, it's consistent with the Revolution, the Great Revolution, but elections were very indirect. There was universal suffrage to elect electors, who would then elect a final legislature. This was the usual kind of compromised solution. The use of the plebiscite was novel; it gave Napoleon's regime a patina not only of democracy, but of radical democracy, almost the general will speak through the plebiscites. If one thinks about the period, this is absolutely a remarkable sort of phenomenon, of going directly to the people to say "Yea" or "Nay" to major matters of state.

The Napoleonic Code

The Napoleonic Code, created with the goal of being clearly written and accessible is considered one of the most influential documents ever written. Napoleon insisted upon the codification of law; the Napoleonic Code would become one of the great achievements of his regime, implemented not only in France, but also in the countries of Europe occupied by the French armies. That new code imposed upon France a uniform system of justice. It called for equality before the law. This was a major step. One thing that equality before the law meant to the Napoleonic regime was that no one would be tax-exempt. All French citizens were now going to bear the financial burdens of state. Freedom of religion was guaranteed under the new constitution; Protestants would be able to practice their religion, and Napoleon took steps to emancipate the Jews. This had been done initially during the Revolution itself in the first constitution. Napoleon would take additional steps in this direction. The new constitution also called for freedom of profession. This doesn't sound very revolutionary, but it was. It dealt the final deathblow to the old guilds, and it was a bow toward the new forces of commercial capitalism and industrialization in France. What it did was to signal to liberal economic elements that this was going to be a regime that would adopt policies that were favourable to business, favourable to trade, to commerce, to break whatever residual powers lingered of the old guild system in France. For Napoleon, it was quite clear the genie could not be put back in the bottle; the Revolution had happened. Still, Napoleon believed you could not have a legitimate government, post-Revolution, without a constitution. His regime was built on a claim to popular sovereignty, embedded in the Constitution, embedded in the elections, embedded in the plebiscites, all of which gave to this Napoleonic regime a very radical progressive bent.

Napoleon also would continue a policy that had really been emphasized during the Revolution: an emphasis on education. Napoleon would create the system of lycees under close government supervision, and this emphasis was on educating people so they could read, so they could participate, so they could be citizens. This was also part of one of the other great social claims of the Napoleonic regime. This was to be a regime in which careers were open to talent. It wasn't heredity, it wasn't connections, and it was none of that. What really mattered was the man of talent, the man of ability, willing to take chances and to achieve.

Napoleon's Administrative Reforms and Peace with the Vatican

The regime also instituted a reform of the French administration. A rational centralized administration was created under Napoleon. He created a very efficient system of taxation, not a very exciting sort of reform, but obviously, considering the history of France in the 18th century, it was absolutely essential. He returned France to a system of centralized administration, where local officials were appointed from Paris. In fact, under Napoleon, one sees the most centralized of all the various French regimes of the 18th century and into the 19th century. In addition to these initiatives, though, and possibly one of the most important, if not the most important, in terms of sealing Napoleon's popularity at home, was his establishment of peace with the Church. The Concordat of 1801, which acknowledged Catholicism as the religion of the majority of French people, also required that Catholic leaders in France take a civil oath to the government. After a decade in which relations between the various French revolutionaries and the Church were strained (to put it mildly), Napoleon was determined to restore good relations with the papacy, to bring the Church back into the mainstream of French political life. In 1801, he signed a concordat with the Vatican, with Pius VII, in which the Napoleonic regime recognized Catholicism as "the religion of the majority of French people." It was not to be the state religion; the constitution that would be drafted called for freedom of religion but it acknowledged that Catholicism was the religion of the majority of the French people. This concordat with the Vatican was enormously popular in France.

Napoleon as an Oppressive but Popular Ruler

These aspects of the regime certainly solidified Napoleon's hold on the population. But if these factors were consistent with the Revolution, other aspects of this Napoleonic regime were not. His opponents claimed that Napoleon was really a dictator, if one with great popular support. Certainly the system was maintained by secret police and very strict

ensorship. The number of newspapers in Paris shrank from 73 in 1799 to 13, and then down to four. They were closely censored by the regime. Secret agents supervised the press and the arts under Napoleon. Surveillance of enemies was common, and arrest of enemies or potential enemies was also commonplace. One also sees a somewhat chilling development here, which was that some opponents or potential opponents of Napoleon were arrested or taken into a kind of protective custody, and then sent off to mental institutions not prisons, but mental institutions still, for whatever oppressive qualities this Napoleonic regime displayed, the Napoleonic Empire was enormously popular in France, certainly down to 1812–1813. Most of the population clearly believed that the regime had consolidated the most positive gains made during the Revolution. In addition to this Napoleon had restored grandeur to France. Paris had once again become the centre of Western civilization. The grandeur of empire, the military glory of French armies marching over the breadth of the European continent all of these things cemented Napoleon's popularity in France.

Napoleonic Wars

The Napoleonic Wars comprised a series of global conflicts fought during Napoleon Bonaparte's imperial rule over France (1805–1815). They formed to some extent an extension of the wars sparked by the French Revolution of 1789. These wars revolutionized European armies and artillery, as well as military systems, and took place on a scale never before seen, mainly due to the application of modern mass conscription. French power rose quickly, conquering most of Europe; and collapsed rapidly after the disastrous invasion of Russia (1812), and Napoleon's empire ultimately suffered complete military defeat, resulting in the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy in France in 1814 and 1815. The Napoleonic Wars brought great changes to Europe. Though Napoleon brought most of Western Europe under his rule (a feat not seen since the days of the Roman Empire), a state of constant warfare between France and the combined other major powers of Europe for over two decades finally took its toll. By the end of the Napoleonic Wars, France no longer held the role of the dominant power in Europe, as it had since the times of Louis XIV. The United Kingdom emerged as one of the most powerful countries in the world, effectively becoming the first real hyper power. The British Royal Navy held unquestioned naval superiority throughout the world, and Britain's industrial economy made it the most powerful commercial country.

Background 1789-1802

The French Revolution posed an implied threat to monarchies throughout Europe, which only increased with the arrest and execution of King Louis XVI of France in 1792 - 1793. The first attempt to crush the French Republic came in 1792 when Austria, Piedmont, the Kingdom of Naples, Prussia, Spain, and the Kingdom of Great Britain formed the First Coalition. French measures, including general conscription (*levee en masse*), military reform, and total war, contributed to the defeat of the First Coalition. The war ended when Bonaparte forced the Austrians to accept his terms in the Treaty of Campo Formio. The United Kingdom remained the only anti-French power still in the field by 1797. The Second Coalition, formed in 1798, consisted of the following nations or states: Austria, Great Britain, the Kingdom of Naples, the Ottoman Empire, Papal States, Portugal, and Russia. During the War of the Second Coalition, the French Republic suffered from corruption and division under the Directory. France also lacked funds to prosecute the war and no longer had the services of Lazare Carnot, the war-minister who had guided her to successive victories following extensive reforms during the early 1790s. Napoleon Bonaparte, the main architect of victory in the last years of the First Coalition, had gone to campaign in Egypt. Stripped of two of its most important military figures from the previous conflict, the Republic suffered successive defeats against revitalized enemies which British financial support brought back into the war.

Napoleon managed to return to France on August 23, 1799. He seized control of the French government on November 9, 1799 in the coup of 18 Brumaire, toppling the Directory. Napoleon reorganized the French military and created a reserve army positioned to support campaigns either on the Rhine or in Italy. On all fronts, French advances caught the Austrians off-guard. In Italy, Napoleon won a victory against the Austrians at Marengo (1800). However, the decisive battle came on the Rhine at Hohenlinden in 1800. The defeated Austrians left the conflict after the Treaty of Laneville (February 9, 1801). Thus the Second Coalition ended in another French triumph. However, the United Kingdom remained an important influence on the continental powers in encouraging their resistance to France. London had brought the Second Coalition together through subsidies, and Napoleon realized that without British defeat or a treaty with the UK he could not achieve a complete peace.

War with Britain 1803-1814

Unlike its many coalition partners, Britain remained at war throughout the entire period of the Napoleonic Wars. Protected by naval supremacy, the United Kingdom was able

to maintain low-cost low-intensity warfare on a global scale for over a decade. Commitment increased in the Peninsula War, where, protected by topography, guerrilla activity, and sometimes massive earthworks, the British army succeeded in harassing French forces for several years. By 1815, the British army would play a central role in the final defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo.

The Treaty of Amiens (March 25, 1802) resulted in peace between the UK and France, and marked the final collapse of the Second Coalition. But the Treaty always seemed unlikely to endure: it satisfied neither side, and both sides dishonoured parts of it. Military actions soon clouded the peace: the French intervened in the Swiss civil strife (Stecklikrieg) and occupied several coastal cities in Italy, while the United Kingdom occupied Malta. Napoleon attempted to exploit the brief peace at sea to restore the colonial rule in the rebellious Antilles. The expedition, though initially successful, would soon turn to a disaster, with the French commander and Bonaparte's brother-in-law, Charles Leclerc, dying of yellow fever and almost his entire force destroyed by the disease combined with the fierce attacks by the rebels.

Hostilities between Great Britain and France recommenced on May 18, 1803. The Allied war-aims changed over the course of the conflict: a general desire to restore the French monarchy became an almost Manichean struggle to stop Bonaparte. The series of naval and colonial conflicts, including a large number of minor naval actions (such as the Action of 1805) gave perhaps a clear sign of the new nature of war. Conflicts in the Caribbean, and in particular the seizure of colonial bases and islands throughout the wars, would directly and immediately have an effect upon the European conflict, and battles thousands of miles apart could influence each other's outcomes. The Napoleonic conflict had reached the point at which subsequent historians could talk of a "world war." Only the Seven Years' War offered a precedent for widespread conflict on such a scale.

Third Coalition 1805

Napoleon planned an invasion of the British Isles, and massed 180,000 troops at Boulogne. However, in order to mount his invasion, he needed to achieve naval superiority or at least to pull the British fleet away from the English Channel. A complex plan to distract the British by threatening their possessions in the West Indies failed when a Franco-Spanish fleet under Admiral Villeneuve turned back after an indecisive action off Cape Finisterre on 22 July 1805. The Royal Navy blockaded Villeneuve in Cadiz until he left for Naples on

October 19, but Lord Nelson caught and defeated his fleet at the Battle of Trafalgar on October 21. This battle cost Admiral Nelson his life as a result of a French bullet, but Napoleon would never again have the opportunity to challenge the British at sea. By this time, however, Napoleon had already all but abandoned plans to invade the British Isles, and had turned his attention to enemies on the Continent once again. The French army left Boulogne and moved towards Austria. In April 1805 the United Kingdom and Russia signed a treaty with the aim of removing the French from Holland and Switzerland. Austria joined the alliance after the annexation of Genoa and the proclamation of Napoleon as King of Italy on 17 March 1805.

The Austrians began the war by invading Bavaria with an army of about 70,000 under Karl Mack von Leiberich, and the French army marched out from Boulogne in late July, 1805 to confront them. At Ulm (September 25 - October 20) Napoleon managed to surround Mack's army in a brilliant envelopment, forcing its surrender without significant losses. With the main Austrian army north of the Alps defeated (another army under Archduke Charles manoeuvred inconclusively against Andre Massena's French army in Italy), Napoleon occupied Vienna. Far from his supply lines, he faced a superior Austro-Russian army under the command of Mikhail Kutuzov, with the Emperor Alexander of Russia personally present. On December 2 Napoleon crushed the joint Austro-Russian army in Moravia at Austerlitz (usually considered his greatest victory). He inflicted a total of 25,000 casualties on a numerically superior enemy army while sustaining fewer than 7,000 in his own force. After Austerlitz, Austria signed the Treaty of Press burg (December 26, 1805) and left the Coalition. The Treaty required the Austrians to give up Venetia to the French-dominated Kingdom of Italy and Tyrol to Bavaria. With the withdrawal of Austria from the war, stalemate ensued. Napoleon's army had a record of continuous unbroken victories on land, but the full force of the Russian army had not yet come into play.

Fourth Coalition 1806–1807

The Fourth Coalition (1806–1807) of Prussia, Russia, Saxony, Sweden and the United Kingdom against France formed within months of the collapse of the previous coalition. In July 1806 Napoleon formed the Confederation of the Rhine out of the many tiny German states which constituted the Rhineland and most other parts of western Germany. He amalgamated many of the smaller states into larger electorates, duchies and kingdoms to

make the governance of non-Prussian Germany smoother. Napoleon elevated the rulers of the two largest Confederation states, Saxony and Bavaria, to the status of kings.

In August 1806 the Prussian king, Friedrich Wilhelm III made the decision to go to war independently of any other great power, save the distant Russia. A more sensible course of action might have involved declaring war the previous year and joining Austria and Russia. This might have contained Napoleon and prevented the Allied disaster at Austerlitz. In any event, the Russian army, an ally of Prussia, still remained far away when Prussia declared war. In September Napoleon unleashed all French forces east of the Rhine. Napoleon himself defeated a Prussian army at Jena (October 14 1806), and Davout defeated another at Auerstadt on the same day. Some 160,000 French soldiers (increasing in number as the campaign went on) went against Prussia and moved with such speed that Napoleon was able to destroy as an effective military force the entire quarter of a million strong Prussian army which sustained 25,000 casualties, lost a further 150,000 prisoners and 4,000 artillery pieces, and over 100,000 muskets stockpiled in Berlin. In the former battle Napoleon only fought a detachment of the Prussian force. The latter battle involved a single French corps defeating the bulk of the Prussian army. Napoleon entered into Berlin on 27 October 1806 and visited the tomb of Frederick the Great, there instructing his marshals to remove their hats, saying, "If he was alive we wouldn't be here today." In total Napoleon had taken only 19 days from beginning his attack on Prussia until knocking it out of the war with the capture of Berlin and the destruction of its principal armies at Jena and Auerstadt. By contrast Prussia had fought for three years in the War of the First Coalition with little achievement.

In Berlin, Napoleon issued a series of decrees which, on November 21, 1806 brought into effect the Continental System. This policy aimed to eliminate the threat of the United Kingdom by closing French-controlled territory to its trade. The United Kingdom's army remained a minimal threat to France; the UK maintained a standing army of just 220,000 at the height of the Napoleonic Wars, whereas France's strength peaked at over 1,500,000 in addition to the armies of numerous allies and several hundred thousand national guards that Napoleon could draft into the military if necessary. The Royal Navy however was instrumental in disrupting France's extra-continental trade - both by seizing and threatening French shipping and by seizing French colonial possessions - but could do nothing about France's trade with the major continental economies and posed no threat to French territory in Europe. In addition France's population and agricultural capacity far outstripped that of the United Kingdom. However, the United Kingdom's industrial capacity was the greatest in

Europe and its mastery of the seas allowed it to build up considerable economic strength through trade. That was sufficient to ensure that France was never able to consolidate its control over Europe in peace. However, many in the French government believed that cutting the United Kingdom off from the Continent would end its economic influence over Europe and isolate it. This was what the Continental System was designed to achieve, although it never succeeded in this objective.

The next stage of the war involved the French driving Russian forces out of Poland and creating a new Duchy of Warsaw. Napoleon then turned north to confront the remainder of the Russian army and to attempt to capture the temporary Prussian capital at Königsberg. A tactical draw at Eylau (February 7–8) forced the Russians to withdraw further north. Napoleon then routed the Russian army at Friedland (June 14). Following this defeat, Alexander had to make peace with Napoleon at Tilsit (July 7, 1807). By September, Marshal Brune completed the occupation of Swedish Pomerania, allowing the Swedish army, however, to withdraw with all its munitions of war.

At the Congress of Erfurt (September–October 1808) Napoleon and Alexander agreed that Russia should force Sweden to join the Continental System, which led to the Finnish War of 1808–1809 and to the division of Sweden into two parts separated by the Gulf of Bothnia.

Fifth Coalition 1809

The Fifth Coalition (1809) of the United Kingdom and Austria against France formed as the United Kingdom engaged in the Peninsular War against France. Once again, the United Kingdom stood alone, and the sea became the major theatre of war between the United Kingdom and Napoleon's allies. During the time of the Fifth Coalition, the Royal Navy won a succession of victories in the French colonies and another major naval victory against the neutral Denmark at the Battle of Copenhagen (September 2 1807). On land, the Fifth Coalition attempted few extensive military endeavours. One, the Walcheren Expedition of 1809, involved a dual effort by the British Army and the Royal Navy to relieve Austrian forces under intense French pressure. It ended in disaster after the Army commander John Pitt, 2nd Earl of Chatham failed to capture the objective, the naval base of French controlled Antwerp. For the most part of the years of the Fifth Coalition, British military operations on land outside of the Peninsular War remained restricted to hit-and-run operations. These were executed by the Royal Navy, who dominated the sea after having beaten down almost all substantial naval opposition from France and its allies and blockading what remained of the

latter's naval forces in heavily fortified French-controlled ports. These rapid-attack operations were a sort of exo-territorial guerrilla strikes: they were aimed mostly at destroying blockaded French naval and mercantile shipping, and disrupting French supplies, communications, and military units stationed near the coasts. Often, when British allies attempted military actions within several dozen miles or so of the sea, the Royal Navy would be present and would land troops and supplies and aid the allied land forces in a concerted operation. Royal Navy ships were even known to provide artillery support against French units should fighting stray near enough to the coastline. However, these operations were limited to the ability and quality of the land forces. For example, when operating with inexperienced guerrilla forces in Spain, the Royal Navy sometimes failed to achieve their objectives simply for lack of manpower that was supposed to have been supplied for the operation by the Navy's guerrilla allies.

The European strategic situation in February 1809.

The struggle also continued in the sphere of economic warfare the French Continental System and the British naval blockade of French-controlled territory. Due to military shortages and lack of organization in French territory, numerous breaches of the Continental System occurred as French-dominated states engaged in illicit (though often tolerated) trade with British smugglers. Both sides entered additional conflicts in attempts to enforce their blockade; the British fought the United States in the War of 1812 (1812-1814), and the French engaged in the Peninsular War (1808-1814). The Iberian conflict began when Portugal continued trade with the United Kingdom despite French restrictions. When Spain failed to maintain the system the alliance with France came to an end and French troops gradually encroached on its territory until Madrid was occupied. British intervention soon followed. Austria, previously an ally of the French, took the opportunity to attempt to restore its imperial territories in Germany as held prior to Austerlitz. Austria achieved a number of initial victories against the thinly-spread army of Marshal Davout. Napoleon had left Davout with only 170,000 troops to defend France's entire eastern frontier. (In the 1790s, 800,000 troops had carried out the same task, but holding a much shorter front.)

Napoleon had enjoyed easy success in Spain, retaking Madrid, defeating the Spanish and consequently forcing a withdrawal of the heavily out-numbered British army from the Iberian Peninsula (Battle of Corunna, January 16, 1809). Austria's attack prevented Napoleon from successfully wrapping up operations against British forces by necessitating his

departure for Austria, and he never returned to the Peninsula theatre. In his absence and in the absence of his best marshals (Davout remained in the east throughout the war) the French situation deteriorated, especially when the prodigious British general, Sir Arthur Wellesley, arrived to command the British forces. The French Empire in Europe in 1811, near its peak extent. Dark and light green areas indicate the French Empire and its territories; blue, pink and yellow areas indicate French client and satellite states.

Napoleon assumed personal command in the east and bolstered the army there for his counter-attack on Austria. After a well-run campaign that, after a few small battles, forced the Austrians to withdraw from Bavaria, Napoleon advanced into Austria. His hurried attempt to cross the Danube resulted in the massive Battle of Aspern-Essling (22 May 1809) Napoleon's first significant tactical defeat. Failure by the Austrian commander, Archduke Karl, to follow up on his indecisive victory meant that Napoleon could prepare for a renewed attempt to seize Vienna, and in early July he did so. He defeated the Austrians at Wagram, on July 5 - 6. (During this battle Napoleon stripped Marshal Bernadotte of his title and ridiculed him in front of other senior officers. Shortly thereafter, Bernadotte took up the offer from Sweden to fill the vacant position of Crown Prince there. Later he would actively participate in wars against his former Emperor.)

The War of the Fifth Coalition ended with the Treaty of Schonbrunn (October 14, 1809). In the east only the Tyrolese rebels led by Andreas Hofer continued to fight the French-Bavarian army until finally defeated in November 1809, while in the west the Peninsular War continued. In 1810 the French Empire reached its greatest extent. On the continent, the British and Portuguese remained restricted to the area around Lisbon behind their impregnable lines of Torres Vedras. Napoleon married Marie-Louise, an Austrian Archduchess, in order to ensure a more stable alliance with Austria and to provide the Emperor with an heir, something his first wife, Josephine, had failed to do. As well as the French empire, Napoleon controlled the Swiss Confederation, the Confederation of the Rhine, the Duchy of Warsaw and the Kingdom of Italy. Allied territories included: the Kingdom of Spain (Joseph Bonaparte); Kingdom of Westphalia (Jerome Bonaparte); the Kingdom of Naples (Joachim Murat, brother-in-law); Principality of Lucca and Piombino (Felix Bacciochi, brother-in-law); and his former enemies, Prussia and Austria.

Sixth Coalition 1812–1814

The Sixth Coalition (1812–1814) consisted of the United Kingdom and Russia, Prussia, Sweden, Austria and a number of German States. In 1812 Napoleon invaded Russia. He aimed to compel Emperor Alexander I to remain in the Continental System and to remove the imminent threat of a Russian invasion of Poland. The French-led Grande Armée, consisting of 650,000 men (270,000 Frenchmen and many soldiers of allies or subject areas), crossed the Niemen River on June 23 1812. Russia proclaimed a Patriotic War, while Napoleon proclaimed a Second Polish war, but against the expectations of the Poles (who supplied almost 100,000 troops for the invasion-force) he avoided any concessions to Poland, having in mind further negotiations with Russia. Russia maintained a scorched-earth policy of retreat, broken only by the Borodino on 7th September. This bloody confrontation ended in a tactical draw, but Napoleon eventually forced the Russians to back down, thus opening the road to Moscow. By September 14, 1812 the Grande Armée had captured Moscow; although by this point the Russians had largely abandoned the city, even releasing prisoners from Moscow's prisons to inconvenience the French. Alexander I refused to capitulate, and with no sign of clear victory in sight Napoleon had to withdraw from Moscow after the governor, Count Fyodor Vasilievich Rostopchin, allegedly ordered the city burnt to the ground. So the disastrous Great Retreat began, with 370,000 casualties largely as a result of starvation and the freezing weather conditions, and 200,000 captured. By November, when the remnants of the Grande Armée crossed the Berezina River, only 27,000 fit soldiers remained. Napoleon then left his army and returned to Paris to prepare the defence of Poland from the advancing Russians. The situation was not as dire as it might at first have seemed the Russians had lost around 400,000 men and their army was similarly depleted. However they had the advantage of shorter supply lines and were able to replenish their armies with greater speed than the French. Meanwhile, in the Peninsular War, at Vitoria (June 21, 1813), Arthur Wellesley's victory over Joseph Bonaparte finally broke the French power in Spain. The French had to retreat out of Spain, over the Pyrenees.

Seeing an opportunity in Napoleon's historic defeat, Prussia re-entered the war. Napoleon vowed that he would create a new army as large as that he had sent into Russia, and quickly built up his forces in the east from 30,000 to 130,000 and eventually to 400,000. Napoleon inflicted 40,000 casualties on the Allies at Lutzen (May 2) and Bautzen (May 20 - 21, 1813). Both battles involved total forces of over 250,000 making them some of the largest conflicts of the wars so far.

The belligerents declared an armistice from June 4, 1813 (continuing until August 13) during which time both sides attempted to recover from approximately quarter of a million losses since April. During this time allied negotiations finally brought Austria out in open opposition to France. Two principal Austrian armies took the field, adding an additional 300,000 troops to the Allied armies in Germany. In total the Allies now had around 800,000 front-line troops in the German theatre, with a strategic reserve of 350,000 formed to support the frontline operations.

Napoleon succeeded in bringing the total imperial forces in the region up to around 650,000 although only 250,000 came under his direct command, with another 120,000 under Nicolas Charles Ordinate and 30,000 under Devout. The Confederation of the Rhine furnished Napoleon with the bulk of the remainder of his forces, with Saxony and Bavaria as the principal contributors. In addition, to the south, Murat's Kingdom of Naples and Eugene de Beauharnais's Kingdom of Italy had a combined total of 100,000 men under arms. In Spain an additional 150,000 to 200,000 French troops steadily retreated before Spanish and British forces numbering around 150,000. Thus in total around 900,000 French troops in all theatres faced somewhere around a million Allied troops (not including the strategic reserve under formation in Germany). The gross figures may however mislead slightly, as most of the German troops fighting on the side of the French were unreliable at best and on the verge of defecting to the Allies. It is reasonable to say that Napoleon could count on no more than 450,000 troops in Germany which left him outnumbered about two to one.

Following the end of the armistice, Napoleon seemed to have regained the initiative at Dresden (August 1813), where he defeated a numerically-superior allied army and inflicted enormous casualties, while the French army sustained relatively few. However the failures of his marshals and a slow resumption of the offensive on his part cost him any advantage that this victory might have secured him. At the Battle of Leipzig in Saxony (October 16 - 19, 1813), also called the "Battle of the Nations," 191,000 French fought more than 300,000 Allies, and the defeated French had to retreat into France. Napoleon then fought a series of battles, including the Battle of Arcis-sur-Aube, in France itself, but the overwhelming numbers of the Allies steadily forced him back.

The Russian army enters Paris in 1814.

The Allies entered Paris on March 30, 1814. During this time Napoleon fought his Six Days Campaign, in which he won multiple battles against the enemy forces advancing

towards Paris. However, during this entire campaign he never managed to field more than 70,000 troops against more than half a million Allied troops. At the Treaty of Chaumont (March 9, 1814) the Allies agreed to preserve the Coalition until Napoleon's total defeat. Napoleon determined to fight on, even now, incapable of fathoming his massive fall from power. During the campaign he had issued a decree for 900,000 fresh conscripts, but only a fraction of these ever materialized, and Napoleon's increasingly unrealistic schemes for victory eventually gave way to the reality of the hopeless situation. Napoleon abdicated on 6th April. However, occasional military actions continued in Italy, Spain and Holland throughout the spring of 1814. The victors exiled Napoleon to the island of Elba, and restored the French Bourbon monarchy in the person of Louis XVIII. They signed the Treaty of Fontainebleau (April 11, 1814) and initiated the Congress of Vienna to redraw the map of Europe.

Gunboat War 1807–1814

Originally declared itself neutral in the Napoleonic Wars, established a navy, and engaged in trade with both sides. The British attacked, captured, and or destroyed large portions of the Danish fleet in the First Battle of Copenhagen (April 2, 1801), and again in the Second Battle of Copenhagen (August–September 1807). This ended the Danish neutrality, and the Danish engaged in a naval guerrilla war in which small gunboats would attack larger British ships in Danish and Norwegian waters. The Gunboat War effectively ended with a British victory at the Battle of Lyngør in 1812, involving the destruction of the last large Danish ship a frigate.

Seventh Coalition 1815

The Seventh Coalition (1815) pitted the United Kingdom, Russia, Prussia, Sweden, Austria, the Netherlands and a number of German states against France. The period known as the Hundred Days began after Napoleon left Elba and landed at Cannes (March 1, 1815). Travelling to Paris, picking up support as he went, he eventually overthrew the restored Louis XVIII. The Allies rapidly gathered their armies to meet him again. Napoleon raised 280,000 men, whom he distributed amongst several armies. To add to the 90,000 troops in the standing army he recalled well over a quarter of a million veterans from past campaigns and issued a decree for the eventual draft of around 2.5 million new men into the French army. This faced an initial Allied force of about 700,000 although Allied campaign plans provided for one million frontline troops supported by around 200,000 garrisons, logistics and other auxiliary personnel. This force was intended to be overwhelming against the numerically

inferior imperial French army which never came close to reaching Napoleon's goal of more than 2.5 million under arms.

Napoleon took about 124,000 men of the Army of the North on a pre-emptive strike against the Allies in Belgium. He intended to attack the Allied armies before they combined, in the hope of driving the British into the sea and the Prussians out of the war. His march to the frontier achieved the surprise he had planned. He forced Prussia to fight at Ligny on June 16 1815, and the defeated Prussians retreated in some disorder. On the same day the left wing of the Army of the North, under the command of Marshal Michel Ney, succeeded in stopping any of Wellington's forces going to the aid of Blucher's Prussians by fighting a blocking action at Quatre Bras. But Ney failed to clear the cross-roads and Wellington reinforced the position. With the Prussian retreat, Wellington was forced to retreat as well, however. He fell back to a previously reconnoitred position on an escarpment at Mont St Jean, a few miles south of the village of Waterloo. Napoleon took the reserve of the Army of the North, and reunited his forces with those of Ney to pursue Wellington's army, but not before he ordered Marshal Grouchy to take the right wing of the Army of the North and stop the Prussians reorganizing. Grouchy failed and although he engaged and defeated the Prussian rearguard under the command of Lt-Gen. von Thielmann in the Battle of Wavre (June 18–19), the rest of the Prussian army "marched towards the sound of the guns" at Waterloo. Napoleon delayed the start of fighting at the Battle of Waterloo on the morning of June 18, 1815 for several hours while he waited for the ground to dry after the previous night's rain. By late afternoon the French army had not succeeded in driving Wellington's Allied forces from the escarpment on which they stood. When the Prussians arrived and attacked the French right flank in ever-increasing numbers, Napoleon's strategy of keeping the Allied armies divided and a combined Allied general advance drove his army from the field in confusion. Grouchy partially redeemed himself by organizing a successful and well-ordered retreat towards Paris, where Marshal Davout had 117,000 men at the ready to turn back the 116,000 men of Blucher and Wellington. Militarily it appeared quite possible (indeed probable) that the French could defeat Wellington and Blucher, but politics proved the source of the Emperor's downfall. Furthermore, even had Davout succeeded in defeating the two northern Coalition armies, around 400,000 Russian and Austrian troops continued to advance from the east.

On arriving at Paris three days after Waterloo, Napoleon still clung to the hope of a concerted national resistance; but the temper of the chambers and of the public generally, did not favour his view. The politicians forced Napoleon to abdicate again on June 22, 1815.

Despite the Emperor's abdication, irregular warfare continued along the eastern borders and on the outskirts of Paris until the signing of a cease-fire on July 4. On July 15 Napoleon surrendered himself to the British squadron at Rochefort. The Allies exiled him to the remote South-Atlantic island of Saint Helena, where he died on May 5, 1821.

Napoleon as King of Italy (Appiani)

In most European countries, the importation of the ideals of the French Revolution (democracy, due process in courts, abolition of privileges, etc.) left a mark. European monarchs found it difficult to restore pre-revolutionary absolutism, and had to keep some of the reforms brought about during Napoleon's rule. Institutional legacies have remained to this day: many European countries have a Civil law legal system, with clearly redacted codes compiling their basic laws an enduring legacy of the Napoleonic Code.

A relatively new and increasingly powerful movement became significant. Nationalism would shape the course of much future European history; its growth spelled the beginning of some nations and states and the end of others. The map of Europe changed dramatically in the hundred years following the Napoleonic Era, based not on fiefs and aristocracy, but on the perceived basis of human culture, national origins, and national ideology. Bonaparte's reign over Europe sowed the seeds for the founding of the nation-states of Germany and Italy by starting the process of consolidating city-states, kingdoms and principalities. Another concept emerged that of Europe. Napoleon mentioned on several occasions his intention to create a single European state, and although his defeat set the thought of a unified Europe back over one-and-a-half centuries, the idea re-emerged after the end of the Second World War.

Military legacy

The Napoleonic Wars also had a profound military impact. Until the time of Napoleon, European states had employed relatively small armies with a large proportion of mercenaries who sometimes fought against their own native countries. However, military innovators in the middle of the eighteenth century began to recognize the potential of an entire nation at war: a "nation in arms." Napoleon himself showed innovative tendencies in his use of mobility to offset numerical disadvantages, as brilliantly demonstrated in the rout of the Austro-Russian forces in 1805 in the Battle of Austerlitz. The French Army reorganized the role of artillery, forming independent, mobile units as opposed to the

previous tradition of attaching artillery pieces in support of troops. Napoleon standardized cannonball sizes to ensure easier resupply and compatibility among his army's artillery pieces.

France, with the fourth-largest population in the world by the end of the eighteenth century (27 million, as compared to the United Kingdom's 12 million and Russia's 35 to 40 million), seemed well poised to take advantage of the 'levee en masse'. Because the French Revolution and Napoleon's reign witnessed the first application of the lessons of the eighteenth century's wars on trade and dynastic disputes, commentators often falsely assume that such ideas arose from the revolution rather than found their implementation in it. Not all the credit for the innovations of this period should go to Napoleon, however. Lazare Carnot played a large part in the reorganization of the French army from 1793 to 1794 a time which saw previous French misfortunes reversed, with Republican army's advancing on all fronts.

The great sizes of the armies involved give an obvious indication of the changes in warfare. During Europe's major pre-revolutionary war, the Seven Years' War of 1756-1763, few armies ever numbered more than 200,000. By contrast, the French army peaked in size in the 1790s with 1.5 million Frenchmen enlisted. In total, about 2.8 million Frenchmen fought on land and about 150,000 at sea, bringing the total for France to almost three million combatants. The United Kingdom had 747,670 men under arms between 1792 and 1815. In addition, about a quarter of a million personnel served in the Royal Navy. In September 1812, Russia had about 904,000 enlisted men in its land forces, and between 1799 and 1815 a total of 2.1 million men served in the Russian army, with perhaps 400,000 serving from 1792-1799. A further 200,000 or so served in the Russian Navy from 1792 to 1815. One cannot readily find consistent equivalent statistics for other major combatants. Austria's forces peaked at about 576,000 and had little or no naval component. Apart from the United Kingdom, Austria proved the most persistent enemy of France, and one can reasonably assume that more than a million Austrians served in total. Prussia never had more than 320,000 men under arms at any given time, only just ahead of the United Kingdom. Spain's armies also peaked in size at around 300,000, but to this one needs to add a considerable force of guerrillas. Otherwise only the United States (286,730 total combatants), the Maratha Confederation, the Ottoman Empire, Italy, Naples and Poland ever had more than 100,000 men under arms. Even small nations now had armies rivalling the Great Powers' forces of past wars in size. However one should bear in mind that the above numbers of soldiers come from military records and in practice the actual numbers of fighting men would fall below

this level due to desertion, fraud by officers claiming non-existent soldiers' pay, injuries and death, and in some countries deliberate exaggeration to ensure that forces met enlistment-targets. Despite this, the size of armed forces expanded at this time.

The initial stages of the Industrial Revolution had much to do with larger military forces it became easy to mass-produce weapons and thus to equip significantly larger forces. The United Kingdom served as the largest single manufacturer of armaments in this period, supplying most of the weapons used by the Allied powers throughout the conflicts (although using relatively few itself). France produced the second-largest total of armaments, equipping its own huge forces as well as those of the Confederation of the Rhine and others.

Another advance affected warfare:

The semaphore system had allowed the French War-Minister, Carnot, to communicate with French forces on the frontiers throughout the 1790s. The French continued to use this system throughout the Napoleonic wars. Additionally, aerial surveillance came into use for the first time when the French used a hot-air balloon to survey Allied positions before the Battle of Fleurus, on June 26, 1794. Advances in ordnance and rocketry also occurred in the course of the conflict.

3. The Continental System

Continental System is the name of the economic warfare, which Napoleon started against England in 1806. According to Napoleon “England was a nation of Shopkeepers”. If her trade with the European continent is stopped, her industries will be ruined and she will have to make peace with France. The Continental System can also be described as a battle between Land power and Sea power by 1806, Napoleon had become the dominant power in Europe, while after the battle of Trafalgar 1805, England had become the Master of the seas. Historians Grant and Temperley have called the Continental System as “The battle between the Elephant and the Whale”. The Berlin Decree- In November 1806, by the Berlin Decree Napoleon issued the following orders

1. All the European countries which consider Napoleon as their friend should boycott trade with England.
2. No person in Europe should send any letter or parcel to any person in England.
3. Any English man found in any European country should be arrested.

1807- Warsaw and Milan Decree to further strengthen the Continental system, Napoleon issued two more Decrees in 1807 from Warsaw and Milan. By these Decrees, Napoleon ordered that even if England's goods were found in the ships of neutral countries, those ships would be seized by the France. 1810- Paris or Fontainblue Decree- By this decree, Napoleon ordered that if England's goods are found in any country of Europe, they should be publicly burned. The reply of England-Order in Council, The reply to the Continental System of Napoleon, England also issued Order in Council, by which England declared that country of Europe which does not trade with England or whose ships carry France's good will be seized by the English Navy. In this way, England stopped the foreign trade of Napoleon and his friends, because the England was the master of the seas, she was successful in enforcing her Orders in council.

The Results of the Continental System

. As a result of the stoppage of the foreign trade of European countries by England. There was a famine of things of daily necessity which were imported from outside in Europe especially tea, coffee and sugar.

- a. The people of Europe had to suffer great difficulties-Especially the people of Russia had to suffer great hardship.
- b. Even France and Napoleon had to suffer great hardship. Napoleon secretly imported 50,000 over-coats for his army from England.
- c. As a result of the Continental System, Napoleon had to fight many wars against those countries, which refused to boycott England's trade.

1807 War with Portugal

The King of Portugal was a friend of England and he refused to boycott trade with England. In November 1807, Napoleon made a treaty with Spain by which Spain allowed France army to attack Portugal through its territory. Portugal was defeated and occupied by Napoleon. War with Pope 1808-1809 Pope also refused to accept the Continental System and declared him neutral. In 1809, Napoleon occupied Rome and arrested the Pope. It had serious results and all the Roman Catholics in Europe became the enemies of Napoleon. 1810 Annexation of Holland by France Napoleon's brother Louis Bonaparte was the king of Holland. When the people of Holland faced great difficulty, Louis gave up the Continental

System and started trade with England. Napoleon removed Louis Bonaparte and Holland was included in France.

War with Russia – 1812

The people of Russia experienced great difficulty due to the Continental System of Napoleon. In Dec. 1812, Czar Alexander of Russia gave up the Continental System and started trade with England. Napoleon started preparations for attack on Russia. In June 1812, Napoleon attacked Russia with a huge army of 6 Lakh men. He was able to reach Moscow, but due to winter, he had to return back. While returning from Moscow, most of his army was destroyed due to hunger and cold. Only 20,000 persons returned from Russia.

Causes of the Failure of the Continental System

1. It was an impossible scheme and Napoleon could not pursue the European countries to boycott trades with England.
2. England was all-powerful on the seas and she successfully stopped all foreign trade of Napoleon and his friends.
3. The countries of Europe were dependent for many articles of daily necessity like sugar, coffee, tea on foreign countries. With the stoppage of foreign trade, there was a famine of these things in Europe. Especially Russian people experienced great difficulty and Czar of Russia started trade with England in Dec 1810. This resulted in Napoleon's attack on Russia in 1812.

4. Napoleon Bonaparte and His Internal Reforms

Domestic Reforms of Napoleon Bonaparte

After the revolution, Napoleon Bonaparte brought some important changes in French's Administration which is known as Napoleonic reforms from 1799 onwards. Napoleon had defeated his rival in the continent and England was no more a threat for France. Napoleon wanted to bring social and economic liberty, but he did not believe in political liberty, means he created platform for development where he gave equal justice, rights, and chances for advancement, but kept all political power into his own hand.

Administrative Reforms

Napoleon introduced a centralized administrative structure, where all powers were vested in his own hands. He brought the Law Courts completely under his control by legislation. Elective Bodies of the Districts and small districts were abolished as part of the revision of Local Government and the Consulate of the Country. In their place, the Prefects and Sub-Prefects were to be appointed by the first Consul. On the other hand, the First Consul was the right to choose the mayors of Town with a population of 5000. The Local Government and Central Government were centralized in Paris.

Economic Reforms

He introduced the efficient and effective system of tax collection which created a balance budget in France. He revived the bank of France to serve as a National bank. He revived the mercantilist practices to encourage industry and business in France. Established a sound Currency system and public credit. He lowered taxes imposed on Farmers. Created an independent peasantry that would be the backbone of the French economy. On the other hands, workers were not allowed to form any type of guilds or trade unions. The reforms stimulated the country's economy by providing food at low prices and increased employment.

Religious Reforms

At that time in French, religious dissensions were there, hence Napoleon wanted to bring some changes in Religious matter. He fully acknowledged the importance of religion as a political lever and determined to use it for his own benefit. As part of his religious reforms, Napoleon decided not to interfere in the Catholic if the Church itself ceased to interfere in the State's affairs. He wanted to achieve active support from the Catholic Church, who drifted away because of anti-clerical measures. Napoleon, therefore decided to enter into an agreement with Pope Pius VII in April 1801. Which was known as Concordat as per this Settlement, Pope recognized the confiscation and sale of the church property at the early period of revolution. As per the Concordat, the First Consul appointed the Bishops and the Bishops were to appoint the Priests. Catholic worship in public was allowed. Church seminars were reopened. Extended legal toleration to the Catholics, Protestants and Jews. The Concordat replaced the revolutionary Calendar with Christian calendar. Thus the Concordat gave a considerable advantage to Napoleon, as the clergy's were strictly become sub-ordinate to the state.

Educational Reforms

His Educational Reforms were based on a system of Public education under State control. He established a University in France. The First Consul appointed its chief officers. Moreover, any person who wanted to open school or private teaching needed to obtain license from the University. All education was to conform Catholic Church and was to be loyal to the State and the First Consul. Napoleon did not want to encourage private education. Therefore, he maintained a regular system of education for the country. As part of this policy, every commune had to maintain primary school and a prefect was responsible to manage the affairs of these schools. Grammar schools were opened in all important towns. Technical schools were established. Military schools under government control.

Judicial Reforms

Before the Revolution, there was no uniformity in the Judicial System of France. Different laws were there. Napoleon had completely rebuilt the Legal System of the country. A Civil Code was brought out in 1804, and different codes were adopted such as civil procedure, Code of criminal Procedure, Penal Code and a Commercial Code. Laws of Napoleon guaranteed civil equality, religious toleration, equality of inheritance and the trial by Jury.

Public Works

Napoleon improved the Road Connectivity. Most of the modern roads of France were actually built as per the order of Napoleon, during his period a total of 299 roads were constructed bridges and canals. Some important harbour like Toulon was enlarged and fortified.

Legion of Honour

Napoleon Bonaparte had established the institution of the Legion of Honour to honour and rewards those who render outstanding service to the state. This institution became so popular in France.

Drawbacks of Napoleonic Reforms.

Inequality for women (Denied women equal status with men), Women and children were dependent on their husband and father. Divorce was more difficult, Women could not

buy or sale property, income earned by wife went to their husbands. Workers were not allowed to form trade unions, Practiced nepotism by placing his relatives on the thrones of the nations he conquered.

The Downfall of Napoleon

Despite Napoleon Bonaparte's early successes in restoring order to France at the beginning of the 1800s, the ten years after he became Emperor would be mired by failures, eventually leading to his downfall. One of his first moves in attempting to conquer or gain an advantage over much of Europe came with the Continental System. This decree, enacted by Napoleon, was meant to weaken England. In it, he encouraged any countries who were either neutral (meaning they didn't take sides) or who were allies with France to stop doing business with England. It was his hope that England would suffer economically. The Continental System, however, failed, due in part to the fact that England had natural resources to sustain itself. The country that was weakened, ironically, was France. From 1808 to 1814, France was engaged in the Peninsular War against Spain and Portugal, who were aided in the conflict by Great Britain. Napoleon had set his sights on conquering the Iberian Peninsula and actually succeeded in doing so when he conquered Spain in 1808. He installed his older brother, Joseph as the King of Spain. His short rule lasted from 1808 to 1813. This upset the Spaniards, who had once been allies with France. The Peninsular War turned out to be quite costly, and although the French won against Spain, this was a turning point in Napoleon's reign: it was a moment in which his previous allies realized how land-greedy he was becoming.

Meanwhile, in 1812, the French under Napoleon embarked on an invasion of Russia. He had hoped to gain political advantage with both Russia and Poland as a result of this invasion, and to defeat Russian troops. It was, however, a total disaster. Not only was it freezing cold, but the Russians were certainly not open to any engagements with the French. They retreated, but not before enacted a "scorched earth" policy, one in which they burned all of the crops as they moved further away from the French. This left Napoleon's troops with little to eat. All totalled, the French army would lose hundreds of thousands of men during the six-month invasion. By June of 1815, Napoleon's list of enemy countries had grown to include Britain, Austria, Prussia, and Russia due to his actions. The four countries all braced themselves for what they assumed would be a war with Napoleon's forces, and when he got wind of this, he thought he might catch them by surprise and try to defeat them. He

subsequently invaded Belgium, the spark which ignited the Battle of Waterloo. Napoleon and his forces were defeated at this battle, which would mark the final defeat of his reign.

5. The Congress of Vienna

The Congress of Vienna marked the establishment of a new political and legal order for Europe after more than two decades of turmoil and war following the French Revolution. The defeat of Napoleon (1769–1821) in 1813–1814 by a huge coalition of powers under the leadership of Britain, Russia, Austria, and Prussia gave the victorious powers an opportunity to stabilise Europe. This they intended to do by containing the power of France and recreating the balance between the great powers.

The Balance of Power

The Concert of Europe was a system of dispute resolution adopted by the major conservative powers of Europe to maintain their power, oppose revolutionary movements, weaken the forces of nationalism, and uphold the balance of power. As the four major European powers (Britain, Prussia, Russia, and Austria) opposing the French Empire in the Napoleonic wars saw Napoleon's power collapsing in 1814, they started planning for the post-war world. The Treaty of Chaumont of March 1814 reaffirmed decisions that would be ratified by the more important Congress of Vienna of 1814–15. The Congress of Vienna was the first of a series of international meetings that came to be known as the Concert of Europe, an attempt to forge a peaceful balance of power in Europe. It served as a model for later organizations such as the League of Nations in 1919 and the United Nations in 1945. They included the establishment of a confederated Germany, the division of French protectorates and annexations into independent states, the restoration of the Bourbon kings of Spain, the enlargement of the Netherlands to include what in 1830 became modern Belgium, and the continuation of British subsidies to its allies. The Treaty of Chaumont united the powers to defeat Napoleon and became the cornerstone of the Concert of Europe, which formed the balance of power for the next two decades. The basic tenet of the European balance of power is that no single European power should be allowed to achieve hegemony over a substantial part of the continent and that this is best curtailed by having a small number of ever-changing alliances contend for power.

The Congress of Vienna dissolved the Napoleonic world and attempted to restore the monarchies Napoleon had overthrown, ushering in an era of reaction. Under the leadership of

Metternich, the prime minister of Austria (1809–48) and Lord Castlereagh, the foreign minister of Great Britain (1812–22), the Congress set up a system to preserve the peace. Under the Concert of Europe, the major European powers Britain, Russia, Prussia, Austria, and (after 1818) France pledged to meet regularly to resolve differences. The goal was not simply to restore old boundaries but to resize the main powers so they could balance each other and remain at peace. The leaders were conservatives with little use for republicanism or revolution, both of which threatened to upset the status quo in Europe. This plan was the first of its kind in European history and seemed to promise a way to collectively manage European affairs and promote peace.

The Congress resolved the Polish–Saxon crisis at Vienna and the question of Greek independence at Laibach. Three major European congresses took place. The Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle (1818) ended the occupation of France. The others were meaningless as each nation realized the Congresses were not to their advantage, as disputes were resolved with a diminishing degree of effectiveness. The Congress was the first occasion in history where, on a continental scale, national representatives came together to formulate treaties instead of relying mostly on messages between the several capitals. The Congress of Vienna settlement, despite later changes, formed the framework for European international politics until the outbreak of the First World War in 1914.

Conservative Order

The Conservative Order is a term applied to European political history after the defeat of Napoleon in 1815. From 1815 to 1830 a conscious program by conservative statesmen, including Metternich and Castlereagh, was put in place to contain revolution and revolutionary forces by restoring old orders, particularly previous ruling aristocracies. Britain, Prussia, Russia, and Austria renewed their commitment to prevent any restoration of Bonaparte's power and agreed to meet regularly in conferences to discuss their common interests. This period contains the time of the Holy Alliance, a military agreement. The Concert of Europe was the political framework that grew out of the Quadruple Alliance in November 1815.

The goal of the conservatives at the Congress, led by Prince Clemens von Metternich of Austria, was to re-establish peace and stability in Europe. To accomplish this, a new balance of power had to be established. Metternich and the other four represented states sought to do this by restoring old ruling families and creating buffer zones between major

powers. To contain the still powerful French, the House of Orange-Nassau was put on the throne in the Netherlands, which formerly comprised the Dutch Republic and the Austrian Netherlands (Belgium). To the southeast of France, Piedmont (officially part of the kingdom of Sardinia) was enlarged. The Bourbon dynasty was restored to France and Spain as well as a return of other legitimate rulers to the Italian states. And to contain the Russian empire, Poland was divided up between Austria, Prussia, and Russia.

Concert of Europe

The Concert of Europe, also known as the Congress System or the Vienna System after the Congress of Vienna, was a System of dispute resolution adopted by the major conservative powers of Europe to maintain their power, oppose revolutionary movements, weaken the forces of nationalism, and uphold the balance of power. It grew out of Congress of Vienna. It operated in Europe from the end of the Napoleonic Wars (1815) to the early 1820s. The Concert of Europe was founded by the powers of Austria, Prussia, the Russian Empire, and the United Kingdom, who were the members of the Quadruple Alliance that defeated Napoleon and his First French Empire. In time, France was established as a fifth member of the Concert. At first, the leading personalities of the system were British foreign secretary Lord Castlereagh, Austrian Chancellor Klemens von Metternich, and Tsar Alexander I of Russia. Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord of France was largely responsible for quickly returning that country to its place alongside the other major powers in international diplomacy.

The Concert of Europe had no written rules or permanent institutions, but at times of crisis any of the member countries could propose a conference. Meetings of the Great Powers during this period included: Aix-la-Chapelle (1818), Carlsbad (1819), Troppau (1820), Laibach (1821), Verona (1822), London (1832), and Berlin (1878). The basic features of the reorganisation of Europe from Vienna would survive for more than 5 decades, until the German unification. Whereas Europe was plagued by numerous armed conflicts and wars, the Vienna order proved at the same time sufficiently grounded and flexible to allow the great powers the leeway necessary to prevent these wars from escalating into a new general war. Even the disruption of the balance of power through the defeat of France in the Franco-German War and the ensuing unification of Germany in 1870 did not lead to an end to the endeavours by the great powers to manage the system and to sustain peace. The breakdown of the peace and the total conflagration of 1914–1918 destroyed the credit of one of the

pillars of the Viennese settlement, the balance of power. But the other survived. Even more so, the idea that the best guarantee for order and peace was their joint management by the great powers became the backbone of the institutional organisation of collective security in the League of Nations in 1919 and the United Nations Organisation in 1945.

6. The Holy Roman Empire

The Holy Roman Empire officially lasted from 962 to 1806. It was one of Europe's largest medieval and early modern states, but its power base was unstable and continually shifting. The Holy Roman Empire was not a unitary state, but a confederation of small and medium-sized political entities. When they managed to speak with one voice, the Holy Roman Emperor was one of Europe's mightiest sovereigns. More often than not, though, the "member states" of the Holy Roman Empire had divergent interests and came into conflict with one another. Other European powers regularly and ruthlessly exploited these divisions. Consequently, weak emperors were almost completely ignored by the heads of the Holy Roman Empire's lesser states. Strong emperors, on the other hand, fared better at subjugating them to their will, but always had to fight tooth and nail to project and protect their power. To make matters worse for the imperial house, the Holy Roman Emperor was elected by an Imperial College. Every new election carried with it the risk of losing the imperial crown to another ambitious family. To prevent this, the ruling dynasty usually had to offer concessions to members of the college to woo their votes. Over time, this hollowed out the imperial family's power so that - sooner or later - they would enter an election with not much left to offer. These were often the moments when the imperial dynasty was replaced with a new one, only to start the cycle anew. Therefore, despite its impressive size, the Holy Roman Empire only turned into an imperial juggernaut under the strongest of emperors. The weaker ones were on the receiving end of the political machinery of this confederal elective monarchy, de facto ruling over not much more than their family's hereditary lands.

Foundation

During the 8th and 9th centuries, the Franks carved out a humongous realm in Central and Western Europe. On Christmas Day, 800, the Frankish king, Charlemagne, had himself crowned as emperor in Rome. Under his grandsons, however, the Frankish realm swiftly disintegrated. They agreed to split the empire into three parts: the Kingdom of West Francia (the precursor of medieval France), Middle Francia or Lotharingia, and East Francia. The

third kingdom evolved into the Kingdom of Germany during the late 9th and early 10th centuries.

Since, in theory, you can only have one emperor at the same time, Charlemagne's grandsons decided that the ruler of Middle Francia was to carry the imperial title. This agreement broke down quickly because that family line of the Carolingian Dynasty went extinct. As a result, Middle Francia descended into chaos, breaking apart into the Kingdom of Burgundy and the Kingdom of Italy. In the 10th century, the Italian princess Adelaide (931-999) asked Otto I, King of Germany (r. 936-973) and Holy Roman Emperor (r. 962-973), to come and settle affairs south of the Alps. Otto invaded northern Italy, installed order, married Adelaide, and continued to Rome. Otto was now King of Germany and, through Adelaide's family line, King of Italy. In his mind, this called for an imperial title. Fortunately for him, the pope was grateful for the reintroduction of some sense of stability in Italy by the German forces. So he thanked Otto by reviving the vacant imperial title and crowned him emperor.

The 'office' of the Holy Roman Emperor was hereby formally transferred from Middle Francia to East Francia or Kingdom of Germany, where it would remain for the rest of the Holy Roman Empire's history. That is why this event, in 962, is usually seen as the start of the Holy Roman Empire. Some historians regard the crowning of Charlemagne, in 800, as the beginning but his empire is now generally referred to as the Frankish or Carolingian Empire. Otto's family, the Ottoman Dynasty or Saxon Dynasty, ruled the empire until 1024 CE. They incorporated the Duchy of Bohemia into the empire. Soon after, the Ottomans were replaced by the Salian Dynasty. The Salians added the other, leftover part of Middle Francia, the Kingdom of Burgundy, to the Holy Roman Empire. They thus turned the empire into a composite monarchy with the major building blocks being Germany, Italy, Bohemia, and Burgundy. Meanwhile, the ascendant Salians entered into a major conflict with the medieval church, known as the Investiture Controversy. The growing imperial power in the 11th century raised the question of who reigned supreme in Latin Christianity: the pope or the emperor? After much debate and bloodshed, a compromise was reached; the Concordat of Worms in 1122 limited the religious influence of the emperor. The Holy Roman Empire's next dynasty, the Stouffers, nevertheless pushed imperial power in secular matters to its very limit.

The Stauffer Dynasty

The Stauffer dynasty was one of the Holy Roman Empire's most remarkable imperial houses. Under their reign, the Empire reached its greatest territorial extent. At their height of power in the 13th century, the Staufers ruled - in theory - from the southern border of Denmark to the Mediterranean island of Sicily. The first Stauffer emperor, Frederick I (1155-1190), was called Barbarossa, on account of his red beard. He participated in the Second Crusade before he became emperor and accrued a wealth of military experience at a young age. After his imperial coronation, he was challenged again and again by the flourishing mercantile republics in his own Kingdom of Italy. He led over six military expeditions against his Italian subjects. Ultimately, he made so many enemies that several cities allied against him with the pope, Sicily, and even the Byzantine Empire. Barbarossa was beaten and returned north a bitter man. Determined for revenge, he prepared another expedition but was overtaken by events in the Levant. The armies of the Saladin, the Muslim Sultan of Egypt and Syrian (1174-1193) had conquered Jerusalem. Barbarossa joined the Third Crusade, intending to reconquer the Holy City. Having progressed quite far on the way to his target, he took a fateful bath in a river in current-day Turkey and drowned.

His grandson, Frederick II (1220-1250) made such an impression on his contemporaries that they called him *stupor mundi*, meaning "wonder of the world". He spoke six languages and promoted poetry, philosophy, and medieval literature, also welcoming Muslim and Jewish scholars at his court in Palermo, Sicily. His religious tolerance, combined with his limitless territorial ambitions, brought him into a near-permanent state of conflict with the pope. Frederick was excommunicated three times over and Pope Innocent IV even called him "the Antichrist". Nevertheless, Frederick saw himself as a paragon of Christianity and sailed to the Holy Land with the Sixth Crusade. Contrary to the aggressiveness which was - by now - characteristic for armies of the crusades, the emperor negotiated with the sultan, al-Kamil (1218-1238), and regained control of Jerusalem. Where the Third Crusade had failed militarily, the Sixth succeeded with diplomacy.

The centrifugal issues that plagued the Holy Roman Empire were temporarily subdued by Frederick's overbearing might. But when he died and the Stauffer era came to an end in 1250, these challenges came to the fore with increased intensity. The Italian republics as well as the northern cities united in the Hanseatic League jumped into the power vacuum that Frederick's death created and enlarged their political and economic autonomy. Inland, feudal lords squabbled over the imperial succession but none managed to subjugate the

others. A new emperor was only crowned in 1312 - over 60 years after the end of the Staufer Dynasty. This period is known as the Interregnum, meaning “between reigns”.

Culture and Economy

As central authority decreased after the Staufer emperors, a decentralization process kicked in that transferred power from the ancient feudal aristocracy to the late medieval and early modern burgher class, who populated the cities. Because money was reinjected into the economic system, the possession of land was gradually overshadowed by having a big, fat purse. This shift in power did not mean that the empire became democratic in any way. The Imperial College, whose members elected the emperor, still consisted exclusively of feudal lords. Its ecclesiastical members were the archbishops of Mainz, Trier, and Cologne. The secular electors were the dukes of the four "nations" of Germany: Franconia, Swabia, Saxony, and Bavaria. After the Staufer dynasty, Franconia, Swabia, and Bavaria were replaced by the King of Bohemia, the Count Palatine, and the Margrave of Brandenburg. These and other aristocrats continued to wield great power during the late medieval phase of the Holy Roman Empire, but as cities accumulated more wealth, burghers managed to press for ever-increasing concessions from their feudal overlords, gradually paving the way for an early modern, urbanized society.

It was because of this shift from feudalism to a mercantile business economy that Italy started breaking away from the Holy Roman Empire. The maritime republics of Venice, Genoa, and Pisa had built up a significant amount of autonomy under the Staufer emperors. As central imperial authority over Italy faded, they accelerated this process - eventually setting them on a trajectory towards the Renaissance, when Florence and Milan followed their example. During the post-Staufer period, in addition to their distinct political and economic position, they distanced themselves mentally and culturally from the other, northern inhabitants of the empire and started referring to them as “Teutons” or “Germans”.

Meanwhile, in the lands north of the Alps, cities negotiated with dukes and counts for greater economic freedom as well. The outcome of these political confrontations was written down in documents called "privileges", usually highly favourable to the city in question. The burgher class put more and more feudal lords on the defensive. Inside the cities, craftsmen started to organize themselves into medieval guilds. These associations soon became political bodies of their own. They controlled the local labour market, the amount of production, and trade tariffs. Furthermore, the most prosperous cities allied in leagues and could extract even

more concessions and privileges from the feudal aristocracy. The Lombard League, an alliance of North Italian cities, had been a thorn in Barbarossa's side, and in the north, the commercial centres along the North Sea and Baltic coasts, such as Hamburg, Bremen, and Danzig, joined forces by forming the Hanseatic League. Already in the 12th century, this union of cities managed to force the English king to exempt its members from all tolls in London.

Evidently, the Holy Roman Empire did not need a strong emperor to flourish. Although imperial authority waned during the Late Middle Ages, cities, guilds, and burghers cooperated to improve their position. In the meantime, the imperial title passed through the Luxembourgish, Bavarian, and Bohemian dynasties to land in the lap of the Austrian Habsburgs in the 15th century. From 1415 CE, this family reigned over the Holy Roman Empire until its final day.

7. The Reformation

It was under Habsburg rule that the Holy Roman Empire experienced an era of great religious strife, making it one of its darker periods. Whereas the imperial family was staunchly Catholic, in the north of the empire the Protestant Reformation exploded in 1517 when Martin Luther officially broke with the pope and fractured Western Christianity. A large number of cities leaped at this chance to resist the Catholic Habsburgs. They exploited this tectonic shift in church matters and sided with the Reformation, giving it an immediate and inflammable political dimension. The Rhineland, Bohemia, Austria, and the south of the German territories remained mostly Catholic, while the north and cities such as Strasbourg and Frankfurt became bulwarks of Protestantism.

In the meantime, the beleaguered Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor (r. 1519-1556) was also battling the French and the Turks, who had by now replaced the Byzantines in the Balkan and were threatening Hungary - a Habsburg possession, though formally outside the Holy Roman Empire. Although he tried to juggle all these affairs, in 1555 an exhausted Charles V gave in to Protestant demands and resigned soon thereafter. From that moment, the lord of a "member state", such as the Duke of Saxony or the King of Bohemia, could decide whether his lands were Catholic or Protestant. It was agreed that the emperor would stay out of religious matters outside his own lands. This gave the Holy Roman Empire a somewhat uneasy but rather stable base to work with for the rest of the 16th century. However, this decline of imperial power once again created a power vacuum that led to open conflict.

As Protestantism was still expanding, the Kingdom of Bohemia slowly yet steadily converted to the new creed. The kingdom was under Habsburg rule at the time: next to being emperor, the Habsburgs were also simultaneously kings of Bohemia. In 1618, the Bohemian nobility revolted and deposed Ferdinand II as king of Bohemia (though not as emperor). They offered the crown to a Protestant candidate. Embarrassed as well as offended, Ferdinand II, Holy Roman Emperor (r. 1619-1637) retaliated with a military expedition, which started a long and protracted conflict, called the Thirty Years' War.

Initially, the imperial party regained control of Bohemia soon enough. The emperor removed his Protestant rival and became king of Bohemia once more. However, because of the agreement that Charles V had signed in 1555, the emperor was supposed to concentrate on his own hereditary lands and leave other territories unmolested. In the heated religious atmosphere of the 17th century, the imperial meddling in Bohemian (Protestant) affairs was interpreted as the Habsburgs overstepping their authority. As a result, the duke of Holstein - simultaneously the king of Denmark - rebelled and campaigned against his emperor for a couple of years. Ultimately, he was beaten; the growing Habsburg influence scared others. So, after the Danish phase, it was Sweden's turn to try and strengthen the Protestant cause in northern Germany. The Swedish king warred against the emperor for many years and scored great victories but was slain in battle in 1632.

Because all else had failed, the French - always jealously trying to obstruct Habsburg ambitions - now had no choice but to directly intervene in the conflict as well. Most of the fighting took place on German lands, and the decades of intermittent fighting devastated the country, weakening the imperial position as the conflict dragged on. The combination of internal resistance by Protestant princes and interventions by Danish, Swedish, and French forces ultimately proved to be too much to handle for the Habsburgs. In 1648, after a long period of negotiations, a comprehensive peace package was agreed upon. This Peace of Westphalia finally ended the calamitous conflict, one of the most lethal, ruinous and catastrophic confrontations in European history. At last, peace - both in a religious and secular sense - returned to the Holy Roman Empire.

Decline

After the Treaty of Westphalia, the Habsburgs remained in place as Holy Roman Emperors, but their power was increasingly confined to their own Austrian, Bohemian, and Hungarian possessions. At Vienna, they thwarted a major Ottoman assault on Central Europe

with Polish assistance in 1683, and it was with this power base that they kept trying to obstruct the rise of France as a European great power. The Holy Roman Emperors definitively failed at this task when Louis XIV of France (r. 1643-1715) managed to extend his eastern borders to the Rhine River. As threatening as the French might have seemed, the next great challenge to Habsburg authority did not come from Paris, but was - once again - growing inside the Holy Roman Empire.

During these years, the Hohenzollern family ruling the Margraviate of Brandenburg expanded this state into the Kingdom of Prussia. Although this happened mostly with the grudging approval of the emperors, in 1740, the Prussian king launched a swift invasion of Silesia, one of the wealthiest and most productive Habsburg lands. A Habsburg counter-offensive was not altogether unsuccessful, but in the end the emperor had to cede this province to Prussian control. The conflict between Austria and Prussia would continue for a long time afterward and played a major role in the first German national unification in the 19th century CE. However, before that came to pass, the Holy Roman Empire was no more.

Around 1800, the eternal threat from the west, the French, took on a whole new shape. First in the form of revolutionary armies, later in the persona of Napoleon Bonaparte (l. 1769-1821), France marched east with unprecedented success. In 1805, Napoleon inflicted such a crushing defeat on the Holy Roman Emperor that his authority outside his own Habsburg lands ceased to exist. The next year, the Holy Roman Empire was officially dissolved, while the French reorganized most German states into their satellite state called the Confederation of the Rhine. After Napoleon was beaten for good, the confederation idea remained in place. All German states, including Prussia and Austria, joined the new German Confederation. From this alliance of member states modern Germany finally emerged, although Austria and the Habsburgs were ultimately excluded from this project by the continuing expansion of Prussia. In Vienna, the Habsburg family clung to power as Emperors of Austria-Hungary and ruled until the events of the First World War (1914-1918) made this imperial title obsolete as well.

8. Metternich System (1815-1848)

Introduction

The Metternich System, also known as the Congress System after the Congress of Vienna, was the balance of power that existed in Europe from the end of the Napoleonic

Wars (1815) to the outbreak of World War I (1914), albeit with major alterations after the revolutions of 1848. The purpose of Metternich's plan was to keep control of Europe in the hands of conservatives through "Concert of Europe". It was a peacekeeping alliance pledging to maintain a "balance of power" and suppress uprisings. Its founding powers were Austria, Prussia, the Russian Empire and the United Kingdom, the members of the Quadruple Alliance responsible for the downfall of the First French Empire. In time France was established as a fifth member of the concert. At first, the leading personalities of the system were British foreign secretary Lord Castlereagh, Austrian chancellor Klemens von Metternich and Russian tsar Alexander I. The Congress of Vienna established an international system of reactionary governments dedicated to maintaining a set of European boundaries, preventing revolutions and changes in government, and stopping any one power from becoming too powerful. To this end, the Congress powers agreed to meet whenever trouble should crop up in Europe to discuss how to fix it.

Early Life of Metternich

The French Revolution of 1789 and its consequences were referred to by Metternich as the "hateful time". Metternich's family was directly affected by both the Revolution and the fighting. The revolutionary wars forced the Metternich family to flee from Germany into Austria. The young Metternich never forgot this trauma. The rest of his career was, in a sense, one long reaction. Once Metternich was back in Vienna, his career as a statesman and politician advanced rapidly. His marriage in 1795 to Eleonore von Kaunitz, granddaughter of the Austrian state chancellor, gave him access to the highest social and political circles in the Austrian Empire. His wife's contacts and knowledge were important for an ambitious man who had never before lived in Austria's capital city. After serving as Austrian ambassador to Berlin and Dresden, Metternich was appointed ambassador to France in 1806. In April of 1809, he appealed to the French emperor's vanity (and cemented a temporary French-Austrian alliance) by marrying Napoleon to Marie Louise, daughter of the Austrian emperor Francis I. But diplomatic success did not come as easily. He sent such optimistic reports back to Vienna portraying a vulnerable Napoleon who was in danger of being overthrown by a resurgent revolutionary movement in France that the Austrian government went to war against France and lost. Yet when Metternich gained favourable peace terms from Napoleon, he was rewarded by being appointed the Austrian minister of foreign affairs in October 1809. At that time the Habsburg Empire was at its lowest point in its struggle against Napoleon.

Within a few years, he had pulled the Empire back from the brink of possible extinction. In short, Metternich used his diplomatic skills to outgeneral Napoleon.

In 1810 he persuaded the Habsburg Emperor, Francis I, to ally with Napoleon. But when it became clear that the French leader was not prepared to settle down and play the part of an old-fashioned absolute monarch he turned against him and joined the Fourth Coalition, which eventually defeated France. In 1813, he was given the hereditary title of prince. The year 1815 saw Metternich at the peak of his power and popularity in Austria. In 1810, Napoleon had been master of much of Europe, and Austria had been a virtual puppet of French foreign policy; five years later, Metternich had become a key leader in the coalition of countries which defeated the French emperor twice. Now the victors held the fate of Europe in their hands. When the victorious countries agreed to hold a diplomatic conference at Vienna (the Congress of Vienna), Metternich saw it as a personal triumph.

Metternich's system

The period from 1815 to 1848 has usually been called the 'Era of Metternich' for during these years he was the central figure in European politics. For the preservation of Habsburg dominion inhabited by Hungarians, Czechs, Slovaks, Croats, Rumanians, and Poles, Metternich devised his famous system. He was the apostle of conservatism. 'Govern and change nothing' was his watchword. Believing that nationalism and liberalism and other revolutionary principles were responsible for disturbances in Europe since 1789, Metternich wanted that all Europe must be rid of these contagions. His ideal was a reactionary Europe propped up under the hegemony of Austria. In Germany Metternich frustrated the fulfilment of nationalist hopes. At his initiative, the German Diet in September 1819 passed the Carlsbad Decrees. These decrees dissolved the patriotic student societies and enforced rigid censorship of the press. These decrees remained in force for nearly twenty years. The following year Metternich persuaded the German States to restrict the subjects that might be discussed in parliamentary assemblies.

It was in Italy that Metternich made his influence felt through the Habsburg princes restored to power in 1815. Everywhere there was censorship, popular ignorance and poverty. The strength of Metternich's system in Italy lay in the division which prevented any concerted nationalist movement of independence. To sustain Habsburg domination in Austria and elsewhere called for constant vigilance and fixed determination. Both of these qualities

Metternich had in his vision internal and international affairs were inseparable. He wanted to crush the spirit of revolution everywhere and to maintain the balance of power in Europe.

Estimate

Metternich came to the conclusion that the restored monarchs must combine themselves and prepare machinery for concerted action. It was Metternich who invented the periodic Congresses to resolve all disputes that might endanger the peace of Europe. The fundamental weakness of the Metternich System was that it only postponed the day of reckoning. It secured a false appearance of unity. The forces of revolution, driven underground, erupted with so violent force in 1848 that the system crumbled.

9. Charles X 1824–1830

Charles X, the younger brother of Louis XVIII, had spent the Revolutionary years in exile and had returned embittered rather than chastened by the experience. What France needed, in his view, was a return to the unsullied principle of divine right, buttressed by the restored authority of the established church. The new king and his cabinet still headed by Villele promptly pushed through the Chamber a series of laws of sharply partisan character. The most bitterly debated of these laws was the one that indemnified the émigrés for the loss of their property during the Revolution. The cost of the operation almost one billion francs was borne by government bondholders, whose bonds were arbitrarily converted to a lower interest rate. A severe press law hamstrung the publishers of newspapers and pamphlets; another established the death penalty for sacrilegious acts committed in churches.

Along with these signs of reaction went a vigorous campaign to reassert the authority of the Roman Catholic Church, which had been undermined by Enlightenment skepticism and by the Revolutionary upheaval. The Concordat of 1802 had allowed the beginning of a religious revival, which gained strength after 1814. The best-selling *Le Génie du christianisme* (1802; *Genius of Christianity*), by the Romantic writer François-Auguste-René, vicomte de Chateaubriand, marked a change in public attitudes toward belief; Chateaubriand rejected Enlightenment rationalism and argued that only religion could satisfy human emotional needs. Under the Bourbons several new missionary orders and lay organizations were founded in an effort to revive the faith and to engage in good works. Catholic seminaries began to draw increasing numbers of students away from the state lycees. Charles X threw himself enthusiastically into the campaign for Catholic revival. The anticlericals of

the liberal left were outraged, and even many moderates of Gallican sympathies were perturbed. Rumours spread that the king had secretly become a Jesuit and was planning to turn the country over to “the men in black.”

King Charles and his ultra ministers might nevertheless have remained in solid control if they had been shrewd and sensitive men, aware of the rise of public discontent and flexible enough to appease it. Instead, they forged stubbornly ahead on the road to disaster. Villèle, though a talented administrator, lacked creative imagination and charismatic appeal. As the years passed, his leadership was increasingly challenged even within his own ultra majority. A bitter personal feud between Villele and Chateaubriand, who had entered politics after 1814 and had become the most colourful of the ultra politicians, undermined both the ministry and the dynasty. The liberal campaign organization "Aide-toi, le ciel t'aidera" (“God helps those who help themselves”) coordinated the opposition’s preparations for the elections of 1827, which brought a sharp resurgence of liberal and moderate strength and led to Villele’s downfall. The king patched together a disparate ministry of moderates and ultras headed by an obscure official, Jean-Baptiste-Sylvère Gay, vicomte de Martignac. But Martignac lacked Charles’s confidence and failed to win the support of the more moderate leftists in the Chamber. In 1829 the king brusquely dismissed him and restored the ultras to power.

The delayed consequences of this act were to be fatal to the dynasty. The king, instead of entrusting power to an able ultra such as Villele or a popular one such as Chateaubriand, chose a personal favourite, Jules-Auguste-Armand-Marie, prince de Polignac, a fanatic reactionary. The makeup of the cabinet, which included several members of the most bigoted faction of “ultra-ultras,” seemed to indicate the king’s determination to polarize politics. That, in any case, was the immediate result. On the left the mood turned aggressively hostile; the republicans of Paris began to organize; an Orleanist faction emerged, looking to a constitutional monarchy headed by the king’s cousin, Louis-Philippe-Joseph, duc d’Orléans. The liberal banker Jacques Laffitte supplied funds for a new opposition daily, *Le National*, edited by a young and vigorous team whose most notable member was Adolphe Thiers. A confrontation of some sort seemed inevitable. Some of Polignac’s ministers urged a royal coup d’état at once, before the rejuvenated opposition could grow too strong. Instead, the king procrastinated for several months, offering no clear lead or firm policy. When the Chamber met at last in March 1830, its majority promptly voted an address to the throne denouncing the ministry. The king retaliated by dissolving the Chamber and ordering new

elections in July. Both Charles and Polignac hoped that pressure on the electors, plus foreign policy successes, might shape the outcome. Such a success was won at just the opportune moment: news came that Algiers had fallen to a French expeditionary force sent to punish the bey for assorted transgressions. But even this brilliant victory could not divert the fury of the king's critics. The opposition won 274 seats, the ministry 143. When Charles chose not to substitute a moderate for Polignac and accept the role of constitutional monarch, the risk was great that a royal coup d'état would leave the Charter of 1814 in tatters. King and ministers prepared a set of decrees that dissolved the newly elected Chamber, further restricted the already narrow suffrage, and stripped away the remaining liberty of the press. These July Ordinances, made public on the 26th, completed the polarization process and ensured that the confrontation would be violent.

10. The revolution of 1830

The July Revolution was a monument to the ineptitude of Charles X and his advisers. At the outset, few of the king's critics imagined it possible to overthrow the regime; they hoped merely to get rid of Polignac. As for the king, he naively ignored the possibility of serious trouble. No steps were taken to reinforce the army garrison in Paris; no contingency plans were prepared. Instead, Charles went off to the country to hunt, leaving the capital weakly defended. During the three days known to Frenchmen as *les Trois Glorieuses* (July 27–29), protest was rapidly transmuted into insurrection; barricades went up in the streets, manned by workers, students, and petty bourgeois citizens (some of them former members of the National Guard, which Charles, in pique, had disbanded in 1827). On July 29 some army units began to fraternize with the insurgents. The king, on July 30, consented at last to dismiss Polignac and to annul the July Ordinances; but the gesture came too late. Paris was in the hands of the rebels, and plans for a new regime were crystallizing rapidly.

As the insurrection developed, two rival factions had emerged. The republicans mainly workers and students gained control of the streets and took over the Hotel de Ville, where on July 29 they set up a municipal commission. They looked to the venerable General Lafayette, commander of the National Guard, as their symbolic leader. The constitutional monarchists had their headquarters at the newspaper *Le National*; their candidate for the throne was Louis-Philippe. He was at first reluctant to take the risk, fearing failure and renewed exile; Adolphe Thiers undertook the task of persuading him and succeeded. On July 31 Louis-Philippe made his way through a largely hostile crowd to the Hotel de Ville and

confronted the republicans. His cause was won by Lafayette, who found a constitutional monarchy safer than the risks of Jacobin rule; Lafayette appeared on the balcony with Louis-Philippe and, wrapped in a tricolour flag, embraced the duke as the crowd cheered. Two days later Charles X abdicated at last, though on condition that the throne passes to his grandson, “the miracle child.” But the parliament, meeting on August 7, declared the throne vacant and on August 9 proclaimed Louis-Philippe “king of the French by the grace of God and the will of the nation.”

The July Monarchy

The renovated regime (often called the July Monarchy or the bourgeois monarchy) rested on an altered political theory and a broadened social base. Divine right gave way to popular sovereignty; the social centre of gravity shifted from the landowning aristocracy to the wealthy bourgeoisie. The Charter of 1814 was retained but no longer as a royal gift to the nation; it was revised by the Chamber of Deputies and in its new form imposed on the king. Censorship was abolished; the Tricolour was restored as the national flag, and the National Guard was resuscitated. Roman Catholicism was declared to be simply the religion “of the majority of Frenchmen,” the voting age was lowered to 25, and the property qualification was reduced to include all who paid a direct tax of 200 (formerly 300) francs. The suffrage was thus doubled, from about 90,000 to almost 200,000. The new king seemed admirably suited to this new constitutional system. The “Citizen King” was reputed to be a liberal whose tastes and sympathies coincided with those of the upper bourgeoisie. He had spent the Revolutionary years in exile but was out of sympathy with the irreconcilable émigrés; and since his return, his house in Paris had been a gathering place for the opposition. Yet, in spite of appearances, Louis-Philippe was not prepared to accept the strictly symbolic role of a monarch who (in Thiers’s phrase) “reigns but does not govern.” His authority, he believed, rested on heredity and not merely on the will of the Chamber; his proper function was to participate actively in decision making and not merely to appoint ministers who would govern in his name. As time went by, he was increasingly inclined to choose ministers who shared his view of the royal power. The Orleanist system thus rested on a basic ambiguity about the real locus of authority.

In the Chamber two major factions emerged, known by the rather imprecise labels right-centre and left-centre. The former group, led by the historian Francois Guizot, shared the king’s political doctrines; it saw the revised Charter of 1814 as an adequate instrument of

government that needed no further change. The left-centre, whose ablest spokesman was the kingmaker Adolphe Thiers, saw 1830 as the beginning rather than the culmination of a process of change. It favoured restricting the king's active role and broadening the suffrage to include the middle strata of the bourgeoisie. These differences of viewpoint, combined with the king's tendency to intrigue, contributed to chronic political instability during the 1830s. The decade of the 1830s was marked also by repeated challenges to the regime by its enemies on the right and the left and by a series of attempts to assassinate the king. Both the ultras (who now came to be called Legitimists) and the republicans refused to forgive "the usurper" of 1830. In 1832 the duchesse de Berry, mother of "the miracle child," landed clandestinely in southern France in an effort to spark a general uprising; but the scheme collapsed, and most Legitimists withdrew into sullen opposition. More serious was the agitation in the cities. Economic distress led to the November 1831 insurrection in Lyon, in which armed workers seized control of the city for a week. In June 1832 a republican demonstration in Paris drew 100,000 participants. Again in 1834 there were serious disturbances in Lyon and Paris that had to be put down by the army. In 1836 it was the turn of the Bonapartist pretender to challenge the regime. Since Napoleon's death in 1821, a legend had taken shape around his name. No longer detested as a ruthless autocrat who had sacrificed a generation of young Frenchmen on the battlefield, he became transmuted into the Little Corporal who had risen to the heights by his own talents and had died a victim of British jealousy. The emperor's nephew Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte presented himself as the true heir; he crossed the frontier in 1836 and called on French troops in Strasbourg to join his cause. The venture failed ignominiously, as did also a second attempt on the Channel coast in 1840. Louis-Napoleon was condemned to prison for life but managed in 1846 to escape to England. Interspersed with these attempts at political risings were individual attacks on the king's person; the most elaborate of these plots was the one organized by a Corsican named Giuseppe Fieschi in 1835.

By 1840, however, the enemies of the regime had evidently become discouraged, and a period of remarkable stability followed. François Guizot emerged as the key figure in the ministry; he retained that role from 1840 to 1848. One of the first Protestants to attain high office in France, Guizot possessed many of the moral and intellectual qualities that marked the small but influential Protestant minority. Hardworking and intelligent, Guizot was devoted to the service of the king and to the defence of the status quo. He was convinced that the wealthy governing class was ideal natural elite to which any Frenchman might have

access through talent and effort. To those who complained at being excluded by the property qualification for voting and seeking office, Guizot's simple reply was "Enrichissez-vous!" ("Get rich!"). His government encouraged the process by granting railway and mining concessions to its bourgeois supporters and by contributing part of the development costs. High protective tariffs continued to shelter French entrepreneurs against foreign competition. The result was an economic boom during the 1840s, beginning the transformation of France from a largely rural society into an industrial one.

Guizot shared with Louis-Philippe a strong preference for a safe and sane foreign policy. The king, from the beginning of his reign, had cautiously avoided risks and confrontations and had especially sought friendly relations with Britain. In 1830, when the revolution in Paris inspired the Belgians to break away from Dutch rule, Louis-Philippe avoided the temptation of seeking to annex Belgium or of placing one of his sons on the Belgian throne. Again in 1840, when a crisis flared up in the Middle East and Thiers (then head of the government) took an aggressive stance that threatened to coalesce all of Europe against France, the king had found an excuse to replace his firebrand minister. Guizot continued this cautious line through the 1840s, with the single exception of an episode in Spain. A long contest involving rival suitors for the Spanish queen's hand finally tempted Guizot, in 1846, to try for a cheap diplomatic victory; it infuriated the British and helped to destroy the Anglo-French entente. One problem Guizot inherited from his predecessors was that of Algeria. Since 1830 the French had maintained an uneasy presence there, wavering between total withdrawal and expanded conquest. The decision to remain had been made in the mid-1830s; during the Guizot era, General Thomas-Robert Bugeaud used brutal methods to break Algerian resistance, pushed the native population back into the mountains, and began the process of colonizing the rich coastal plain.

11. The Revolution of 1848

The overthrow of the constitutional monarchy in February 1848 still seems, in retrospect, a puzzling event. The revolution has been called a result without a cause; more properly, it might be called a result out of proportion to its cause. Since 1840 the regime had settled into a kind of torpid stability; but it had provided the nation with peace abroad and relative prosperity at home. Louis-Philippe and his ministers had prided themselves on their moderation, their respect for the ideal of cautious balance embodied in the concept of juste-

milieu. France seemed to be arriving at last at a working compromise that blended traditional ways with the reforms of the Revolutionary era. There were, nevertheless, persistent signs of discontent. The republicans had never forgiven Louis-Philippe for “confiscating” their revolution in 1830. The urban workers, moved by their misery and by the powerful social myths engendered by the Revolution of 1789, remained unreconciled. For a decade or more they had been increasingly drawn toward socialism in its various utopian forms.

An unprecedented flowering of socialist thought marked the years 1830–48 in France: this was the generation of the Saint-Simonians (followers of utopian thinker Henri de Saint-Simon [1760–1825]) and of Charles Fourier, Auguste Blanqui, Louis Blanc, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, Etienne Cabet, and many others. Most of these system builders preached persuasion rather than violence, but they stimulated the hopes of the common man for an imminent transformation of society. Women also began to question existing social arrangements; the first French feminist groups grew out of the Saint-Simonian movement in 1831–32. Within the bourgeoisie as well, there was strong and vocal pressure for change in the form of a broadening of the political elite. Bills to extend the suffrage (and the right to hold office) to the middle bourgeoisie were repeatedly introduced in parliament but were stubbornly opposed by Guizot. Even the National Guard, that honour society of the lesser bourgeoisie, became infected with this mood of dissatisfaction. Other factors, too, contributed to this mood. In 1846 a crop failure quickly developed into a full-scale economic crisis: food became scarce and expensive; many businesses went bankrupt; unemployment rose. Within the governing elite there were signs of a moral crisis: scandals that implicated some high officials of the regime and growing dissension among the notables. Along with this went a serious alienation of many intellectuals. Novelists such as Victor Hugo, George Sand, and Eugene Sue glorified the common man; the caricaturist Honore Daumier exposed the foibles of the nation’s leaders; and historians such as Jules Michelet and Alphonse de Lamartine wrote with romantic passion about the heroic episodes of the Great Revolution.

Beginning in 1847, the leaders of the opposition set out to take advantage of this restless mood and to force the regime to grant liberal reforms. Since public political meetings were illegal, they undertook a series of political “banquets” to mobilize the forces of discontent. This campaign was to be climaxed by a mammoth banquet in Paris on February 22, 1848. But the government, fearing violence, ordered the affair cancelled. On the 22nd, crowds of protesting students and workers gathered in the streets and began to clash with the police. The king and Guizot expected no serious trouble: the weather was bad, and a large

army garrison was available in case of need. But the disorders continued to spread, and the loyalty of the National Guard began to seem dubious. Toward the end of two days of rioting, Louis-Philippe faced a painful choice: unleash the army (which would mean a bloodbath) or appease the demonstrators. Reluctantly, he chose the second course and announced that he would replace the hated Guizot as his chief minister. But the concession came too late. That evening, an army unit guarding Guizot's official residence clashed with a mob of demonstrators, some 40 of whom died in the fusillade. By the morning of February 24, the angry crowd was threatening the royal palace. Louis-Philippe, confronted by the prospect of civil war, hesitated and then retreated once more; he announced his abdication in favour of his nine-year-old grandson and fled to England.

The Second Republic, 1848–52

The succession to the throne was not to be decided so easily, however. The Chamber of Deputies, invaded by a crowd that demanded a republic, set up a provisional government whose members ranged from constitutional monarchists to one radical deputy, Alexandre-Auguste Ledru-Rollin. Led by the poet-deputy de Lamartine, the members of the government proceeded to the Hotel de Ville, where the radical republican leaders had begun to organize their own regime. After considerable palaver, the provisional government co-opted four of the radical leaders, including the socialist theoretician Blanc and a workingman who called himself Albert. Under heavy pressure from the crowd surrounding the Hotel de Ville, the government proclaimed the republic.

During the next few days, continuing pressure from the social reformers pushed the government further than its bourgeois members really wanted to go. The government issued a right-to-work declaration, obligating the state to provide jobs for all citizens. To meet the immediate need, an emergency-relief agency called the ateliers nationaux (national workshops) was established. A kind of economic and social council called the Luxembourg Commission was created to study programs of social reform; Blanc was named its president. The principle of universal manhood suffrage was proclaimed a return to the precedent of 1792 that increased the electorate at a stroke from 200,000 to 9,000,000. In matters of foreign policy, on the other hand, Foreign Minister Lamartine resisted radical demands. The radicals were eager for an ideological crusade on behalf of all peoples who were thirsting for freedom: Poles, Italians, Hungarians, and Germans had launched their own revolutions and needed help. Lamartine preferred to confine himself to lip-service support, since he was

aware that an armed crusade would quickly inspire an anti-French coalition of the major powers. By April 23, when Frenchmen went to the polls to elect their constituent assembly, the initial mood of brotherhood and goodwill had been largely dissipated. Paris had become a cauldron of political activism; dozens of clubs and scores of newspapers had sprung up after the revolution.

Severe tension developed between moderates and radicals both within and outside the government and led to a number of violent street demonstrations that were controlled with difficulty. The ateliers nationaux satisfied no one: for the radicals they were a mere caricature of social reform, whereas for the moderates they were a wasteful and dangerous experiment that attracted thousands of unemployed to Paris from every corner of France. Financial problems plagued the government, which sought a solution by imposing special 45-centime surtax on each franc of direct property taxes; this burden weighed most heavily on the peasantry and was bitterly resented in the countryside. The radicals, fearing that universal suffrage under these conditions might produce unpleasant results, vainly urged postponement of the elections until the new voters could be “educated” as to the virtues of a social republic. The election returns confirmed the radicals’ fears: the country voted massively for moderate or conservative candidates. Radicals or socialists won only about 80 of the 880 seats; the rest were bourgeois republicans (500) or constitutional monarchists (300). Lamartine led the popularity parade, being elected in 10 districts. When the assembly convened in May, the new majority showed little patience or caution; it was determined to cut costs and end risky experiments. In spite of Lamartine’s efforts to maintain broad republican unity and avert a sharp turn to the right, the assembly abolished the Luxembourg Commission and the ateliers nationaux and refused to substitute a more useful program of public works to provide for the unemployed.

The immediate consequence was a brief and bloody civil war in Paris the so-called June Days (June 23–26, 1848). Thousands of workers suddenly cut off the state payroll were joined by sympathizers—students, artisans, employed workers in a spontaneous protest movement. Barricades went up in many working-class sections. The assembly turned to General Louis-Eugene Cavaignac as a saviour. Cavaignac had made his mark in repressing Algerian rebel tribes and was entrusted with full powers to do the same in Paris. He gave the workers time to dig themselves in, and then brought up artillery against their barricades.

At last 1,500 rebels were killed; 12,000 were arrested, and many were subsequently exiled to Algeria. The radical movement was decapitated; the workers withdrew into silent and bitter opposition. Social conflict now gave way to political manoeuvring and constitution making. Cavaignac was retained in office as temporary executive, while the assembly turned to its central task. After six months of discussion, it produced a constitution that appeared to be the most democratic in Europe. The president of the republic would be chosen for a four-year term by universal male suffrage; a one-house legislative assembly would be elected for three years by the same suffrage. What remained unclear was the relationship between president and assembly and the way out of a potential deadlock between them.

This problem might not have been fatal if the right kind of president had been available in 1848. Instead, the voters chose Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte, who had returned from British exile in September after having successfully stood for the constituent assembly in a by-election. He had made a poor initial impression; indeed, some politicians, such as Thiers, backed him for the presidency because they thought him too stupid to rule and thus soon to be shunted aside for an Orleanist monarch. What he possessed, however, was a name a name that Frenchmen knew and that conveyed an aura of glory, power, and public order. In December Louis-Napoleon won by a landslide, polling 5.5 million votes against 2 million for all other candidates combined. In May 1849 the election of the legislative assembly produced an equal surprise. The two extremes the radical left and the monarchist right made impressive gains, whereas the moderate republicans, who had shaped the new system, were almost wiped out. The moderates emerged with only 80 seats, the radicals with 200, the monarchists with almost 500. But the monarchist majority lacked coherence, being split into legitimist and Orleanist factions that distrusted each other and differed on political principles.

During the next two years, President Bonaparte played his cards carefully, avoiding conflict with the monarchist assembly. He pleased Roman Catholics by restoring the pope to his temporal throne in Rome, from which he had been driven by Roman republicans. At home he accepted without protest a series of conservative measures adopted by the assembly: these laws deprived one-third of all Frenchmen of the right to vote, restricted the press and public assemblage, and gave the church a firm grip on public as well as private education. Yet there was some reason to doubt that Louis-Napoleon really welcomed this trend toward conservatism. His writings of the 1840s had been marked by a kind of technocratic outlook, in the tradition of Saint-Simonian socialism. His effort to please the assembly probably derived from his hope that the assembly would reciprocate: he wanted funds from the

treasury to pay his personal debts and run his household, along with a constitutional amendment that would allow him to run for a second term. By 1851 it was clear that the majority was not ready to give the president what he wanted. His alternatives were to step down in 1852, bereft of income and power, or to prepare a coup d'état. Some members of his entourage had long urged the latter course; Louis-Napoleon now concurred, with some reluctance.

On the early morning of December 2, 1851, some 70 leading politicians were arrested, and the outlines of a new constitution were proclaimed to the nation. It restored manhood suffrage, sharply reduced the assembly's powers, and extended the president's term to 10 years. Although the coup went off smoothly, it was followed by several days of agitation. Barricades went up in the streets, crowds clashed with troops and police in Paris and in the provinces, several hundred demonstrators were killed, and 27,000 were arrested. A widespread peasant revolt in south-eastern France showed that republican convictions were much stronger by 1851 than they had been in 1848. Once the resistance was broken, Louis-Napoleon proceeded with his announced plebiscite on the new constitution and was gratified to receive the approval of 92 percent of those who voted. But the authoritarian republic was only a stopgap. Officially inspired petitions for a restoration of the empire began to flow to Paris; the Senate responded to what it described as the nation's desires, and on December 2, 1852, Louis-Napoleon was proclaimed emperor of the French as Napoleon III. This time there was no open protest; and the voters, in a new plebiscite, accorded Napoleon a handsome majority of 97 percent.

The Second Empire, 1852–70

Posterity's image of Napoleon III and his regime has not been uniform. Some historians have seen him as a shallow opportunist whose only asset was a glorious name. Others have described him as a visionary reformer and patron of progress, a man who successfully attempted to reconcile liberty and authority, national prestige and European cooperation. The emperor's enigmatic character and the contradictions built into his regime make it possible to argue either case. From 1852 to 1859 the empire was authoritarian in tone. Civil liberties were narrowly circumscribed; vocal opponents of the regime remained in exile or were constrained to silence; parliament's wings were clipped; elections to the Corps Legislatif (the lower house of the parliament) were spaced at six-year intervals and were "managed" by Napoleon's prefects, who sponsored official candidates. An illusion of popular

control was created by the use of the plebiscite to ratify decisions already made. The emperor and his ministers (members of his personal entourage or former Orleanist politicians) rested their authority on the peasant masses, the business class, the church, and those local notables who were willing to cooperate. Little attempt was made to install a new power elite or to create an organized Bonaparte's party. Policy during the 1850s was consistently conservative; defence of the social order took precedence over reform. The most striking achievements of these authoritarian years were in economic growth and foreign policy. The economic crisis of the late 1840s had been prolonged by political instability after the revolution; the restoration of order set off a vigorous economic expansion. During the Second Empire industrial production doubled, foreign trade tripled, the use of steam power increased fivefold, and railway mileage grew six fold. The first great investment banks were founded (e.g., the Pereire brothers' Credit Mobilier) and the first department store (the Bon Marché in Paris). The surge of French enterprise transcended frontiers: French capital and engineers built bridges, railways, docks, and sewerage systems throughout much of Continental Europe.

In part, this burst of energy had its source in favourable world conditions: the availability of more rapid steam transportation, an influx of new gold from overseas, general recovery from the slump of 1846–51. But to some degree Napoleon's government could claim credit, too not so much by direct intervention in economic life as by creating a favourable climate for private enterprise. Many Frenchmen took advantage of the opportunities offered; they accumulated sizable fortunes and founded enterprises that still exist today. Among these entrepreneurs, however, there was a disproportionate number of "outsiders" notably men of Protestant or Jewish origin or former disciples of Henri de Saint-Simon. Alongside these dynamic newcomers, the older business and banking leaders continued to operate on more cautious traditional lines. From the Second Empire onward, the French economy would combine these two contrasting sectors: a dynamic modernized element superimposed upon a largely static traditional kind of enterprise.

Napoleon's foreign policy at the outset was cautious; "the empire means peace," he assured his countrymen and the nervous powers of Europe. Yet, for a ruler who bore the name Napoleon, the prudent and colourless policy of a Louis-Philippe seemed hardly appropriate. Besides, the emperor was eager to achieve recognition from the other European monarchs, who regarded him as an upstart. It was for these reasons rather than because of urgent national interest that he became involved in the Crimean War in 1854. Britain and Russia were engaged in a contest for influence in the crumbling Turkish Empire. A dispute

over the holy places in Palestine gave Napoleon an excuse to offer the British his support and thus to restore the Franco-British entente. Although the Crimean campaign was on the whole a fiasco for all the participating armies, the French forces came off less ingloriously than the others and could with some justice pose as victors. Napoleon served as host for the Paris peace conference that ended the war in 1856. Midway through the conference, the birth of a male heir to the emperor and his empress, Eugenie, seemed to assure the permanence of the dynasty.

The empire thus appeared to have compiled a record of unbroken successes and to be beyond challenge by its domestic critics. Perhaps it was this stability and self-confidence that led Napoleon, beginning in 1859, to turn in the direction of liberalizing the empire. The immediate impulse for this dramatic reversal was the attempted assassination of the emperor in January 1858 by an Italian patriot, Felice Orsini, who sought thus to draw public attention to the frustrated hopes of Italian nationalists. Napoleon, shaken by the episode and by the reminder that in his youth he, too, had fought for Italian independence, met secretly in July 1858 with the conte di Cavour, premier of Piedmont; the two men laid plans designed to evict Austria from northern Italy and to convert Italy into a confederation of states headed by the pope. In return, France was promised Nice and Savoy (Savoie). The new allies provoked the Austrians into a declaration of war in April 1859, and Napoleon led his armies across the Alps. French victories at Magenta and Solferino were followed by a somewhat premature settlement in which the Austrians turned over the province of Lombardy to the Piedmontese. The campaign had aroused the passions of Italian nationalists up and down the peninsula; revolutions broke out in some of the smaller Italian states, and in 1860 the colourful guerrilla leader Giuseppe Garibaldi set forth from Piedmont to conquer Sicily and Naples.

These repercussions of Napoleon's new foreign policy stirred up bitter controversy in France. Conservatives were outraged and feared that the pope would be deposed as temporal ruler of Rome by the Italian nationalists. On the other hand, the long-silent liberal and radical opposition voiced reluctant approval. It is likely that Napoleon, whose bent toward Saint-Simonian reform ideas was strong, had never been very comfortable in his alliance with the conservatives and welcomed a chance to indulge his deeper instincts. At any rate, late in 1859 he announced the first hesitant steps toward a liberal empire. Political exiles were amnestied, press controls were relaxed, and the Corps Legislatif was given slightly increased authority. An even more dramatic turn toward economic liberalism soon followed; in January 1860 Napoleon negotiated a low-tariff treaty with Britain, ending the long tradition of

protectionism that had insulated French producers. With this move, however, the emperor alienated the businessmen, who until now had been his strong supporters.

Some of the emperor's advisers had sharply opposed the turn toward liberalism. Events during the next decade seemed to confirm their warnings; for the empire now ran into increasingly stormy weather. The political opposition, stifled since 1851, showed little gratitude to its benefactor and took every opportunity to harass the government. In the 1863 elections, opposition candidates polled two million votes, and 35 of them were elected to the Corps Legislatif including such effective spokesmen as the Orleanist Thiers and the republican Jules Favre. A downward turn in the economy played into the hands of the opposition. Foreign policy errors added to the regime's embarrassment: Napoleon's ill-conceived intervention in Mexico, where he hoped to establish a client empire under Maximilian of Austria, proved costly and futile and seemed to threaten a conflict with the United States. And from the mid-1860s a new threat began to loom across the Rhine: the burgeoning power of Prussia, under the guidance of Otto von Bismarck.

Despite these evil portents, Napoleon clung doggedly to his liberalization venture; additional reforms were granted throughout the decade. He expressed sympathy with the workers, granted them a kind of extralegal right to form trade unions and to strike, and helped them organize mutual-aid societies. His minister of education, Victor Duruy, carried out an enlightened program of broadened public education, including the establishment of the first secondary education for girls. In 1867 the emperor restored quite considerable freedom of the press and of public assembly and further broadened the powers of the Corps Legislatif. Yet the response of the voters to these concessions caused some dismay; in the elections of 1869 the opposition vote rose to 3.3 million, and the number of seats held by oppositionists more than doubled.

The emperor now faced a momentous choice: a still further dose of liberalism or a brusque return to the authoritarian empire. He chose the former alternative; in January 1870 he asked the leader of the liberal opposition, Emile Olivier, to form a government. Olivier supervised the drafting of a new constitution, which, though hybrid in nature, converted the empire into a quasi-parliamentary regime. The ministers were declared to be "responsible," and their powers (as well as those of the Corps Legislatif) were increased. At the same time, the emperor retained most of his existing prerogatives, so that the real locus of power in case of a conflict was unclear. Nevertheless, the voters, when consulted by referendum (May 8,

1870), gave the new system a massive vote of confidence: 7 million in favour and only 1.5 million against. Outwardly, at least, it appeared that the emperor had found a widely accepted solution. But war and defeat only four months later were to prevent a fair test of the liberal empire in its final form.

The Franco-German War

Napoleon, meanwhile, had become uncomfortably involved in a diplomatic poker game with Bismarck. Prussian victories over Denmark (1864) and Austria (1866) indicated a serious shift in the European balance of power. Napoleon, aware that he faced a severe challenge, set out to strengthen his armed forces; he proposed a tighter conscription law that would increase the size of the standing army but had to retreat in the face of public and parliamentary hostility. The crisis that finally erupted in July 1870 over the succession to the Spanish throne was clumsily handled by French officials. The French successfully blocked the accession of a Hohenzollern prince in Spain, and then demanded further guarantees for the future; they thus provided Bismarck with an easy opportunity to arouse German opinion and to goad France into declaring war on July 19. Few French or foreign observers anticipated the military disaster that followed. The French armies, sunk in routine and slow to mobilize, were not yet ready to fight when the Prussian forces under Helmuth von Moltke crossed into France. One French army, under Achille-François Bazaine, was bottled up in Metz; another, under Patrice de Mac-Mahon, was cornered at Sedan. There, on September 1, the Prussians won a clear-cut victory; Napoleon himself was taken prisoner. The regime could not survive such a humiliation. When the news reached Paris on September 4, crowds filled the streets and converged on the Corps Legislatif, demanding the proclamation of a republic. The imperial officials put up no serious resistance; the revolution of 4th September was the most bloodless in French history.

A provisional government of national defence was set up in 1870 and took as its first task the continuation of the war against the invaders. Composed of the deputies representing Paris and formally headed by General Louis-Jules Trochu, the new government's most forceful member was Leon Gambetta, hero of the radical republicans. Gambetta, a young Parisian lawyer of provincial origin, had been elected to the Corps Legislatif in 1869 and had already made his mark through his energy and eloquence. As minister of the interior and, some weeks later, minister of war as well, he threw himself into the task of improvising military resistance. His task was complicated by the advance of the Prussian forces, which,

by 23rd September , surrounded and besieged Paris. Gambetta shortly left the city by balloon to join several members of the government at Tours. During the next four months, Gambetta's makeshift armies fought a series of indecisive battles with the Prussians in the Loire valley and eastern France. But his attempt to send a force northward to relieve Paris from siege was frustrated by Moltke and by the poor quality of the scratch French forces. Adolphe Thiers had been sent meanwhile to tour the capitals of Europe in search of support from the powers; but he returned empty-handed. By January 1871 it was clear that further armed resistance would be futile. Over Gambetta's angry protests, an armistice was signed with the Prussians on January 28, 1871.

One provision of the armistice called for the prompt election of a National Assembly with authority to negotiate a definitive treaty of peace. That election, held on 8th February, produced an assembly dominated by monarchists more than 400 of them, compared with only 200 republicans and a few Bonapartists. The decisive issue for the voters, however, had not been the nature of the future regime but simply war or peace. Most of the monarchists had campaigned for peace; the republicans had insisted on a last-ditch fight. Most Frenchmen opted for peace, though Paris and certain provinces, such as Alsace, voted heavily for republicans. When the National Assembly convened in Bordeaux on February 13, it chose the aging Orleanist Adolphe Thiers as "chief of the executive power of the French republic." Thiers had been the most outspoken critic of Napoleon III's foreign policy and had repeatedly warned the country of the Prussian danger. He set out at once to negotiate a settlement with Bismarck; on March 1 the Treaty of Frankfurt was ratified by a large majority of the assembly. The terms were severe: France was charged a war indemnity of five billion francs plus the cost of maintaining a German occupation army in eastern France until the indemnity was paid. Alsace and half of Lorraine were annexed to the new German Empire. The German army was authorized to stage a victory march through the Arc de Triomphe in Paris. After the assembly ratified the treaty, the deputies of the lost provinces (Leon Gambetta, too) resigned their seats in protest.

The Commune of Paris

A few days later, the assembly transferred the seat of government from Bordeaux to Versailles. Immediately after, it was confronted by a major civil war the rebellion of the Commune of Paris. This event, complex in itself, has been made even more difficult to understand by the mythology that later grew up around it. Karl Marx, who promptly hailed

the Commune as the first great uprising of the proletariat against its bourgeois oppressors, was partly responsible for inspiring imaginative but misleading misrepresentations. There was undoubtedly a class-struggle element in the episode, but this was not the central thread. Parisians, tense and irritable after the long strain of the siege, were outraged by the action of rural France in electing a monarchist assembly committed to what they regarded as a dishonourable peace. They were further angered by the assembly's subsequent acts, notably those that ended the wartime moratorium on debts and rents, cut off further wage payments to the National Guard (which had been resuscitated in Paris after the empire fell), and transferred the capital to Versailles rather than to Paris. Thiers, aware that Paris was in an ugly mood, thought it prudent to disarm the National Guard, which heavily outnumbered the regular army units at the government's disposition.

Before dawn on March 18 he sent troops to confiscate the National Guard cannon on the butte of Montmartre. A crowd gathered; a bloody encounter ensued; two generals were caught and lynched by the mob. As violence spread through the city, Thiers hastily withdrew all troops and government offices from Paris and went to Versailles to plan his strategy. He appealed successfully to Bismarck to release French prisoners of war in order to form a siege army that could eventually force Paris to capitulate. During the next two months, this governmental force was slowly assembled. Within Paris, meanwhile, initial chaos gradually gave way to an improvised experiment in municipal self-government. On March 26, Parisians elected a council that promptly adopted the traditional label Commune of Paris. Its membership ranged from radical republicans of the Jacobin and Blanquist variety to socialists of several different sorts notably disciples of Proudhon, who favoured a decentralized federation of self-governing communes throughout France. These internal divisions prevented any vigorous or coherent experiments in social reform and also interfered with the Commune's efforts to organize an effective armed force. Communes on the Paris model were set up briefly in several other cities (Lyon, Marseille, and Toulouse) but were quickly suppressed. By May 21 Thiers's forces were ready to strike. In the course of "Bloody Week" (May 21–28), the Communards resisted, street by street, but were pushed back steadily to the heart of Paris. In their desperation, they executed a number of hostages (including the archbishop of Paris) and in the last days set fire to many public buildings, including the Tuileries Palace and the Hotel de Ville. A final stand was made in Pere-Lachaise Cemetery, where the last resisters were shot down against the Federalists' Wall (Mur des Federes)—ever since, a place of pilgrimage for the French left. Thiers's government took a terrible

vengeance. Twenty thousand Communards were killed in the fighting or executed on the spot; thousands of survivors were deported to the penal islands, while others escaped into exile.

The formative years (1871–1905)

The repression of the Commune of Paris left its mark on the emerging republic. The various socialist factions and the newly organized labour movement were left leaderless; the resultant vacuum eventually opened the way to Marxist activists in the 1880s. Much of the working class became more deeply alienated than before, but, among moderate and conservative elements, Thiers gained added stature as the preserver of law and order against “the reds.” His ruthless action probably hastened the conversion of many rural and small-town Frenchmen to the idea of a republic, because the regime had proved its toughness in handling subversion. A large number of by-elections to the assembly in July 1871 brought startling gains to the republicans: they won 99 of 114 vacancies. The voters were clearly willing to accept a republic so long as it was run by such a man as Thiers.

The monarchists, however, still held a comfortable majority in the assembly and continued to hope and plan for a restoration. Legitimists and Orleanists remained at odds, but a compromise seemed possible. The Bourbon pretender, the Comte de Chambord (“the miracle child” of 1820), was old and childless; the Orleanist pretender, Philippe d’Orleans, Comte de Paris, was young and prolific. The natural solution was to restore Chambord, with the Comte de Paris as his successor. Chambord, however, refused to accept the throne except on his own terms, which implied a return to the principle of absolute royal authority, unchecked by constitutional limitations. The Orleanists and even some Legitimists found this too much to swallow. For the time being, they, too, settled for Thiers’s presidential rule. During the next two years, Thiers’s position was beyond challenge, and he gave the republic vigorous and efficient leadership. He reorganized the army and worked to restore national morale; he successfully floated two bond issues that permitted the war indemnity to be paid off in 1873, thus ending the German occupation ahead of schedule. Late in 1872, however, Thiers abjured his long-held Orleanist faith and publicly announced his conversion to republicanism. The monarchists, outraged and seeing their majority in the assembly dwindling because of by-elections, found an excuse to force Thiers’s resignation as provisional president (May 1873) and hastily substituted the commander of the army, Marshal Patrice de Mac-Mahon. Behind the scenes, monarchist politicians again set out to

arrange an agreement between the two pretenders. Their hopes were once more sabotaged by Chambord, who again announced that he would return only on his own terms and under the fleur-de-lis flag of the old regime. The disheartened monarchists fell back on waiting for the Bourbon line to die out. But when Chambord passed from the scene in 1883, it was too late for a restoration.

The constitution of the Third Republic

Meanwhile, the task of writing a constitution for the republic could no longer be postponed. The assembly began its deliberations in 1873; in 1875 it adopted a series of fundamental laws, which, taken collectively, came to be known as the constitution of the Third Republic. A patchwork compromise, it established a two-house legislature (with an indirectly elected Senate as a conservative check on the Chamber of Deputies); a Council of Ministers (cabinet), responsible to the Chamber; and a president, elected for seven years by the two houses, with powers resembling those of a constitutional monarch. The label republic was approved by a single-vote margin. Monarchists believed that this system could be easily converted to their purposes once the right monarch was available. The constitution left untouched many aspects of the French governmental structure, notably the centralized administrative system inherited from Napoleon I, the hierarchy of courts and judges, and the Concordat of 1801, governing church-state relations.

At the end of 1875 the National Assembly at last dissolved itself, and the provisional phase of the Third Republic came to an end. The new Senate, which heavily overrepresented rural France was safely monarchist from the outset; and the term of President Mac-Mahon, a loyal monarchist, ran until 1880. But when the first Chamber of Deputies was elected in 1876, the republicans won more than two-thirds of the seats. A period of severe friction between Mac-Mahon and the Chamber followed, and a crisis in May 1877 produced a total deadlock. Mac-Mahon dissolved the Chamber and called on the voters' support, but again they opted for the republic, by a narrower but clear-cut margin. Leon Gambetta, who had returned to political life and had led the republicans during the campaign, called on Mac-Mahon to "give in or get out." The president gave in, naming a premier acceptable to the republican majority. Two years later partial elections gave the republicans control of the Senate, and Mac-Mahon shortly found an excuse to resign. He was replaced by a colourless republican, Jules Grevy, who was believed to favour a reduced role for the president.

With the republican regime apparently safe from outside attack, rival factions developed among the republicans. During the 1880s the labels Radical and Opportunist began to be attached to the two wings of the republican movement. On the left, the Radicals saw themselves as heirs to the Jacobin tradition: they stood for a strong centralized regime, intransigent anticlericalism, an assertive nationalism in foreign policy, a revision of the constitution to prune out its monarchical aspects, and such social reforms as labour laws and a graduated income tax; their most colourful spokesman was Georges Clemenceau, a ferocious debater and due list who specialized in overthrowing cabinets. The Opportunists (so named by a satiric journalist because of their penchant for compromises and postponements) occupied the centre seats in the Chamber: their stance was more cautious and their techniques gradualist; they were content to work within the system, and they aimed to restrict governmental interference in the affairs of private citizens. Only on the issue of the church's role in politics and education were the two factions in general agreement.

Between 1879 and 1899 the Opportunists, with only brief interruptions, controlled the machinery of government. Gambetta, their most dynamic leader, had begun his career as an outspoken Radical, but in time his political instincts had prevailed. The other Opportunist leaders men such as President Grevy and Jules Ferry disliked Gambetta's flamboyance, however, and feared his alleged dictatorial ambitions; they kept him out of the premiership save for a brief interlude in 1881–82, shortly before his death. Ferry served as premier or in other key cabinet posts during most of the period from 1880 to 1885 and left his mark on two institutions: the public school system and the colonial empire. His school laws made primary education free, compulsory, and secular, with religious teaching in the public schools replaced by "civic education"; a strong anticlerical bias thenceforth marked French public education. Ferry's support of various colonial expeditions sometimes behind the back of the Chamber gave France protectorates over Tunisia and in Vietnam (Annam and Tonkin), a large new colony in the Congo basin, and an initial foothold in Madagascar. This expansionist policy, unpopular at the time, led later generations to call Ferry the founder of the French empire.

In the 1885 elections the monarchists, Bonapartists, and Radicals all made significant gains, partly because of boredom with the Opportunists, Catholic resentment over the school laws, and revived agitation by socialist organizers. The Opportunists, lacking a clear majority in the Chamber, sought Radical support to form a cabinet; the Radicals insisted on the inclusion of General Georges Boulanger as minister of war. Within a few weeks Boulanger

was the most talked-about man in France. He restored the tradition of military parades and rode at their head; he instituted popular reforms in the army; and he spoke out in chauvinistic fashion against the Germans, thus reviving the memory of 1871 and the lost provinces. The unnerved Opportunist leadership dropped him from the cabinet and sent him in 1887 to an obscure provincial command. But Boulanger's backers urged him to plunge into politics and began to enter his name in by-elections. Privately, monarchist and Bonapartist agents also made contact with Boulanger, promising financial support and hoping to use him for their cause.

By 1889 the Boulanger movement had become a major threat to the regime. The government had placed him on the retired list, but this merely freed him to run openly for office on a vague program of constitutional revision. He triumphed in a series of by-elections, but his goal was the parliamentary election of 1889, which he hoped to turn into a kind of national plebiscite. Just prior to the election, however, believing that he was about to be arrested for subversive activities, Boulanger took flight to Brussels. His movement gradually disintegrated; word leaked out of his dealings with the monarchists, and his supporters fell away. The Opportunists' hold on the republic was strengthened by the discomfiture of those on both right and left who had been taken in by this adventurer.

A new crisis soon arose for the regime: the Panama Scandal. Ferdinand, vicomte de Lesseps, the noted French engineer who had built the Suez Canal, had organized a joint-stock company to cut a canal across the Isthmus of Panama. The venture proved difficult and costly; in 1889 the company collapsed, and large numbers of shareholders were stripped of their savings. Demands for a parliamentary investigation proved ineffective until 1892, when a muckraking journalist named Edouard Drumont obtained evidence that agents of the company had bribed a large number of politicians and journalists in a desperate effort to get funds to keep the company afloat. The directors of the company and several deputies and senators were brought to trial in 1893, but the outcome was on the whole a whitewash. The regime survived the scandal, but the effects were more serious than first appeared to be the case. Cynicism about the honesty of the republic's political leadership bolstered the rising socialist movement; in 1893 almost 50 socialists won seats in the Chamber. Clemenceau, unjustly accused of involvement in the scandal, was defeated; and many prominent Opportunists, tainted by the affair, withdrew and were replaced by such younger men as Raymond Poincare and Louis Barthou, who thenceforth preferred to call themselves Progressists or Moderates.

The dramatic socialist gains in 1893 resulted only partly from the Panama Scandal. For more than a decade socialism had been gaining strength among the increasingly class-conscious urban workers. The movement was weakened, however, by multiple splits into antagonistic factions. The Marxist party created by Jules Guesde in 1880 broke up two years later into Guesdists and followers of Paul Brousse the latter group popularly called Possibilists because of their gradualist temper. In 1890 a third faction broke away, headed by Jean Allemane and limited to simon-pure proletarian members. Alongside these Marxist sects there were the Blanquistes (disciples of Auguste Blanqui [1805–81]), the anarchists (whose terrorist campaign in the early 1890s earned them wide notoriety), and a considerable scattering of independent socialists (mainly intellectuals, notably Jean Jaures). By 1900 the parties had been reduced to the two led by Guesde and Jaures, which merged in 1905 to form the French Section of the Workers' International (Section Française de l'Internationale Ouvriere; SFIO), known as the Socialist Party.

The trade union movement, however, refused to join forces with the socialists. Trade unions were finally legalized in 1884 and joined together to form a national General Labour Confederation (Confederation Generale du Travail; CGT) in 1895. CGT leaders rejected political action in favour of direct action—sabotage, boycotts, strikes, and especially the general strike, which they saw as the ultimate weapon that, would transform France into a workers' state. This doctrine, known as revolutionary syndicalism, made the French trade union movement appear to be one of the most radical in Europe. In practice, however, the trade union rank and file was less revolutionary than its leadership.

The 1890s also saw the Third Republic's greatest political and moral crisis the Dreyfus Affair. In 1894 Captain Alfred Dreyfus, a career army officer of Jewish origin, was charged with selling military secrets to the Germans. He was tried and convicted by a court-martial and sentenced to life imprisonment on Devil's Island off the South American coast. Efforts by the Dreyfus family to reopen the case were frustrated by the general belief that justice had been done. But secrets continued to leak to the German embassy in Paris, and a second officer, Major Marie-Charles-Ferdinand Esterhazy, became suspect. The chief of army counterintelligence, Colonel Georges Picquart, eventually concluded that Esterhazy and not Dreyfus had been guilty of the original offense, but his superior officers refused to reopen the case. Rumours and scraps of evidence soon began to appear in the press; and a few politicians, notably Clemenceau, took up Dreyfus's cause. But the army high command refused to discuss the affair, although army officers leaked documents to the press in an effort

to discredit the critics. Each leak aroused new controversy, and by 1898 the case had become a violently divisive issue. Intellectuals of the left led the fight for Dreyfus, while right-wing politicians and many Roman Catholic periodicals defended the honour of the army. The socialists were split: Jaures insisted that no socialist could remain aloof on such a moral issue, while Guesde called the conflict a bourgeois squabble. In 1898 some of the army's most persuasive documents against Dreyfus were discovered to be forgeries. Esterhazy promptly fled to England. In a second court-martial, late in 1899, Dreyfus was again found guilty but with extenuating circumstances; he received a presidential pardon and was later (1906) vindicated by a civilian court.

For a generation the affair left deep scars on French political and intellectual life. The Moderates, who had tried to avoid involvement in the affair and in the end had split into two warring factions, lost control to the Radicals. A coalition cabinet headed by René Waldeck-Rousseau, a pro-Dreyfus Moderate, took office in June 1899; the Radicals dominated the coalition, and even the socialists supported it. From then until the end of the Third Republic, the Radical Party (thenceforth called Radical-Socialist) remained the fulcrum of French political life. Both the army and the church were seriously hurt by their role in the affair; republicans of the left were more convinced than ever that both institutions were anti-republican and hostile to the rights of man enunciated during the Revolution. The new left majority retaliated by bringing the army under more rigorous civilian control and by embarking on a new wave of anticlerical legislation. Most religious orders were dissolved and exiled, and in 1905 a new law separated church and state, thus liquidating the Concordat of 1801.

Foreign policy

Meanwhile, some important successes were being scored in the field of foreign policy. For two decades after 1871 France had remained diplomatically isolated in Europe. Bismarck, to ward off potential French ideas of revenge, had shrewdly encouraged the republic's governments to embark on colonial conquest overseas and had negotiated alliances with all those European powers the French might otherwise have courted. He thus kept Austria-Hungary, Russia, and Italy in tow, while Britain chose to remain aloof in "splendid isolation." Upon Bismarck's fall in 1890, the German emperor William II (Kaiser Wilhelm) terminated the secret treaty between Germany and Russia. The Russians began to cast about for friends and looked with some distaste toward Paris. French policy makers encouraged

French bankers to make loans to the Russian government and opened negotiations for an entente. In 1891 a loose agreement provided for mutual consultation in crisis; in 1894 this was broadened into a military alliance by whose terms each partner promised to aid the other in case of attack by Germany or Germany's allies.

For a decade the Franco-Russian alliance had little practical effect (though French loans did continue to flow to Russia). French diplomats turned to winning the Italians away from the Triple Alliance, and a Franco-Italian secret agreement in 1902 substantially weakened the commitment Italy had made to Germany and Austria-Hungary in 1882. Of more central importance throughout the 1890s was recurrent tension between France and Britain, who had been at odds in various parts of the world and whose colonial competition at times seemed to threaten war. Britain's South African (Boer) War added further ill feeling, and some British leaders began to urge an end to "splendid isolation" in favour of an entente with a Continental power most probably Germany, which was seen as part of an Anglo-Saxon racial bloc. But the German government responded coolly to overtures in this direction, thus feeding the fears of British leaders who saw Germany as a threat to British interests. The British turned to France instead and found a willing partner in the foreign minister Theophile Delcasse. A visit to Paris by King Edward VII in 1903 helped pave the way to the Anglo-French Entente Cordiale of 1904, which resolved all outstanding colonial conflicts between the two powers but stopped short of military alliance. The new entente was consolidated a year later, when French moves to take over Morocco as a protectorate were resented by the Germans, who thought they saw an opportunity to break up the new entente. Kaiser Wilhelm offered Germany's support to the sultan of Morocco; this action irritated the British and led them to promise France strong support. In the conference of powers that followed at Algeiras, Spain, in 1906, France had to be content with special privileges rather than a protectorate in Morocco; but the Entente Cordiale was reinforced, and it was Germany that thenceforth began to complain of isolation.

From 1899 to 1905 a fairly coherent coalition of left-wing and centre parties (the so-called Bloc Republicain) provided France with stable government. The cabinets headed by Waldeck-Rousseau in 1899-1902 and Emile Combes in 1902-05 managed to liquidate the Dreyfus Affair and to carry through the anticlerical reforms that culminated in the separation of church and state. The Entente Cordiale and the Russian alliance ensured France a more influential voice in European affairs. France possessed a colonial empire second only to Britain's in size. A new period of economic growth set in after the mid-1890s. Not

surprisingly, later generations were to look back on the pre-1914 decade as *la belle époque* (“the beautiful age”). Still, some sources of sharp dissatisfaction and conflict remained. Many Roman Catholics were outraged by the triumph of the anticlericals, and they responded to the Vatican’s urging to sabotage the new system. They resisted (sometimes violently) the transfer of church property to state ownership and refused to establish lay associations to govern the church. By 1907, however, resistance was clearly futile, and they began to accept the separation law as an accomplished fact. A difficult period followed for the church. The recruitment of priests fell off sharply, and many Catholic schools were closed for lack of funds. In the long run, however, the separation law reduced the intensity of conflict between Catholics and anticlericals. There was less reason for republicans to suspect and denounce a disestablished church.

A vocal minority on the right remained unreconciled to the radical republic and rallied round the banner of the *Action Française* (“French Action”), headed by Charles Maurras. This organization had developed at the height of the Dreyfus Affair as a focal point for intellectuals who opposed a new trial for Dreyfus. Maurras, an aspiring young writer from the south, quickly emerged as its theorist and leader. In his view, France had gone astray in 1789 and had since been dominated by the “four alien nations” Jews, Freemasons, Protestants, and *meteques* (“aliens”). He preached a return to stable institutions and an organic society, in which the monarchy and the church would be essential pillars. Maurras appealed to many traditionalists, professional men, churchmen, and army officers. *Action Française* readily resorted to both verbal and physical violence, and its organized bands, the *Camelots du Roi*, anticipated the tactics of later fascist movements. By 1914 Maurras’s movement, though still relatively small, was the most coherent and influential enemy of the republic. Equally serious was the alienation of much of the working class. The main labour-union federation, CGT, remained officially committed to revolutionary syndicalism; it rejected political action as a useless diversion of the proletariat’s energies and exalted the idea of the general strike as the proper weapon to destroy bourgeois society. Although the CGT attracted only about 10 percent of French workers (most workers stubbornly refused to join any union), it was aggressive enough to cause sporadic turmoil during 1906–10. Several major strikes were broken by forcible repression; the government either called out troops or mobilized the strikers (who were also reservists) into the army. Proposals for labour-reform legislation drew little support in a parliament dominated by representatives of the bourgeoisie and the peasantry.

Despite the CGT, most workers by now were voting for the new unified Socialist Party. But the SFIO refused to permit its deputies to participate in or support bourgeois cabinets (a policy dictated to the French party in 1904 by the Second International, dominated by the German socialists) and thus condemned itself to an oppositionist stance in parliament. This destroyed the left-wing coalition that had given France stable cabinets from 1899 to 1905. Socialist strength continued to rise, and by 1914 the party was second only to the Radicals in the Chamber of Deputies. Although its doctrine remained rigorously Marxist, in deference to the instructions of the International, the party's conduct was much more flexible. Jaures, whose "humanitarian" socialism was in large part derived from an older French heritage of left-wing thought, guided the Socialists in parliament toward informal cooperation with the bourgeois left in an effort to achieve domestic social reforms and an internationalist, antimilitarist foreign policy. Jaures's central concern during the pre-1914 decade was to avert the general war that he saw looming ahead in Europe.

The Socialist withdrawal from the Bloc Republican in 1905 forced the Radicals to look to the other centre parties as coalition partners. Until 1914 and, indeed, most of the time until 1940 France was governed by heterogeneous centre coalitions in which the Radicals most often held the key posts. In 1906 the Radical Georges Clemenceau began a three-year premiership. He proposed a long list of social reforms, including the eight-hour day and an income tax, but parliament blocked virtually all of them. More surprising was Clemenceau's ruthless suppression of strikes and his vigorous, nationalistic foreign policy. In 1907 his government sponsored a rapprochement between Britain and Russia that completed the triangle of understandings thenceforth called the Triple Entente. But Clemenceau refused to risk war through all-out support of his Russian ally during the Bosnian crisis of 1908. When his cabinet fell in 1909, Clemenceau had effectively alienated his own Radical Party and seemed unlikely ever to return to high office.

Clemenceau's successors, Aristide Briand and Joseph Caillaux, undertook a policy of détente in European affairs. Briand, like Clemenceau, belied his left-wing origins by forcibly repressing a major strike in 1910; in foreign affairs, however, he preferred a policy of coexistence with Germany. Caillaux pushed this latter experiment even further. In 1911 he had to deal with a new crisis in Morocco, where the French were again driving toward a protectorate against German objections. When the Germans sent a gunboat to Morocco, Caillaux made an effort at appeasement, handing over to Germany a slice of the Congo

region as compensation. French patriots were outraged; the Caillaux cabinet was overthrown and replaced in January 1912 by one headed by Raymond Poincare.

There were signs of a changing intellectual mood in the country, especially among young Frenchmen. A nationalist revival affected many Frenchmen who for a decade had grown increasingly anxious about what they regarded as the puzzling and threatening attitude of Germany's post-Bismarckian leadership; they looked once more to the army as the nation's bulwark, and its prestige was on the rise. These nationalist tendencies found their embodiment in Poincare, whose intransigent patriotism and determination to stand up to Germany were beyond doubt. As premier in 1912–13 Poincare devoted himself to strengthening the armed forces and to reinvigorating France's alliance system. An agreement with the British provided for a new sharing of naval responsibilities: the French concentrating in the Mediterranean, the British in the North Sea. Poincare made a state visit to Russia to revive the sagging Franco-Russian alliance.

In January 1913 he was elected to the presidency of the republic, where, he believed, he could ensure continuity of policy during his seven-year term. In 1913 the size of the standing army was increased by lengthening the conscription period from two to three years. Poincare found bitter opposition on the left. The socialists were strongly antimilitarist and hoped for an eventual reconciliation with Germany via collaboration between the two socialist parties. They clung to the belief that the working class everywhere could block war by resorting to a general strike. A large segment of the Radical Party followed the Caillaux line, favouring Franco-German collaboration through such ventures as banking consortia for joint investment abroad. Much of rural France also lacked enthusiasm for the new nationalistic mood. The combined strength of this opposition was revealed in the parliamentary elections of 1914, when the parties of the left won a narrow victory.

12. Napoleon III, Emperor of the French (1852-1870)

Napoleon III was born in Paris on 20 April 1808. Named Charles Louis Napoleon, he was the third son of Louis Bonaparte (the third brother of Napoleon) and of Hortense de Beauharnais (daughter of Empress Josephine by her first marriage). His parents' arranged marriage was not very happy, and his father Louis, king of Holland from 1806 to 1810, lived mostly separately from his wife and their sons Napoleon-Charles (born in 1802, died in 1807) Napoleon-Louis (born in 1804, died in 1831) and Charles Louis Napoleon (who was known simply as Louis-Napoleon). A year later, on 21 and 22 November 1852, the Prince-President

asked the French to accept the return of the Imperial regime; it would be the Second French Empire. The referendum was favourable, and thus Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte became Emperor Napoleon III on 2 December 1852. Why then, did he call himself Napoleon “III”, since only one other Napoleon – his uncle – had really reigned over France? Well, after his defeat at Waterloo on 18 June 1815, Napoleon I abdicated (he renounced the throne) declaring that he handed it on to his young son who therefore became “Napoleon II”. But Napoleon II only reigned officially for a few days, after which the imperial regime was replaced by the monarchical regime of the Restoration. On, 30 January 1853, Napoleon III married the Spaniard Eugenie de Guzman y Palafox, Countess of Teba. On 16 March 1856, their only son, the Prince Imperial, was born. He was called Napoleon-Louis.

Napoleon III governed with the help of a government made up of ministers that he himself chose. The Assembly of Deputies was called the “Corps legislative” (the Legislative body): members of this were elected for six years. The body had one sitting per year which lasted three months. They would study any proposed laws and had the power to reject them but were not able to propose any new ones. The “Senat” (Senate) was composed of 150 senators appointed for life and usually chosen by the Emperor. Finally, the “Conseil d’Etat” (State Council) was made up of senior judges chosen by the Emperor. Their job was to study the new laws, but only in an advisory capacity. The first period of his reign, up to 1860, is often called the authoritarian Empire. Members of the Legislature were mostly in favour of the Emperor. The opposition, either republican or monarchist, did not get much of a say, because of the censorship of the press. After 1860, Napoleon III began to govern more openly; this is the period known as the “liberal Empire”. The Legislature was allowed to propose new laws, or ask the government to justify its policy choices, and minutes of such discussions even appeared in newspapers. Censorship was less heavy, new newspapers appeared including some opposed to the regime, and “freedom of assembly” was restored (public meetings could again take place). The deadliest of these occurred on 14 January 1858. The Italian Republican Felice Orsini and three accomplices threw three bombs onto the Imperial carriage when Napoleon III and the Empress Eugenie were on their way to the opera. They survived the attack but twelve other people were killed and 144 wounded. Orsini was arrested and sentenced to death. Before his execution, he wrote to Napoleon to try to persuade him to support the establishment of a republic in Italy.

Louis Napoleon had always been interested in social issues, poverty and unemployment, education, economy. When he became Emperor, he created pensions for civil

servants, favoured mutual aid societies or social housing, and authorized the right to strike in 1864. With his Education Minister Victor Duruy, he made primary education compulsory and free and made further education available also to girls as well as boys.

He enthusiastically encouraged the development of agriculture, industry and commerce, including notably the creation of banks such as the Credit Lyonnais and Societe Generale, which still exist. Napoleon III promoted the development of the railways, which facilitated the transportation of raw materials for factories, carriage of goods and persons. As he had lived for a long time in Switzerland, England, Germany and the USA, he was very interested in economic and political relations between countries. He encouraged trade by signing a commercial treaty for free trade with Britain in 1860, both countries accepting the movement of raw materials and products without paying duty. Napoleon III also undertook major work to improve life in cities. With Baron Haussmann, the Prefect of the Seine department, the Emperor transformed Paris (whose population was 2 million): wide boulevards were created; magnificent buildings were built all on the same model. He also wanted housing for workers and their families, and public gardens open to all. Napoleon III led several military campaigns. In the Crimean War (1854-1856), France allied itself with Britain and the Ottoman Empire against Russia, and won a victory that gave it an important place in Europe. In Italy, Napoleon III supported the efforts of Victor Emmanuel II (1820-1878), king of Piedmont-Sardinia, to unify Italy. The French armies defeated the Austrians at Magenta (4 June 1859) and Solferino (24 June 1859). In exchange for his help, France was given the Savoy and the County of Nice (March 1860).

Between 1861 and 1867, Napoleon III tried to conquer Mexico to install a regime that would be favourable to France and help him develop his business in the Americas. But it was a failure. The colonial Empire continued to expand under Napoleon III: in New Caledonia (1853), Africa (Senegal, creation of the port of Dakar in 1857; Gabon, 1862), Asia (Cochin campaign, now Vietnam, 1858-1862); and the French protectorate Cambodia (1863-1949). After a conquest started in 1830, Algeria was annexed in 1848 and divided into three provinces, which then became French departments, namely Oran, Algiers and Constantine. Kabylie was conquered in 1857.

The fall of the Second Empire and Napoleon III's exile

On 19 July 1870, France declared war on Prussia, which had been trying for several years to bring the German states together into a unified German Empire. Napoleon III, whose

health was failing, was the head of a badly-prepared French army, which suffered a succession of defeats. On 1 September 1870, the Prussians were victorious at Sedan and Napoleon III was taken prisoner. In Paris, the Third Republic replaced the Second Empire on 4 September.

The Emperor was sent to Wilhelmshohe Castle in Westphalia (a region of Germany), where he remained until March 1871. He was then allowed to go to England, where he lived in a small country house, Camden Place, in the village of Chislehurst (near London) with his wife and son. Napoleon III died on 9 January 1873, after a failed operation. In 1881, Empress Eugénie had an abbey built at Farnborough (50 km south of London) to accommodate more honourably the remains of Napoleon III and the Prince Imperial (who died in 1879) which had been hurriedly placed in the small parish church of Chislehurst. The Empress was also buried at St Michael's Abbey in 1920. The abbey is still home to Benedictine monks, and the abbey and the Imperial crypt are open to the public. His entourage described Napoleon III as a small man, with a long, fat face, broad drooping shoulders, a fat torso, and very short legs. He walked slowly, with his feet pointing out, and his body tilted to the left side. Not a very flattering portrait! But the Emperor also had a lot of charm and charisma; he knew how to win over his entourage. His small, light-blue eyes had a kind expression; he was a good listener and was genuinely interested in people. In private, he could be down to earth and had a sense of humour. In public he controlled his emotions and spoke little, but often guessed what others were thinking: his mysterious and enigmatic attitude reminded them of a sphinx, the creature from Greek mythology who challenged passersby to answer riddles ... and devoured those who did not know the right answer. Napoleon III worked hard; he did a lot of research and reading before making a decision. Up at seven, he would drink a cup of coffee and work alone until nine, then with his ministers until eleven. Every Tuesday and Saturday morning, without fail, he would meet the whole Cabinet at the Tuileries Palace. After lunch, he worked again or received visitors. In the afternoons, he might also go horse riding or inspect the various building work in progress in the city of Paris. Before and after dinner, he was back at work. In the evening, he sometimes went to the theatre or the opera with the Empress Eugénie. Napoleon III was not really interested in the art, painting or sculpture of his time. But he was passionate about history and archaeology; he even created the Musée des Antiquités Nationales (National Antiquities Museum) at the Château de Saint-Germain-en-Laye.

13. Unification of Italy and Unification of Germany

During the 1820s the Carbonari secret society tried to organize revolts in Palermo and Naples but with very little success, mainly because the Carbonari did not have the support of the peasants. Giuseppe Mazzini, a patriotic writer set up a national revolutionary movement known as Young Italy (1831). Mazzini was in favour of a united republic. His ideas spread quickly among large segments of the Italian population. Young Italy's revolutionary cells formed throughout the Italian peninsula. After 1830, revolutionary sentiment in favour of a unified Italy began to experience resurgence, and a series of insurrections laid the groundwork for the creation of one nation along the Italian peninsula.

Revolution of 1848:

The first revolt took place in the Kingdom of Sicily, which resulted in a constitution for the whole kingdom. A revolt in Rome forced Pope Pius IX to flee Rome and a republic was proclaimed. Giuseppe Garibaldi (1807-1848) was a revolutionary who had taken part in the 1848 insurrection but had to go into exile when it failed. Garibaldi would later emerge as the face of Italian unification during this period.

First Italian War of Independence:

The First Italian War of Independence was fought by the Kingdom of Sardinia (Piedmont) and Italian volunteers against the Austrian Empire and other conservative states from 23 March 1848 to 22 August 1849 in the Italian Peninsula. Numerous insurrections took place all over the peninsula, but in the end, they were all crushed by the monarchical powers. But the idea and spirit of the resurgence did not die with this defeat. Count Cavour provided the leadership needed at this time. He was a modernizer interested in agrarian improvements, banks, railways, and free trade. He opened a newspaper as soon as censorship allowed it. He became prime minister of Sardinia-Piedmont in 1852 and introduced modern ideologies of development. He encouraged trade and commerce, built railways, introduced the modern postal system and banking, patronized shipping, organized a new taxation system, curbed the power of the church, and reorganized the army on modern lines. In 1855, the kingdom became an ally of Britain and France in the Crimean War, which gave Cavour's diplomacy legitimacy. He allied with Napoleon III and provoked the second Italian independence war of 1859 against Austria.

Revolution of 1860:

By early 1860, only five states remained in Italy: the Austrians in Venetia, the Papal States (now minus the Legations), the new expanded Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia, the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and San Marino. The insurrection in 1860 became a success as Garibaldi and his army of Redshirts conquered the island of Sicily and Naples. Meanwhile, the northern states had joined up with Piedmont-Sardinia and accepted Victor Emmanuel II as their King. Garibaldi handed Naples and Sicily to him in November 1860 and by 1861 Italy was declared a kingdom. Venetia was added to Italy in 1866 when Prussia defeated Austria in the Seven Weeks' war. In that war Italy sided with Prussia and Venetia was its reward. When the Franco-Prussian War broke out in 1870, Napoleon III had to withdraw his troops from Rome. The Italian government sent troops at once to take over Rome from the Pope. The citizens of Rome voted for a union with Italy which was declared the new capital city of Italy in 1871. Thus, the Unification of Italy was completed.

The aftermath of the unification of Italy

The unification and governance were achieved entirely in terms of Piedmont's interest. The new Kingdom of Italy was structured by renaming the old Kingdom of Sardinia and annexing all the new provinces into its structures. The first king was Victor Emmanuel II, who kept his old title. The new constitution was Piedmont's old constitution. The document was generally liberal and was welcomed by liberal elements. Its anticlerical provisions were disliked in the pro-clerical regions such as Venice, Rome, Naples, and the island of Sicily. Cavour had promised there would be regional and municipal, local governments, but all the promises were broken in 1861. The first decade of the kingdom saw savage civil wars in Sicily and in the Naples region, which were all suppressed. Many native Italians still showed dissatisfaction with the arrangement and there was always unrest in the kingdom which is also called Italian irredentism. Italy entered the First World War in 1915 to complete national unity. It remained neutral at first but eventually agreed to join the war against central powers after the Treaty of London was signed in 1915. Italy did not receive other territories promised by the Treaty of London, so this outcome was denounced as a "Mutilated victory". The expression of "Mutilated victory" was adopted by Benito Mussolini which led to the rise of Italian Fascism, becoming the propaganda of Fascist Italy. After World War II, the irredentism movement faded away in Italian politics. The anniversary of the unification of Italy is celebrated every fifty years, on 17 March (the date of the proclamation of the Kingdom of Italy). The anniversary occurred in 1911 (50th), 1961 (100th), 2011 (150th), and 2021 (160th) with several celebrations throughout the country.

Sensitivity to Cavour

Garibaldi's attack on the Papal areas of Umbria and Marches was pre-empted by King Victor Emmanuel's annexation of these areas. He avoided, however, attacking Rome itself. When Garibaldi learned that the Emperor was also interested in his position, he decided to abandon his pursuits altogether. Thus, a worsening situation caused by patriotic patriots was averted. On October 21, 1860, a plebiscite was arranged in Naples and Sicily. The people of Naples and Sicily voted for union with the rest of Italy. The areas of Capua and Gaeta, which were part of Naples, were taken over by Victor Emmanuel. As a true patriot, Garibaldi turned over the rest of Naples and Sicily to King Victor Emmanuel of Sardinia and then departed from Naples.

Fourth Stage of Unification

Venetia was annexed during this stage. Assimilation of Venezia In 1866, hostilities erupted between Austria and Prussia. Victor Emmanuel II fought alongside Prussia during the war. This war saw Italy's defeat, but Prussia also defeated Austria. In 1866, Prussia and Austria signed the Treaty of Prague. After defeating Austria, Italy received Venetia as part of the terms of the treaty. Historian Fisher says that the formidable Prussian army took home the prize of Venetia by winning the battle of Sadowa.

Fifth and the Final Stage of Unification

During the war between France and Prussia in 1870, Italy was annexed. Faced with a Prussian invasion, Napoleon III had no choice but to call the French army back from Rome. As soon as the opportunity presented itself, Victor Emmanuel took advantage of it and launched an assault on Rome. He took over Rome in no time. It was annexed by the rest of Italy following a popular vote. Turin was replaced by Rome as the capital of Italy. When Italy was united, Rome was chosen as its capital. No obstacle stands in the way of a nation's love for its people. National unity flag-waving Patriots begin marching with a victory path carved by nature. This national spirit of Italian patriotism overcame both temporal power and the spiritual authority of a pope from a distant land. The purity of national unity has forced absolute monarchies to lick their wounds. The 'Unification of Italy' commemorates the convergence of all the rivers of Italian national unity into a single ocean.

Background of the Unification of Italy

The Italian Peninsula had fragmented into different city-states upon the demise of the Western Roman Empire in 476 AD. Although briefly united under the Ostrogothic Kingdom, it again fell to disunity following the invasion of the Eastern Roman Empire (Byzantine Empire) in the 500s. The northern half of Italy was under the control of the Holy Roman Empire (a German-speaking Empire) beginning in the 8th century while the central and the southern half were intermittently governed between the Kingdom of Naples, Kingdom of Sicily and the Papal States. The state of affairs continued well into the 17th century until the rise of the Italian city-states, such as Milan and Venice, changed the balance of power in the region. Wars would be fought between the states and the Holy Roman Empire culminating in the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. Although it would end the involvement of the Holy Roman Empire, most of Northern Italy would still be ruled by the Spanish branch of the Habsburgs, who ruled the Holy Roman Empire at the time. The Spanish Wars of succession would end the Habsburg Rule in Italy by 1714. Italy was thus divided into many small principalities, and it would remain that way until the outbreak of the French Revolution in 1789.

Italy under Napoleon

Towards the end of the French Revolution, Napoleon Bonaparte would begin a series of wars that would change the political landscape of Europe for years to come. Napoleon conquered the Italian city-states and turned it into a single administrative unit. As part of the French Empire, the Italian people would imbibe many ideas of the revolution such as liberty, equality and fraternity. Above all, active participation by the people in governance was encouraged, something unheard of in the Italian states for centuries. The empire established by Napoleon had served as a fuel for revolutionary ideas, as he even encouraged nationalism. Italy would be split again following the Napoleons' fall in 1815, its city-states divided among various European powers, with the Empire of Austria having the most power. But by this time the Italian people had enough of foreign involvement in their land and would begin a series of insurrections to drive the foreigners out and unite their country.

The Unification of Italy Begins

During the 1820s and 1830s, the movement for unification would grow finally culminating in revolutions break out in many Italian states in 1848. Although the revolutions would be suppressed, it did little to stem the tide of revolutionary activities. Guiseppe Garibaldi would emerge as the face of Italian unification during this period. Guiseppe Garibaldi (1807-1848) was a revolutionary who had taken part in 1848 insurrection but had to

go into exile when it failed. Lending his support to King Victor Emmanuel II of Piedmont, he would return to Italy in 1860 bringing with him an army consisting of volunteers from Sicily and Naples. In 1858, Victor Emanuel, along with other northern Italian states, had allied with France to permanently end Austrian involvement in the region. The insurrection in 1860 would be a success as Garibaldi and his army of Redshirts would conquer the island of Sicily and Naples. Meanwhile, the northern states had joined up with Piedmont-Sardinia and accepted Victor Emmanuel II as their King. Garibaldi handed Naples and Sicily to him in November 1860 and by 1861 Italy was declared as a kingdom. Only Venice and Rome would remain under foreign control and they became a part of Italy in 1866 and 1871 respectively. Thus, the Unification of Italy was completed.

The aftermath of the Unification

Although the reunification was a reality, it leads to total domination of the Kingdom of Piedmont. Despite promises that regional authorities would participate equally in the government, it was the ruling class of Piedmont that dominated the government during the initial years. The Italian people wanted a united Italy with a weak central government and strong states. What they got instead was a strong central government with little to no power exercised by the states. The new Kingdom of Italy was structured by renaming the old Kingdom of Sardinia and annexing all the new provinces into its structures. The first king was Victor Emmanuel II, who kept his old title. The new constitution was Piedmont's old constitution. The document was generally liberal and was welcomed by liberal elements. But this was resented by pro-clergy elements in Venice, Rome Naples and Sicily. The first decade of the Kingdom of Italy saw civil wars raging in Sicily and Naples which was harshly suppressed. The inevitable long-run results were a severe weakness of national unity and a politicized system based on mutually hostile regional violence. Such factors remain in the 21st century.

Unification of Germany

The Unification of Germany into the German Empire, dominated by Prussia with a federalist structure was announced on 18 January 1871 in the Hall of Mirrors at the Palace of Versailles in France. This event would have a major impact on European politics for decades.

Background of the Unification of Germany

Before unification, Germany was a collection of small kingdoms that came into existence following the Treaty of Verdun in 843. These kingdoms would form the basis of the Holy Roman Empire. Yet, there was no homogenous German identity until the 19th century. This was in part due to the autonomy of the princely states and most inhabitants not ruled directly by the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire largely identified with their prince instead of the German emperor this system of having small states within the empire was called “practice of kleinstaaterei” or “practice of small states”. It was during the onset of the Industrial Revolution that brought about an improvement in transportation and communication, ultimately bringing far-flung regions in close contact with each other. The scenario changed upon the defeat and dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire by France during the Napoleonic Wars in 1806. Even though a German Confederation was re-established following the French defeat in 1815, a huge wave of German nationalism swept through the region at the beginning of the 19th century. This wave of nationalism gave rise to the demands of a centralized authority by the mid 19th century.

The rise of Prussia

The Congress of Vienna in 1815 had established a confederation of German states under the leadership of the Austrian Empire. For their part, the Austrians, in a bid to maintain their own influence over the German states, suppressed any expression of German nationalism and pitted the German states against one another. It ensured that no one state would become powerful over that of the other. Prussia, the easternmost state of the German Confederation was one such state. It had briefly attempted unification of the German confederation under its rule in 1848 until the combined power of other states, with support from the Austrian Empire, foiled it. With the appointment of Otto von Bismarck as the Prime Minister of Prussia, the situation began to change. Otto von Bismarck had a burning ambition to transform Prussia into a formidable power and avenge the humiliating loss at Austria’s hands years before. To this end, he brought major reforms into the Prussian army that made it into the most disciplined and professional fighting force in that part of the world. The war that followed in 1866 (known as the Seven Weeks War) saw Prussia dealing a heavy blow on Austria and its German allies. So profound was the victory that it ended Austrian interference in German matters and allowed Prussia to lay the foundations of its own empire.

However, this would not be enough. Bismarck knew that only a new war with an old enemy would unite other German states, who had been traditional rivals of Prussia, to throw in their lot with the new Prussian empire. That enemy would be France.

Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1871

France was ruled by Napoleon III, the nephew of Napoleon Bonaparte. Unlike his uncle, Napoleon III would lack both political acumen and military skill. He would become a perfect target for Otto von Bismarck's machinations. Through a series of clever diplomatic manoeuvres and subtle provocations, Bismarck managed to provoke Napoleon III into declaring war against Prussia. The seemingly aggressive move by the French was enough to restrain other European powers from supporting Napoleon III. The result in the German states was a wave of anti-French sentiments. When Bismarck marched the Prussian Army towards the French border in July 1870, they were joined by armies of the other German states. The resulting war would prove devastating for France with the most notable defeat being at Sedan in September 1870. It was enough for Napoleon III to tender his resignation as emperor to the French parliament and live out the rest of his life in England. But the war with the Prussians still continued regardless. The war would continue until the fall of Paris to the Prussian Army in January 1871. In the meantime, Bismarck had gathered the German general's princes and Kings at Versailles and declared King William I of Prussia as the Emperor of the German Empire on January 18. On the same day, the new Constitution of the German Confederation came into force, thereby significantly extending the federal German lands to the newly created German Empire with Prussia at its helm. As for the French, furious and smarting under the humiliation of their own monuments being used to further the cause of their enemies, they would avenge their defeat decades later.

Result of the German Unification

The Unification of Germany was a watershed moment in European history that would forever change its political landscape. With the arrival of a new unified German nation onto European politics, the other powers took note with mixed feelings of appreciation, awe and fear. An appreciation that a new state would change the balance of power within continental Europe, awe at the fact that motley collection of bickering German state could band together to defeat a common foe in such a short span of time and fear at the prospect of facing a new powerful enemy whose military prowess was unmatched by any European army at the time.

The new German state would for the first time write its own chapter on colonialism when it undertook expeditions to Africa and Asia. This naturally brought the German Empire into conflict with its European neighbours in the continent and elsewhere. The aggressive approach would further antagonise other nations such as Britain, France and Russia. The animosity between them would spark the fires of the First World War in 1914, which would end the German Empire through the Treaty of Versailles (whose terms were dictated by France) in 1919, ironically in the very same halls where the German Empire was first proclaimed.

The role of Bismarck

Otto Von Bismarck was the Prussian Chancellor. His main goal was to further strengthen the position of Prussia in Europe. Bismarck had a number of primary aims:

- to unify the north German states under Prussian control
- to weaken Prussia's main rival, Austria, by removing it from the German Federation
- to make Berlin, not Vienna, the centre of German affairs
- to strengthen the position of the King of Prussia, Wilhelm I, countering the demands for reform from the Liberals in the Prussian Reichstag

Military improvements

In the 1850s, Bismarck and Wilhelm I wanted to build up Prussia's army to be ready if war broke out with the other German states or Austria. To do this they needed to raise money through taxation. The Prussian Parliament refused to allow money to be raised in this way.

Bismarck ignored the Parliament - he collected money for military reforms through direct taxation. These reforms included:

- an increase in army conscription from two to three years
- the introduction of new battle tactics
- the introduction of and weapons such as the needle gun

The Congress of Princes 1863

- To counter Prussia's growing influence, Austria tried to strengthen its position in the German Federation.

- Since it was the most influential member of the Bund, an increase in the power of the German Federation would strengthen Austria.
- Bismarck thwarted Austria's plans by insisting on popular elections to the Diet (the Federation's Parliament). Austria refused and the reforms were discarded.
- Bismarck had successfully ruined Austria's plans. Ironically as a defender of the Liberal nationalists.

There is much debate about Bismarck's aims to unify all German states under Prussian rule. Some historians argue that Bismarck only intended to unify the north German states. According to this opinion:

- Bismarck did not begin with a master plan to control all German states
- Bismarck actually reacted to and capitalised on political changes in other German states
- strength of nationalist feelings after 1866 led to German unification under its own steam
- economic co-operation meant that unification may have happened eventually anyway
- Bismarck made sure that it happened

However, other historians believe that unification would not have happened without him:

- he made sure that the army reforms took place
- he successfully isolated other countries by making them look like aggressors
- He made Prussia appear to be the defender of the German states and protector of their rights.

15. Eastern Question

The history of the Ottoman Empire between 1815 and 1914 is the history of its dissolution. The Ottoman Empire was at its zenith in the 17th century and with the end of the century began its dismemberment. In the 18th century, Russia and Austria brought large portions of this empire under their control. Most of the rulers of the Turkish empire proved incapable and the relation of exploiter and exploited arose between the Turks and their Christian subjects. Behind the shrinkage of the Turkish Empire ethnic and religious

causes were the most prominent. Besides them, the spirit of nationalism was also a predominant cause of its dissolution. In the Turkish Empire, there were a number of nationalists who had determined to get complete freedom for themselves. The problem of filling the vacuum caused by the slowly degenerating Turkish Empire is called the Eastern Question. Conflicting interests, conflicting people and conflicting opinions complicated the eastern question. This problem was a joint outcome of the gradual decline of Turkey, the expansionist attitude of Russia, Austria's efforts to safeguard herself, England's anxiety to secure her colonies from Russian expansion and changing clashes between Pan-Slavism and Pan-Germanism.

The Russian rulers followed the imperialist policy of dividing the Turkish Empire and capturing as much part of it as possible. In the mid-nineteenth century, Czar Nicholas I told the British ambassador, 'We have a sick man of Europe amongst us for whose death we must remain prepared. It is my duty to defend the Christian subjects of the Turkish Empire. Therefore I will capture Constantinople and England can easily get Egypt and Crete'. But England followed the policy of keeping the Turkish Empire intact so that the expansionist move of Russia could be thwarted and she might not be allowed to establish her influence on the Mediterranean Sea also. Austria thought that if Russia succeeded in bringing Balkan states which had been under Turkey under her influence the Slavs in Austria would create a disturbance. Russia was instigating the Slavs in Balkan states against Turkey. There were commercial reasons also which made her take interest in Turkish problems. Most of the Austrian trade was carried on through the Danube. Russia also wanted to establish her influence on this route of strategic importance. As far as France is concerned, she participated in the Eastern Question keeping her commercial and religious interests in view. France was trying to safeguard the interest of the Roman Catholics living in the Turkish Empire as well as to obtain several commercial concessions. All these causes internationalized the Turkish problem. Nationalism rose and developed in the Balkan nations- Serbia, Rumania, Albania, Bulgaria and Greece between 1815 and 1875. The Crimean war was fought on this question in 1845-56. Half-hearted reforms introduced in Turkey failed.

There were a number of revolts in the Balkan region of the Turkish Empire between 1875 and 1914. Berlin Congress was convened (1878) to decide the fate of Turkey but instead of resolving this problem, it made it more complicated. The discontented Balkan

states continued to struggle to change the decisions taken in this congress. The possibility of regeneration in Turkey as a result of the Young Turks movement caused fear in the European states lest Turkey should recapture all the territories on which her influence had either dwindled or finished. To avert this fear Austria took the first step (October 6, 1908) by annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina to her empire, whereas the Berlin Congress had given her only administrative right on them. This action of Austria enraged Serbia because she herself was planning to annex them. In 1912-13 the Eastern Question became very explosive. The Greeks, the Serbs and the Bulgarians etc. did not forget the heinous murders committed by the Young Turks in Macedonia, and Armenia etc. To save themselves from annihilation, the Balkan nations obliterated their difference and formed the Balkan League. In 1912 the members of the League- Montenegro, Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece- declared war against Turkey. The first and the second Balkan wars drastically changed the map of the Balkan Peninsula. Turkish Empire in Europe came to its near end. All the European states began to expand their arsenals and threatened peace in Europe. These Balkan wars prepared ground for the European Great War which burst out in 1914.

The Greek War of Independence (1821–1829),

The Greek War of Independence (1821–1829), also commonly known as the Greek Revolution was a successful war waged by the Greeks to win independence for Greece from the Ottoman Empire. After a long and bloody struggle, and with the aid of the Great Powers, independence was finally granted by the Treaty of Constantinople in July 1832. The Greeks were thus the first of the Ottoman Empire's subject peoples to secure recognition as an independent sovereign power. The anniversary of Independence Day (March 25, 1821) is a National Day in Greece, which falls on the same day as the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary. European support was critical but not unambiguous in aiding the revolution. A mix of romanticism about Ancient Greece as the inspiration behind much European art, philosophy and culture, Christian animosity towards Islam and sheer envy of the Ottomans combined to compel the great powers to rally to the Hellenic cause.

Later, however, when other Ottoman provinces in the Balkans began to fight for their independence, support was less enthusiastic: Some powers linked the demise of the Ottomans with the fate of their own autocratic imperial projects; others preferred the status quo to the potential destabilization of the region. When the powers did intervene, it was invariably to

further their own interests and agendas. Sometimes, their interests coincided with those struggling for freedom in the region but sometimes their interests clashed. As the world matures, becoming increasingly conscious of the unity of the human family, intervention should promote the good of all people within the global community and not the interests of a few. The powers spoke about liberating people from the "Turkish yoke" while denying freedom to their own colonial subjects. Duplicity and self-interest in international intervention needs to be placed under the microscope, and carefully examined. During the war, European nations expressed concern for the economic backwardness of Greece yet when, post-independence, Greece was their client state, with their own candidate on the throne, they did little to help build up its economy. Later still, they only admitted Greece to the European Union (1981) reluctantly and again for mainly strategic reasons.

Background

The Fall of Constantinople in 1453, and the subsequent fall of Trebizond (Greek: Trapezous or Trapezounda) and Mystras in 1461, marked the end of Greek sovereignty for almost four centuries, as the Ottoman Empire ruled the whole of Greece, with the exception of the Ionian Islands, the Agra Mountains, and the Mani Peninsula, after its conquest of the remnants of the Byzantine Empire over the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. While the Greeks preserved their culture and traditions largely through the institution of the Greek Orthodox Church, they were a subject people and lacked basic political rights. However, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as revolutionary nationalism grew across Europe, including Greece (due, in large part, to the influence of the French Revolution), the Ottoman Empire's power was declining, and Greek nationalism began to assert itself, with the Greek cause beginning to draw support not only from Western European philhellenes, but also the large Greek merchant Diaspora in both Western Europe and Russia which had flourished after the Russo-Turkish War (1768–1774) and the Treaty of Kutchuk Kainarji, which gave Greek merchants the right to sail under the Russian flag. The successful rebellion of the 13-colonies in North America against what they saw as the tyranny of the British Empire also inspired the insurrection. The irony was that this revolt would attract support from the great imperial powers, despite the fact that they also ruled their empires with an iron-hand. The Greek revolution was the first of many that led to the eventual break-up of the Ottoman Empire, completed after World War I. Success of the Greek revolution inspired freedom struggles throughout the Balkans, immediately spilling

over the border into Macedonia and eventually leading to the eventual independence of every European province of the Empire.

The Greeks under the Ottoman Empire

The Greek Revolution was not an isolated event; there were numerous failed attempts at regaining independence throughout the history of the Ottoman occupation of Greece. In 1603, an attempt took place in Morea to restore the Byzantine Empire. Throughout the seventeenth century there was great resistance to the Turks in the Peloponnese and elsewhere, as evidenced by revolts led by Dionysius in 1600 and 1611 in Epirus.

Ottoman rule over Morea was interrupted with the Morean War, as the peninsula came under Venetian rule for 30 years between the 1680s and Ottoman re-conquest in 1715, after the Turkish–Venetian War; the province would remain in turmoil from then on, as over the span of the seventeenth century, the bands of the klephts multiplied. The first great uprising was the Russian-sponsored Orlov Revolt of the 1770s, which was crushed by the Ottomans. The Mani Peninsula in the southern Peloponnese continually resisted Turkish rule, enjoying virtual autonomy and defeating several Turkish incursions into the region, the most famous of which was the Ottoman Invasion of Mani (1770). At the same time, a small number of Greeks enjoyed a privileged position in the Ottoman state as members of the Ottoman bureaucracy. Greeks controlled the affairs of the Orthodox Church and the Ecumenical Patriarchate, based in Constantinople, and the higher clergy of the Orthodox Church was mostly Greek.

Thus, through the Ottoman millet system, the predominantly Greek hierarchy of the Church enjoyed control over the Empire's Orthodox subjects. From the eighteenth century onwards, Phanariote Greek notables (Turkish-appointed Greek administrators from the Phanar district of Constantinople) played an increasingly influential role in the governance of the Ottoman Empire. A strong maritime tradition in the islands of the Aegean, together with the emergence over the eighteenth century of an influential merchant class, generated the wealth necessary to found schools and libraries and pay for young Greeks to study in the universities of Western Europe. Here they came into contact with the radical ideas of the European Enlightenment and the French Revolution. Educated and influential members of the large Greek Diaspora, such as Adamantios Korais and Anthimos Gazis, tried to transmit these ideas back to the Greeks, with the double aim of raising their educational level and simultaneously strengthening their national identity. This was achieved through the

dissemination of books, pamphlets and other writings in Greek, in a process that has been described as the "Diafotismos."

The most influential of these writers and intellectuals helping to shape opinion among Greeks both in and outside the Ottoman Empire was Rigas Feraios. Born in Thessaly and educated in Constantinople, Feraios wrote articles for the Greek-language newspaper *Ephimeris* in Vienna in the 1790s; deeply influenced by the French Revolution, he published a series of revolutionary tracts and proposed republican Constitutions for the Greek and later also pan-Balkan nations. Arrested by Austrian officials in Trieste in 1797, he was handed over to Ottoman officials and transported to Belgrade along with his co-conspirators. All were strangled to death and their bodies dumped in the Danube, in June 1798; Feraios' death fanned the flames of Greek nationalism. His nationalist poem, the *Thourios* (war-song), was translated into a number of Western European and later Balkan languages, and served as a rallying cry for Greeks against Ottoman rule: While some scholars stress the Ottoman history of religious toleration and suggest that former provinces of the Ottoman empire, especially in border zone contexts, might help to bridge European and Muslim civilization, the particularities of Greek-Turkish relations may mitigate against this.

Not only did the Turks conquer the Greek homeland but they destroyed the Byzantine Empire which had represented a continuation both of the Roman Empire and of classical Greece into the medieval period. To some extent, leadership of the Orthodox world also shifted to Russia, which claimed to be the Third Rome. Although a significant figure within the Ottoman space, the authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople did not, under the Ottomans, extend beyond this jurisdiction. For Greeks, this was blow to their pride and sense of their place in the world.

Central to the Greek Revolution were the *Klephts* and *Armatoloi*. After the conquest of Greece by the Ottomans in the fifteenth century, many surviving Greek troops, whether regular Byzantine forces, local militia, or mercenaries, had either to join the Ottoman army as *janissaries* or serve in the private army of a local Ottoman notable, or fend for themselves. In this environment many Greeks wishing to preserve their Greek identity, Orthodox Christian religion and independence, chose the difficult but free life of a bandit. These bandit groups soon found their ranks swollen with impoverished and/or adventurous peasants, societal outcasts, and escaped criminals. Those that chose to go to the hills and form independent militia bands were called *Klephts*, while those that chose to serve the Ottomans were known

as Armatoloi. but many men would alternate between these two groups. For the Ottomans, it became progressively more difficult to distinguish the armatoloi from the klephts; both groups began to establish relations with one another under a common ethnic identity. This collaboration was also based on mutual sentiments against foreign conquerors, and many armatoloi took up arms against the Turks at the outbreak of the revolution: among them were Odysseas Androutsos, Georgios Karaiskakis, Athanasios Diakos and Markos Botsaris.

The armatoloi considered concepts of sacrifice and martyrdom honorable when fighting on the field of battle. Sacrifices from individuals such as Athanasios Diakos merely continued a tradition of martyr-like efforts by armatoloi such as Vlachavas and Antonis Katsantonis. During feasts, the armatoloi would traditionally prepare for conflict with phrases such as, literally meaning "good shot") or kalo molivi literally meaning "good lead"). In times of warfare, these wishes also took on the connotation, "May the shot that kills you be a good shot," and on a number of occasions where armatoloi were seriously wounded during battle they demanded that their own comrades bring about their death; for this group, it was better to be killed by your own kind than to be captured by the enemy.

In 1814, three Greek merchants, Nikolaos Skoufas, Manolis Xanthos, and Athanasios Tsakalov, inspired by the ideas of Feraios and influenced by the Italian Carbonari, founded the secret Filiki Eteria ("Society of Friends"), in Odessa, an important centre of the Greek mercantile Diaspora. With the support of wealthy Greek exile communities in Great Britain and the United States and the aid of sympathizers in Western Europe, they planned the rebellion. The basic objective of the society was a revival of the Byzantine Empire, with Constantinople as the capital, not the formation of a national state. In early 1820, Ioannis Kapodistrias, an official from the Ionian Islands who had become the Russian Foreign Minister, was approached by the Society to be named leader but declined the offer; the Filikoi (members of Filiki Eteria) then turned to Alexander Ypsilantis, a Phanariote serving in the Russian army as general and adjutant to Tsar Alexander I, who accepted.

The Filiki Eteria rapidly expanded, gaining members in almost all regions of Greek settlement, amongst them figures who would later play a prominent role in the war, such as Theodoros Kolokotronis, Odysseas Androutsos, Papaflessas and Laskarina Bouboulina. In 1821, the Ottoman Empire found itself occupied with war against Persia and most particularly with the revolt by Ali Pasha in Epirus, which had forced the vali (governor) of the Morea, Hursid Pasha, and other local pashas to leave their provinces and campaign

against the rebel force. At the same time, the Great Powers, allied in the "Concert of Europe" in their opposition to revolutions in the aftermath of Napoleon I of France, were preoccupied with revolts in Italy and Spain. It was in this context that the Greeks judged the time to be ripe for their own revolt. The plan originally involved uprisings in three places, the Peloponnese, the Danubian Principalities and Constantinople. The start of the uprising can be traced to on February 22, 1821 (O.S.), when Alexander Ypsilantis and several other Greek officers of the Russian army crossed the river Prut into Moldavia.

Due to Greece's classical heritage, there was tremendous sympathy for the Greek cause throughout Europe. Many wealthy Americans and Western European aristocrats, such as the renowned poet Lord Byron, took up arms to join the Greek revolutionaries. Many more also financed the revolution. The Scottish historian and philhellene Thomas Gordon took part in the revolutionary struggle and later wrote the first histories of the Greek revolution in English. Use of the term "Turkish yoke" in his title reflects the popular view that the Ottomans were tyrants who exploited and oppressed their subjects, who were therefore fully justified to revolt. Rebellion against oppression may indeed be just cause for revolt but few in Europe drew parallels between how their empires treated their own subjects, even though the British had experienced the successful revolt of their 12 North American colonies and numerous revolts in Ireland. Gordon wrote of how the Greeks were "accustomed from their infancy to tremble at the sight of a Turk" while "ruin and depopulation were pressing on these hardy mountaineers" whose "hatred of their tyrants" was "untamed."

Once the revolution broke out, Ottoman atrocities were given wide coverage in Europe, including also by Eugene Delacroix, and drew sympathy for the Greek cause in Western Europe, although for a time the British and French governments suspected that the uprising was a Russian plot to seize Greece (and possibly Constantinople) from the Ottomans. The Greeks were unable to establish a coherent government in the areas they controlled, and soon fell to fighting among themselves. Inconclusive fighting between Greeks and Ottomans continued until 1825, when Sultan Mahmud II asked for help from his most powerful vassal, Egypt.

In Europe, the Greek revolt aroused widespread sympathy among the public but was met at first with the lukewarm reception above from the Great Powers, with Britain then backing the insurrection from 1823 onward, after Ottoman weakness was clear, despite the opportunities offered it by Greek civil conflict and the addition of Russian support aimed at

limiting British influence over the Greeks. Greece was viewed as the cradle of western civilization, and it was especially lauded by the spirit of romanticism of the time and the sight of a Christian nation attempting to cast off the rule of a decaying Muslim Empire also found favour amongst the western European public, although few knew very much about the Eastern Orthodox Church.

Lord Byron spent time in Albania and Greece, organizing funds and supplies (including the provision of several ships), but died from fever at Messolonghi in 1824. Byron's death did even more to add European sympathy for the Greek cause. This eventually led the Western powers to intervene directly. Byron's poetry, along with Delacroix's art, helped arouse European public opinion in favour of the Greek revolutionaries: Alexander Ypsilantis was selected as the head of the Filiki Eteria in April 1820, and set himself the task of planning the insurrection. Ypsilantis' intention was to raise all the Christians of the Balkans in rebellion, and perhaps force Russia to intervene on their behalf.

On February 22 1821, he crossed the river Prut with his followers, entering the Danubian Principalities, while in order to encourage the local Romanian Christians to join him, he announced that he had "the support of a Great Power," implying Russia. Two days after crossing the Prut, on the February 24, Ypsilantis issued a proclamation calling on all Greeks and Christians to rise up against the Ottomans; Fight for Faith and Motherland! The time has come, O Hellenes. Long ago the people of Europe, fighting for their own rights and liberties, invited us to imitation... The enlightened peoples of Europe are occupied in restoring the same well-being, and, full of gratitude for the benefactions of our forefathers towards them, desire the liberation of Greece. We, seemingly worthy of ancestral virtue and of the present century, are hopeful that we will achieve their defence and help. Many of these freedom-lovers want to come and fight alongside us.... Who then hinders your manly arms? Our cowardly enemy is sick and weak. Our generals are experienced, and all our fellow countrymen are full of enthusiasm. Unite, then, O brave and magnanimous Greeks! Let national phalanxes be formed, let patriotic legions appear and you will see those old giants of despotism fall by themselves, before our triumphant banners.

Instead of directly advancing on Braila, where he arguably could have prevented Ottoman armies from entering the Principalities, and where he might have forced Russia to accept a *fait accompli*, he remained in Ionan, and ordered the executions of several pro-Ottoman Moldovans. In Bucharest, where he had arrived on March 27 after some weeks

delay, he decided that he could not rely on the Wallachian Pandurs to continue their Oltenian-based revolt and assist the Greek cause; Ypsilantis was mistrusted by the Pandur leader Tudor Vladimirescu, who, as a nominal ally to the Eteria, had started the rebellion as a move to prevent Scarlat Callimachi from reaching the throne in Bucharest, while trying to maintain relations with both Russia and the Ottomans.

At that point, former Russian Foreign Minister, the Corfu-born Greek Ioannis Kapodistrias, sent Ypsilantis a letter upbraiding him for misusing the mandate received from the Tsar, announcing that his name had been struck off the army list, and commanding him to lay down arms. Ypsilantis tried to ignore the letter, but Vladimirescu took this to mean that his commitment to the Eteria was over. A conflict erupted inside his camp, and he was tried and put to death by the Eteria on May 27. The loss of their Romanian allies followed an Ottoman intervention on Wallachian soil sealed defeat for the Greek exiles, culminating in the disastrous Battle of Dragashani and the destruction of the Sacred Band on June 7.

Alexander Ypsilantis, accompanied by his brother Nicholas and a remnant of his followers, retreated to Ramnic, where he spent some days negotiating with the Austrian authorities for permission to cross the frontier. Fearing that his followers might surrender him to the Turks, he gave out that Austria had declared war on Turkey, caused a Te Deum to be sung in the church of Cozia, and, on pretext of arranging measures with the Austrian commander-in-chief, he crossed the frontier. But the reactionary policies of the Holy Alliance were enforced by Emperor Francis I and the country refused to give asylum for leaders of revolts in neighbouring countries. Ypsilantis was kept in close confinement for seven years. In Moldavia, the struggle continued for a while, under Giorgakis Olympios and Yiannis Pharmakis, but by the end of the year, the provinces had been pacified by the Ottomans.

The Revolution in the Peloponnese

The Peloponnese, with its long tradition of resistance to the Ottomans, was to be the heartland of the revolt. In the early months of 1821, with the absence of the Turkish governor Mora valesi Hursid Pasha and many of his troops, the situation was favourable for the Greeks to rise against Ottoman occupation. Theodoros Kolokotronis, a renowned Greek klepht who had served in the British army in the Ionian Islands during the Napoleonic Wars, returned on January 6, 1821, and went to the Mani Peninsula. The Turks found out about Kolokotronis' arrival, and demanded his surrender from the local bey, Petros Mavromichalis, also known as Petrobey. Mavromichalis refused, saying he was just an old man.

The crucial meeting was held at Vostitsa (modern Aigion), where chieftains and prelates from all over the Peloponnese assembled on January 26. There the klepht captains declared their readiness for the uprising, while most of the civil leaders presented themselves skeptical, and demanded guarantees about a Russian intervention. Nevertheless, as news came of Ypsilantis' march into the Danubian Principalities, the atmosphere in the Peloponnese was tense, and by mid-March, sporadic incidents against Muslims occurred, heralding the start of the uprising. The traditional legend that the Revolution was declared on March 25 in the Monastery of Agia Lavra by the archbishop of Patras Germanos is a later invention. However, the date has been established as the official anniversary of the Revolution, and is celebrated as a national day in Greece.

On March 17, 1821, war was declared on the Turks by the Maniots at Areopoli. An army of 2,000 Maniots under the command of Petros Mavromichalis, which included Kolokotronis, his nephew Nikitaras and Papaflessas advanced on the Messenian town of Kalamata. The Maniots reached Kalamata on March 21 and after a brief two day siege it fell to the Greeks on the 23rd. On the same day, Andreas Londos, a Greek primate, rose up at Vostitsa.[10] On March 28, the Messenian Senate, the first of the Greeks' local governing councils, held its first session at Kalamata.

In Achaia, the town of Kalavryta was besieged on March 21. In Patras, in the already tense atmosphere, the Ottomans had transferred their belongings to the fortress on February 28, followed by their families on March 18. On March 22, the revolutionaries declared the Revolution in the square of Agios Georgios in Patras, in the presence of archbishop Germanos. On the next day the leaders of the Revolution in Achaia sent a document to the foreign consulates explaining the reasons of the Revolution. On March 23, the Ottomans launched sporadic attacks towards the town while the revolutionaries, led by Panagiotis Karatzas, drove them back to the fortress. Yannis Makriyannis who had been hiding in the town referred to the scene in his memoirs:

By the end of March, the Greeks effectively controlled the countryside, while the Turks were confined to the fortresses, most notably those of Patras, Rio, Acrocorinth, Monemvasia, Nafplion and the provincial capital, Tripolitsa, where many Muslims had fled with their families at the beginning of the uprising. All these were loosely besieged by local irregular forces under their own captains, since the Greeks lacked artillery. With the exception of Tripolitsa, all sites had access to the sea and could be resupplied and reinforced

by the Ottoman fleet. Kolokotronis, determined to take Tripolitsa, the Ottoman provincial capital in the Peloponnese, moved into Arcadia with 300 Greek soldiers. When he entered Arcadia his band of 300 fought a Turkish force of 1,300 men and defeated them. On April 28, few thousand Maniot soldiers under the command of Mavromichalis' sons joined Kolokotronis' camp outside Tripoli. On September 12, 1821, Tripolitsa was captured by Kolokotronis and his men.

The revolution in central Greece

The first region to revolt in Central Greece was Phocis, on March 24, whose capital, Salona (modern Amfissa), was captured by Panourgias on March 27. In Boeotia, Livadeia was captured by Athanasios Diakos on March 29, followed by Thebes two days later. The Ottoman garrison held out in the citadel of Salona, the regional capital, until April 10, when the Greeks took it. At the same time, the Greeks suffered a defeat at the Battle of Alamana against the army of Omer Vryonis, which resulted in the death of Athanasios Diakos. But the Ottoman advance was stopped at the Battle of Gravia, near Mount Parnassus and the ruins of ancient Delphi, under the leadership of Odysseas Androutsos. Vryonis turned towards Boeotia and sacked Livadeia, awaiting reinforcements before proceeding towards the Morea. These forces, 8,000 men under Beyran Pasha, were however met and defeated at the Battle of Vassilika, on August 26. This defeat forced Vryonis to withdraw, securing the fledgling Greek revolutionaries.

The revolution in Crete

Cretan participation in the revolution was extensive, but it failed to achieve liberation from Turkish rule due to Egyptian intervention. Crete had a long history of resisting Turkish rule, exemplified by the folk hero Daskalogiannis who was martyred whilst fighting the Turks. In 1821, an uprising by Christians met with a fierce response from the Ottoman authorities and the execution of several bishops, regarded as ringleaders. Between 1821 and 1828, the island was the scene of repeated hostilities and atrocities. The Muslims were driven into the large fortified towns on the north coast and it would appear that as many as 60 percent of them died from plague or famine while there. The Cretan Christians also suffered severely, losing around 21 percent of their population. As the Ottoman sultan, Mahmud II, had no army of his own, he was forced to seek the aid of his rebellious vassal and rival, the Pasha of Egypt, who sent troops into the island. Britain decided that Crete should not become part of the new Kingdom of Greece on its independence in 1830, evidently fearing that it

would either become a centre of piracy as it had often been in the past, or a Russian naval base in the East Mediterranean. Crete would remain under Ottoman suzerainty, but Egyptians administered the island, such as the Egyptian-Albanian Giritli Mustafa Naili Pasha.

The revolution in Macedonia

The Greek population of Macedonia participated in the war of independence but unfortunately, due to the vicinity to Constantinople (which was the centre of the Turkish army), it did not result in success. Leader and coordinator of the Revolution in Macedonia was Emmanuel Papas, from the village of Dobista (modern day Emmanuel Papas in Serres prefecture). Papas was a member of the "Philike Etaireia" and offered a lot of funding from his personal wealth for the Cause, but wasn't a military expert himself. In the Macedonian mountains of Olympus and Vermion lived a large number of Greek klefts. The revolt "typically" started on March 1821; with Emmanuel Papas from Serres (one of the main figures, who lacked a military background) making provisions and transporting them to Mt. Athos at the orders of prince Alexandros Ipsilantis (leader, at the time, of the Greek Revolution). At Papas' request for naval support, Psara (an island of the N. Aegean) responded and provided the insurgents with sea-coverage. On the news of the Psarian landing, there were Turkish retaliations in Papas' hometown and Greek shops were sacked and Greek traders along with the metropolitan bishop were imprisoned.

In Thessaloniki, too, governor Yusuf Bey took hostages from the Greek community (civic and religious). After learning that Polygyros had joined the revolt, that Ottoman detachments were annihilated and the insurrection was spreading in the Chalkidiki and villages of Langadas, he executed several of them. Subsequently, he proceeded with a more massive slaughter of several thousand Thessalonian Greeks in the cathedral and market area. In his history D. Dankin (1972) says that it was to take over half a century for the Greeks of the city to recover from the blow. Nevertheless, the revolt gained ground and was proclaimed at the "protaton" of Karyes on May, in the district of Olympos, and was joined by Thasos. Subsequently the insurgents cut communications between Thrace and the south, and attempted to prevent Hadji Mehmet Bayram Pasha from transferring forces from E. Macedonia to S. Greece: Although delaying him, were defeated. In late October, a general Ottoman offensive lead by the new Pasha of Thessaloniki, Mehmet Emin, scored another crushing Ottoman victory at Kassandra. Papas and the survivors escaped on board the Psarian fleet to join the Peloponnesians, though the protagonist died en route. Sithonia, Mount Athos

and Thasos surrender on terms. In the meanwhile, the insurrection west of the Thermaic Gulf managed to spread from Olympos to Bermion and Pieria. It was conducted by Anastasios Karatasos from the district of Beroia, Angelos Gatsos from the vicinity of Edessa, Zaferakis Logothetis from Naousa, and was also assisted by the Psarian naval force. On March of 1822, the insurgents were joined by more boats from Psara and Gregory Salas, who had been appointed commander-in-chief of the campaign in Macedonia, and German philhellenes.

These too, Mehmet Emin defeated at Kolindros (near Methoni); then another detachment under captain Diamantis at Kastania (inland, on the other end of the Pierian mountains) and after pushing them eastwards towards the sea, he finally dispersed them at Milia on Easter Sunday. Further north, in the vicinity of Naousa, the detachment of Karatasos, some 5,000 strong, recorded a victory, but was checked by the arrival of fresh Ottoman reinforcements, and then by Mehmet Emin himself who appeared with 20,000 regulars and irregulars. Failing to get the insurgents to surrender Mehmet Emin launched a number of attacks pushed them back and finally took their base of operations itself, the town of Naousa, on April. (The expeditionary force sent from south Greece by prince Demetrios Ipsilants arrived too late to assist Naousa and was subsequently defeated.) Reprisals and executions ensued, and women are reported to have flung themselves over the Arapitsa waterfall to avoid dishonour and being sold in slavery. Those who broke through the siege fall back in Kozani, Siatista and Aspropotamos, or were carried by the Psarian fleet to the N. Aegean islands.

The war at sea

From the early stages of the revolution, success at sea was vital for the Greeks. If they failed to counter the Ottoman Navy, it would be able to resupply the isolated Ottoman garrisons and land reinforcements from the Ottoman Empire's Asian provinces at will, crushing the rebellion. The Greek fleet was primarily outfitted by prosperous Aegean islanders, principally from three islands: Hydra, Spetses and Psara. Each island equipped, manned and maintained its own squadron, under its own admiral. Although they were crewed by experienced crews, the Greek ships were mostly armed merchantmen, not designed for warfare, and equipped with only light guns. Against them stood the Ottoman fleet, which enjoyed several advantages: its ships and supporting craft were built for war; it was supported by the resources of the vast Ottoman Empire; command was centralized and disciplined under the Kaptan Pasha. The total Ottoman fleet size was 23 masted ships of the line, each

with about 80 guns and 7 or 8 frigates with 50 guns, 5 corvettes with about 30 guns and around 40 brigs with 20 or fewer guns.

The destruction of the Turkish flagship at Chios by Kanaris

In the face of this situation, the Greeks decided to use fire ships, which had proven effective for the Psarias during the Orlov Revolt in 1770. The first test was made at Eresos on 27 May 1821, when a Turkish frigate was successfully destroyed by a fire ship under Dimitrios Papanikolis. In the fire ships, the Greeks found an effective weapon against the Ottoman vessels. In subsequent years, the successes of the Greek fire ships would increase their reputation, with acts such as the destruction of the Ottoman flagship by Constantine Kanaris at Chios, after the massacre of the island's population in June 1822, acquiring international fame. Overall, 59 fire ship attacks were carried out, of which 39 were successful. At the same time, conventional naval actions were also fought, at which naval commanders like Andreas Miaoulis, Nikolis Apostolis, Iakovos Tombazis and Antonios Kriezis distinguished themselves. The early successes of the Greek fleet in direct confrontations with the Ottomans at Patras and Spetses gave the crews confidence, and contributed greatly to the survival and success of the uprising in the Peloponnese.

Later however, as Greece became embroiled in a civil war, the Sultan called upon his strongest subject, Muhammad Ali Pasha the Great of Egypt, for aid. Plagued by internal strife and financial difficulties in keeping the fleet in constant readiness, the Greeks failed to prevent the capture and destruction of Kasos and Psara in 1824, or the landing of the Egyptian army at Methoni. Despite victories at Samos and Gerontas, the Revolution was threatened with collapse until the intervention of the Great Powers in the Battle of Navarino in 1827. There the Ottoman fleet was decisively defeated by the combined fleets of the Britain, France and the Russian Empire, effectively securing the independence of Greece.

The Greeks held a national legislative assembly in the Peloponnese January 1822. Demetrius Ypsilanti (brother of Alexander Ypsilantis) was elected president. On November 15-20, 1821, another unrelated council was held in Salona, where the main local notables and military chiefs participated. Under the direction of Theodoros Negris, they set down a proto-constitution for the region, the Legal Order of Eastern Continental Greece, and established a governing council, the Areopagus, composed of 71 notables from Eastern Greece, Thessaly and Macedonia. Officially, the Areopagus was superseded by the central Provisional Administration, established in January 1822 after the First National Assembly, but the

council continued its existence and exercised considerable authority, albeit in the name of the national government. Tensions between the Areopagus which was dominated by Central Greeks, and the National Assembly which was dominated by Peloponnesians caused an early rift in the fledgling Greek state. The relationship between the two governments was extremely tense, and Greece soon entered a phase of virtual civil war based on the regional governments.

Egyptian intervention

Seeing that the Greek forces had defeated the Turks, the Ottoman Sultan asked his Egyptian vassal, Muhammad Ali of Egypt, who hailed from Kavala in today's Greece, for aid. The Egyptians agreed to send their French-trained army to Greece in exchange for Crete, Cyprus and the Peloponnese. Muhammad Ali accepted the offer and sent his son Ibrahim in command of the expedition. They planned to pay for the war by expelling most of inhabitants and resettling Greece with Egyptian peasants. Meanwhile, the Greeks were in political disarray, verging on civil war. Under command of Ibrahim Pasha, the son of the leader of Egypt, Muhammad Ali invaded Greece, landing at Methoni and capturing the city of Kalamata and razing it to the ground. With the Greeks in disarray, Ibrahim ravaged the Peloponnese and after a brief siege he captured the city of Messolonghi. He then tried to capture Nauplio but he was driven back by Dimitrios Ypsilantis and Konstantinos Mavromichalis, Petros' brother. Much of the countryside was ravaged by Egyptian troops. He then turned his attention to the only place in the Peloponnese that remained independent: Mani Ibrahim sent an envoy to the Maniots demanding that they surrender or else he would ravage their land as he had done to the rest of the Peloponnese. Instead of surrendering, the Maniots simply replied: From the few Greeks of Mani and the rest of Greeks who live there to Ibrahim Pasha. We received your letter in which you try to frighten us saying that if we don't surrender, you'll kill the Maniots and plunder Mani. That's why we are waiting for you and your army. We, the inhabitants of Mani, sign and wait for you. Ibrahim tried to enter Mani from the north-east near Almiro on the June 21, 1826, but he was forced to stop at the fortifications at Vergas, Mani. His army of 7,000 men was held off by an army of 2,000 Maniots and 500 refugees from other parts of Greece. Ibrahim again tried to enter Mani, but again the Maniots defeated the Turkish and Egyptian forces. The Maniots pursued the Egyptians all the way to Kalamata before returning to Vergas. This battle was costly for Ibrahim not only because he suffered 2,500 casualties but also ruined his plan to invade Mani

from the north. Ibrahim would try again several times to take Mani, but each time the Turco-Arab forces would be repulsed, suffering much heavier casualties than the Greeks.

European intervention

The Battle of Navarino; On 20 October 1827, the British, Russian and French fleets, on the initiative of local commanders but with the tacit approval of their governments, attacked and destroyed the Ottoman fleet at the Battle of Navarino. This was the decisive moment in the war of independence, although the British Admiral Edward Cardington nearly ruined his career, since he was ordered not to achieve such a victory or destroy completely the Turko-Egyptian fleet. In October 1828, the Greeks regrouped and formed a new government under John Capodistria. They then advanced to seize as much territory as possible, including Athens and Thebes, before the western powers imposed a ceasefire. The Greeks seized the last Turkish strongholds in the Peloponnese with the help of the French general, Nicolas Joseph Maison.

The final major engagement of the war was the Battle of Petra, which occurred North of Attica. Greek forces under Dimitrios Ypsilantis, for the first time trained to fight as a regular European army rather than as guerrilla bands, advanced against Ottoman forces as Greek commanders realized that under the peace terms the new state would comprise whatever parts of Greece Greek troops occupied. The Greek forces met the troops of Osman Aga and after exchanging fires; the Greeks charged with their swords and decisively defeated the Turkish forces. The Turks would surrender all lands from Livadeia to the Spercheios River in exchange for safe passage out of Central Greece. This battle was significant as it was the first time the Greeks had fought victoriously as a regular army. It also marked the first time that Turks and Greeks had negotiated on the field of battle. The Battle of Petra was the last of the Greek War of Independence. Ironically, Dimitrios Ypsilantis ended the war started by his brother, Alexandros Ypsilantis, when he crossed the Prut River eight and a half years earlier.

Massacres during the Revolution

Almost as soon as the revolution began, there were large scale massacres of civilians by both Greek revolutionaries and Ottoman authorities. Greek revolutionaries massacred Turks and Muslims identified with their rule inhabiting the Peloponnese and Attica where Greek forces were dominant, whereas the Turks massacred many Greeks identified with the

revolution especially in Ioni (Asia Minor), Crete, Constantinople and the Aegean islands where the revolutionary forces were weaker. Some of the more infamous atrocities include the Massacre of Chios, the Destruction of Psara, the massacres of Turks and Jews following the Fall of Tripolitsa, and the Navarino Massacre. Harris J. Booras and David Brewer claimed that massacres by Greeks were responses to the prior events (such as the massacre of the Greeks of Tripoli, after the failed Orlof revolution of 1770 and the destruction of the sacred band). However, according to historians W. Alison Phillips, George Finlay, William St. Clair and Barbara Jelavich massacres started simultaneously with the outbreak of the revolt. The country had been ravaged by ten years of fighting, was full of displaced refugees and empty Turkish estates, necessitating a series of land reforms over several decades.

The new state also contained 800,000 people, fewer than one third of the two and a half million Greek inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire and for much of the next century the Greek state was to seek the liberation of the “unredeemed” Greeks of the Ottoman Empire, in accordance with the Megale Idea, the goal of uniting all Greeks in one country. As a people, the Greeks no longer provided the princes for the Danubian Principalities and were regarded within the Ottoman Empire, especially by the Muslim population, as traitors. Phanariotes who had up to then held high office within the Ottoman Empire were thenceforth regarded as suspect and lost their special, privileged category. In Constantinople and the rest of the Ottoman Empire where Greek banking and merchant presence had been dominant, Armenians mostly replaced Greeks in banking and Bulgarian merchants gained importance.

Legacy

In the long term historical perspective, this marked a seminal event in the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, despite the small size and impoverishment of the New Greek state. For the first time, a Christian subject people successfully rebelled against the Ottoman Empire and established a fully independent state, recognized by Europe. This would give hope to the other subject peoples of the Ottoman Empire, as Serbs, Bulgars, Romanians, and Arabs would all successfully throw out the Turks and establish Free states. European support, however, for the break-up of the Ottoman Empire was always cautious and self-serving. On the one hand, they condemned the tyranny of the Ottomans while on the other they treated their own colonies no better than the Ottomans treated theirs. Austria-Hungary thought that the downfall of the Ottomans as an imperial entity governed similarly to their own empire might be an ill omen for their own survival. By the end of the nineteenth century, Germany

was allied with the Ottomans and even Britain, for all her rhetoric about the "Turkish peril" preferred to leave the Balkans in Turkish hands rather than destabilize the region. With respect of the Greek revolution, the mix of romanticism, belief in the superiority of Western civilization and their somewhat duplicitous rhetoric about freedom was too powerful for the great powers to withhold support.

The newly established Greek state would become a springboard for further expansion, and over the course of a century Macedonia, Crete, Epirus, the Aegean and other parts of Greece would also gain their freedom and unite with the New Greek state. Greece went on to achieve satisfactory economic growth during the late 19th century that allowed it to build one of the world's largest merchant fleets. Greece is often described as poor and backward under Ottoman rule. This is only partly true; Greek merchants were among the wealthiest in the empire. One of the ironic aspects of the war is that while the revolutionaries drew encouragement and inspiration from the American Revolution, which itself drew on ancient Greek notions and political institutions in founding the American republic, they failed to establish a strong democratic tradition. Their first King, Otto of Greece ruled as an absolute monarchy. Eventually his subjects' demands for a constitution proved overwhelming faced with armed insurrection, he granted a constitution. He was eventually deposed. The subsequent story of Greece has included an ongoing struggle to develop a strong democratic tradition. For their part, the great powers had initially created was in reality a client state ruled by their own nominee yet they did little to strengthen its economy despite denouncing the Ottomans for having impoverished Greece. A member of the European Union since 1981, democracy has been thriving since then in the land that gave it birth. Relations with Turkey have remained strained due in part to dispute about sovereignty of several islands and especially as a result if the Turkish invasion of Cyprus. As the European Union responds to Turkey's application to join, reconciliation between Greece and Turkey becomes more urgent. On the one hand, the nation of the West acknowledges their own intellectual and political debt to ancient Greece and supported the Greek independence struggle. On the other hand, the European Union was slow to admit Greece both because of concern about the viability of its democracy and because Greece culture, religion and traditions are regarded as different from those of the West European founders of the Union.

European integration has focused, historically on, among other things, the Catholic and Protestant civilization and the strategic alliance with North America ... Europeans have been reluctant to accept new members from the peripheral zone of contact with Islam ... The

Western Christians of the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary, Slovenia, Malta, and the three Baltic states were easily accepted, while any "Orthodox" completion of the Union has always been regarded with suspicion, and endorsed for primarily strategic reasons. The European Community accepted Greece in 1981 in order to bolster its young democratic institutions and reinforce the strategic Southern flank against the Communist bloc. Yet diplomatic gossips in Brussels targeted, for years, the inclusion of Greece as an anomalous member who received much, contributed little and caused trouble. Apostolov prefers to see the former Ottoman space and other civilization frontier zones as bridges between civilizations, not as barriers, arguing throughout his book that such zones can be venues for conflict or for cooperation depending on the agenda of those who preserve the collective memory, stressing episodes of harmony or of hostility.

15. Young Turk Movement of Turkey

Abdul amid II, which culminated in the establishment of a constitutional government. After their rise to power, the Young Turks introduced programs that promoted the modernization of the Ottoman Empire and a new spirit of Turkish nationalism. Their handling of foreign affairs, however, resulted in the dissolution of the Ottoman state. In 1889 a group of students in the Imperial Medical Academy in Istanbul initiated a conspiracy against Abdul amid that spread rapidly to other colleges in the city. When the plot was uncovered, many of its leaders fled abroad, mainly to Paris, where they prepared the groundwork for a future revolution against Abdul amid. Among the most notable of the liberal émigrés was Ahmed Riza, who became a key spokesman for the influential Young Turk organization known as the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), which advocated a program of orderly reform under a strong central government and the exclusion of all foreign influence. A major rival faction was formed by Prince Sabaheddin. His group, called the League of Private Initiative and Decentralization, espoused many of the same liberal principles as those propounded by the CUP, but, unlike the latter, it favoured administrative decentralization and European assistance to implement reforms. Although the CUP and the League played a significant role in disseminating and stimulating liberal thought, the actual impetus for the Young Turk Revolution of 1908 came from groups within the empire, particularly from discontented members of the 3rd Army Corps in Macedonia.

Many young officers of the corps garrisoned at Salonika (now Thessaloníka, Greece) organized to form the Ottoman Liberty Society in 1906. This secret revolutionary group

merged with the CUP in Paris the following year, bringing to the Young Turk ideologists the command of the 3rd Army Corps. Later in 1907 the CUP and the League of Private Initiative and Decentralization agreed, though reluctantly, to work together to achieve their common goal. On July 3, 1908, Maj. Ahmed Niyazi of the 3rd Corps led a revolt against the provincial authorities in Resna. Other conspirators soon followed his example, and the rebellion rapidly spread throughout the empire. Unable to rely on government troops, Abdul amid announced on July 23 the restoration of the 1876 constitution and recalled parliament.

The Young Turks had succeeded in establishing a constitutional government, but their deep-seated ideological differences resurfaced and prevented them from taking effective control of that government until 1913, when the CUP under new leaders the triumvirate of Talat Pasa, Camal Pasa, and Enver Pasa set itself up as the real arbiter of Ottoman politics. While in power, the Young Turks carried out administrative reforms, especially of provincial administration, that led to more centralization. They were also the first Ottoman reformers to promote industrialization. In addition, the programs of the Young Turk regime effectuated greater secularization of the legal system and provided for the education of women and better state-operated primary schools.

Such positive developments in domestic affairs, however, were largely overshadowed by the disastrous consequences of the regime's foreign policy decisions. An overly hasty appraisal of Germany's military capability by the Young Turk leaders led them to break neutrality and enter World War I (1914–18) on the side of the Central Powers. Ottoman troops made an important contribution to the Central Powers' war effort, fighting on multiple fronts. In 1915, members of the Young Turk government directed Ottoman soldiers and their proxies in Eastern Anatolia, near the Russian front, to deport or execute millions of Armenians in an event that later came to be known as the Armenian Riots. Upon the end of the war, with defeat imminent, the CUP cabinet resigned on October 9, 1918, less than a month before the Ottomans signed the Armistice of Mudros.

16. Crimean War

The Crimean War (1854– 1856) was fought between Imperial Russia on one side and an alliance of France, the United Kingdom, the Kingdom of Sardinia, and the Ottoman Empire on the other. The majority of the conflict took place on the Crimean peninsula, with additional actions occurring in western Turkey, the Baltic Sea region, and in the Russian Far East. The war is generally seen as the first modern conflict and "introduced technical changes

which affected the future course of warfare. The chain of events leading to Britain and France declaring war on Russia on March 28, 1854 can be traced to the 1851 coup d'état in France. Napoleon III had his ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, Marquis de Lafayette, force the Ottomans to recognize France as the "sovereign authority" in the Holy Land. Quickly, the Russians made counterclaims to this newest change in "authority" in the Holy Land. Pointing to two more treaties, one in 1757 and the other in 1774, the Ottomans reversed their earlier decision, renouncing the French treaty and insisting that Russia was the protector of the Christian faith in the Ottoman Empire.

Napoleon III responded with a show of force, sending the ship of the line Charlemagne to the Black Sea, a "clear violation" of the London Straits Convention. France's startling show of force, combined with aggressive diplomacy and money, changed Sultan Abdulmecid I's mind on the matter of the Holy Land and its protection. The newest treaty, between France and the Ottomans, confirmed France and the Catholic Church as the supreme Christian organization in the Holy Land, supreme control over the various Christian holy places, and gave the keys to the Church of the Nativity, previously in the hands of the Greek Orthodox Church, to the Catholic Church. Due to his stunning diplomatic success in Constantinople, Napoleon III's support in France grew tremendously. However, Napoleon appeared to misjudge the religious convictions of Tsar Nicholas I. Angry over losing the diplomatic war to France in the Porte, the Russian tsar had his 4th and 5th Army Corps mobilized and deployed along the Danube River and had Count Karl Nesselrode, his foreign minister, begin a diplomatic war to regain Russian prestige with the Ottomans. As Nesselrode, a veteran diplomat, began forming his strategy for the tsar, he privately confided to the British ambassador in Saint Petersburg, Sir Hamilton Seymour: [The row over the Holy Places] had assumed a new character - that the acts of injustice towards the Greek church which it had been desired to prevent had been perpetrated and consequently that now the object must be to find a remedy for these wrongs. The success of French negotiations at Constantinople was to be ascribed solely to intrigue and violence - violence which had been supposed to be the ultimate ratio of kings, being, it had been seen, the means which the present Ruler of France was in the habit of employing in the first instance.

As conflict loomed over the question of the Holy Places, Nicholas I and Nesselrode began a diplomatic offensive which they hoped would prevent either Britain or France from interfering in any conflict between Russia and the Ottomans, as well as to prevent them from allying together. Nicholas began courting Britain through Seymour. Nicholas insisted that he

no longer wished to expand Imperial Russia further, but that he had an obligation to Christian communities in the Ottoman Empire. The Tsar next dispatched a diplomat, Prince Menshikov, on a special mission to the Porte. By previous treaties, the Sultan was committed "to protect the Christian religion and its Churches", but Menshikov attempted to negotiate a new treaty, under which Russia would be allowed to interfere whenever it deemed the Sultan's protection inadequate. Further, this new synod, a religious convention, would allow Russia to control the Orthodox Church's hierarchy in the Ottoman Empire. Menshikov arrived at Constantinople on 16 February on the steam-powered warship Gromovnik. Menshikov wasted no time in breaking protocol at the Porte when, at his first meeting with the Sultan, he condemned the Ottoman's concessions to the French. Menshikov also began demanding the replacement of highly-placed Ottoman civil servants.

The British embassy at Istanbul at the time was being run by Hugh Rose, *chargé d'affaires* for the British. Using his considerable resources within the Ottoman Empire, Rose gathered intelligence on Russian troop movements along the Danube frontier, and became concerned about the extent of Menshikov's mission to the Porte. Rose, using his authority as the British representative to the Ottomans, ordered a British squadron of warships to depart early for an eastern Mediterranean cruise and head for Istanbul. However, Rose's actions were not backed up by the British admiral in command of the squadron, Whitley Dundas, who resented the diplomat for believing he could interfere in the Admiralty's business. Within a week, Rose's actions were cancelled. Only the French sent a naval task force to support the Ottomans.

First hostilities

At the same time, however, the British government of Prime Minister Aberdeen sent Lord Stratford. Through skillful diplomacy, Lord Stratford convinced the Sultan to reject the treaty, which compromised the independence of the Turks. Benjamin Disraeli blamed Aberdeen and Stratford's actions for making war inevitable, thus starting the process by which Aberdeen would be forced to resign for his role in starting the war. Shortly after he learned of the failure of Menshikov's diplomacy, the Tsar marched his armies into Moldavia and Wallachia (Ottoman principalities in which Russia was acknowledged as a special guardian of the Orthodox Church), using the Sultan's failure to resolve the issue of the Holy Places as a pretext. Nicholas believed that the European powers, especially Austria, would

not object strongly to the annexation of a few neighbouring Ottoman provinces, especially given Russian involvement in suppressing the Revolutions of 1848.

When the Tsar sent his troops into Moldavia and Wallachia (the "Danubian Principalities"), Great Britain, seeking to maintain the security of the Ottoman Empire, sent a fleet to the Dardanelles, where it joined another fleet sent by France. At the same time, however, the European powers hoped for a diplomatic compromise. The representatives of the four neutral Great Powers Great Britain, France, Austria and Prussia met in Vienna, where they drafted a note which they hoped would be acceptable to the Russians and Ottomans. The note met with the approval of Nicholas I; it was, however, rejected by Abd-ul-Mejid I, who felt that the document's poor phrasing left it open to many different interpretations. Great Britain, France and Austria were united in proposing amendments to mollify the Sultan, but their suggestions were ignored in the court of Saint Petersburg.

Great Britain and France set aside the idea of continuing negotiations, but Austria and Prussia did not believe that the rejection of the proposed amendments justified the abandonment of the diplomatic process. The Sultan proceeded to war, his armies attacking the Russian army near the Danube. Nicholas responded by dispatching warships, which destroyed a squadron of Ottoman frigates in northern Turkey at the Battle of Sinop on November 30, 1853. The destruction of the Turkish fleet and heavy Ottoman casualties alarmed both Great Britain and France, which stepped forth in defence of the Ottoman Empire. Late in March of 1854, after Russia ignored an Anglo-French ultimatum to withdraw from the Danubian Principalities, Great Britain and France declared war.

Peace attempts

Nicholas felt that because of his services rendered in 1848, Austrians would side with him, or at the very least remain neutral. Austria, however, felt threatened by the Russian troops. When Great Britain and France demanded the withdrawal of Russian forces from the principalities, Austria supported them; and, though it did not immediately declare war on Russia, it refused to guarantee its neutrality. Though the original grounds for war were lost when Russia withdrew its troops, Great Britain and France continued with hostilities.

Determined to address the Eastern Question by putting an end to the Russian threat to the Ottoman Empire, the allies proposed several conditions for a peaceful resolution, including:

Russia was to give up its protectorate over the Danubian Principalities; it was to abandon any claim granting it the right to interfere in Ottoman affairs on the behalf of the Orthodox Christians; the Straits Convention of 1841 was to be revised; all nations were to be granted access to the Danube River. When the Tsar refused to comply with the Four Points, the Crimean War commenced.

Siege of Sevastopol

French zouaves and Russian soldiers engaged in hand-to-hand combat at Malakhov Kurgan. The following month, though the immediate cause of war was withdrawn, allied troops landed in the Crimea and besieged the city of Sevastopol, home of the Tsar's Black Sea fleet and the associated threat of potential Russian penetration into the Mediterranean. The Russians had to scuttle their ships, and used the naval cannons as additional artillery and the ships' crews as marines. During the siege the Russians lost four 110- or 120-gun 3-decker ships of the line, twelve 84-gun 2-deckers and four 60-gun frigates in the Black Sea, plus a large number of smaller vessels. Admiral Nakhimov suffered a mortal bullet wound to the head, inflicted by sniper Benjamin Schneider, and died on 30 June 1855. The city was captured in September 1855, after about a year-long siege.

In the same year, the Russians besieged and occupied the Turkish fortress of Kars (the Battle of Kurekdere had been fought between the two in the same general area the year before). The Baltic was a forgotten theatre of the war. The popularisation of events elsewhere has overshadowed the overarching significance of this theatre, which was close to the Russian capital. From the beginning, the Baltic campaign turned into a stalemate. The outnumbered Russian Baltic Fleet confined its movements to the areas around fortifications. At the same time, British and French commanders Sir Charles Napier and Parseval-Deschènes – although they led the largest fleet assembled since the Napoleonic Wars – considered Russian coastal fortifications, especially the Kronstadt fortress, too well-defended to engage and limited their actions to blockade of Russian trade and small raids on less protected parts of the Finnish coast.

Bombardment of Bomarsund during the Crimean War

Russia was dependent on imports for both the domestic economy and the supply of her military forces and the blockade seriously undermined the Russian economy. Raiding by allied British and French fleets destroyed forts on the Finnish coast including Bomarsund on the Åland Islands and Fort Slava. Other such attacks were not so successful, and the poorly planned attempts to take Hanko, Ekenäs, Kokkola and Turku were repulsed. The burning of tar warehouses and ships in Oulu and Raahe led to international criticism, and in Britain, a Mr Gibson demanded in the House of Commons that the First Lord of the Admiralty explain a system which carried on a great war by plundering and destroying the property of defenceless villagers. In the autumn, a squadron of three British warships led by HMS Miranda left the Baltic for the White Sea, where they shelled Kola (which was utterly destroyed) and the Solovki. Their attempt to storm Arkhangelsk proved abortive, as was the siege of Petropavlovsk in Kamchatka. Here, an Anglo-French naval squadron successfully shelled the town but a Naval Brigade of 800 sailors and marines landed the next day was repulsed. In 1855, the Western Allied Baltic Fleet tried to destroy heavily defended Russian dockyards at Sveaborg outside Helsinki. More than 1,000 enemy guns tested the strength of the fortress for two days. Despite the shelling, the sailors of the 120-gun ship Rossiya, led by Captain Viktor Poplonsky, defended the entrance to the harbour. The Allies fired over twenty thousand shells but were unable to defeat the Russian batteries. A massive new fleet of more than 350 gunboats and mortar vessels was prepared, but before the attack was launched, the war ended. Part of the Russian resistance was credited to the deployment of newly created blockade mines. Modern naval mining is said to date from the Crimean War: " Torpedo mines, if I may use this name given by Fulton to self-acting mines underwater, were among the novelties attempted by the Russians in their defences about Cronstadt and Sebastopol", as one American officer put it in 1860.

Minor naval skirmishes also occurred in the Far East, where a strong British and French Allied squadron under Rear Admiral David Price and Contre-admiral Febrier-Despointes besieged a smaller Russian force under Rear Admiral Yevfimiy Putyatin at Petropavlovsk on the Kamchatka Peninsula. An Allied landing force was beaten back with heavy casualties in September 1854, and the Allies withdrew. The Russians escaped under snow in early 1855 after Allied reinforcements arrived in the region.

Italian Involvement

With the Italian Unification campaign going on at the time in the Italian states, Camillo di Cavour under orders by Victor Emmanuel II of the Kingdom of Sardinia sent troops to side with French and British forces during the war. This was an attempt at gaining the favour of the French especially when the issue of uniting Italy under the Sardinian throne would become an important matter. The deployment of Italian troops to the Crimea allowed Piedmont to be represented at the peace conference at the end of the war, where it could address the issue of the Risorgimento to other European powers.

End of the war

Ottoman losses after the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 (in yellow) Peace negotiations began in 1856 under Nicholas I's son and successor, Alexander II. Furthermore, the Tsar and the Sultan agreed not to establish any naval or military arsenal on the Black Sea coast. The Black Sea clauses came at a tremendous disadvantage to Russia, for it greatly diminished the naval threat it posed to the Turks. Moreover, all the Great Powers pledged to respect the independence and territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire. The Treaty of Paris stood until 1871, when France was crushed by the German states in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1871. Whilst Prussia and several other German states united to form a powerful German Empire, the Emperor of the French, Napoleon III, was deposed to permit the formation of a French Republic. During his reign (which began in 1852), Napoleon III, eager for the support of Great Britain, had opposed Russia over the Eastern Question. Russian interference in the Ottoman Empire, however, did not in any significant manner threaten the interests of France. Thus, France abandoned its opposition to Russia after the establishment of a Republic. Encouraged by the decision of the French, and supported by the German minister Otto, First Von Bismarck, Russia denounced the Black Sea clauses of the treaty agreed to in 1856. As Great Britain alone could not enforce the clauses, Russia once again established a fleet in the Black Sea. Having abandoned its alliance with Russia, Austria was diplomatically isolated following the war. This led to its defeat in the 1866 Austro-Prussian War and loss of influence in most German-speaking lands. Soon after, Austria would ally with Prussia as it became the new state of Germany, creating the conditions that would lead to World War I.

Characteristics of the war

The war became infamously known for military and logistical incompetence. However, it is important to note the work of women who served as army nurses. The

scandalous treatment of wounded soldiers in the desperate winter that followed was reported by war correspondents for newspapers, prompting the work of Florence Nightingale and others and introducing modern nursing methods. Amongst the new techniques used to speed the treatment of wounded soldiers, a primitive form of ambulance was used for the first time during this conflict. The Crimean War also introduced the first tactical use of railways and other modern inventions such as the telegraph. The Crimean War is also credited by many as being the first modern war, employing trenches and blind artillery fire (gunners often relied on spotters rather than actually being on the battlefield). The use of the Minie ball for shot, coupled with the rifling of barrels, greatly increased Allied rifle range and damage. This was the second war ever photographed, after the Mexican-American War. The Crimean War occasioned the introduction of hand rolled "paper cigars" cigarettes to French and British troops, who copied their Turkish comrades in using old newspaper for rolling when their cigar-leaf rolling tobacco ran out or dried and crumbled. It has been suggested that the Russian defeat in the Crimean War may have been a factor in the emancipation of Russian serfs by Tsar Alexander II in 1861. The British Army abolished Sale of commissions as a direct result of the disaster at the Battle of Balaclava, which saw the ill-fated Charge of the Light Brigade. The Balkan Wars were two sharp conflicts that heralded the onset of World War I. In the First Balkan War a loose alliance of Balkan States eliminated the Ottoman Empire from most of Europe. In the Second Balkan War, the erstwhile allies fought among themselves for the Ottoman spoils.

Origins

The Balkan Wars of 1912-1913 initiated a period of conflict that ravaged south-eastern Europe until 1918 and endured there in one form or another into the 21st century. These Balkan wars originated in the aspirations of the nationalist states of south-eastern Europe; having previously achieved independence from the Ottoman Empire during the 19th century, these states wished to incorporate members of their nationalities remaining under Ottoman rule and thus achieve their maximum nationalist claims. In this way, the states of Bulgaria, Greece, Montenegro and Serbia sought to emulate the 19th century nationalist successes of Germany and Italy. Competing claims to Ottoman held territories, especially Macedonia, prevented the Balkan states from cooperating against the Ottomans. When the Young Turks threatened to reinvigorate the Ottoman Empire after their 1908 coup, however, the leaders of the Balkan states sought ways to overcome their rivalries. Russian diplomacy facilitated their efforts. The Russians wanted to compensate for their setback in the Bosnian

Crisis of 1908-1909 by establishing a pro-Russian Balkan alliance intended to impede any further Austro-Hungarian advances in the region. In March 1912, the Bulgarians and Serbs concluded an alliance under Russian aegis.

This agreement contained a plan for the settlement of the Macedonian problem, including a provision for Russian mediation. The Bulgarians and Serbs then both made individual agreements with the Greeks and Montenegrins, who also reached an agreement together. By September 1912 this loose confederation, the Balkan League, was ready to achieve its goals.

The First Balkan War

Montenegro began the First Balkan War on 8 October 1912. Before the other allies could join in, the Ottomans declared war on the Balkan League on 17 October. The main theatre of the ensuing conflict was Thrace. While one Bulgarian army besieged the major Ottoman fortress at Adrianople (Edirne), two others achieved major victories at Kirk Kilisse (Lozengrad) and at Buni Hisar/Lule Burgas. The latter was the largest battle in Europe between the Franco-German War of 1870-1871 and the First World War. The Ottomans rallied at the Chataldza, the last lines of defence before Constantinople. An attack by the exhausted and epidemic ridden Bulgarians on 17 November against the Ottoman positions there failed. Both sides then settled into trench warfare at Chataldza.

Elsewhere the Serbian army broke the western Ottoman army at Kumanovo on 23 October. The Serbs then proceeded against diminishing resistance into Macedonia, Kosovo and on through Albania, reaching the Adriatic coast in December. The Greek navy prevented the Ottomans from shipping reinforcements from Anatolia to the Balkans, and occupied the Ottoman Aegean Islands. The Greek army advanced in two directions, entering Salonika on 8 November, and further west, bringing the town of Janina under siege. Montenegrin forces moved into the Sanjak of Novi Pazar and besieged the northern Albanian town of Scutari (Shkoder).

The Ottomans signed an armistice with Bulgaria, Montenegro and Serbia on 3 December. Greek military operations continued. By this time, Ottoman Europe was limited to the three besieged towns of Adrianople, Janina, and Scutari, the Gallipoli peninsula and eastern Thrace behind the Chataldza lines. As a result of the Ottoman collapse, groups of Albanian notables, supported by Austria and Italy, declared Albanian independence on 28

November 1912. While delegations from the Balkan allies attempted to negotiate a final peace with the Ottomans in London, a conference of Great Power ambassadors met in London to ensure that their interests would prevail in any Balkan settlement. A coup on 23 January 1913 returned a Young Turk government to power in Constantinople. This government was determined to continue the war, mainly in order to retain Adrianople. It denounced the armistice on 30 January. Hostilities recommenced, to the detriment of the Ottomans. Janina fell to the Greeks on 6 March and Adrianople to the Bulgarians on 26 March.

The siege of Scutari, however, incurred international complications. The Austrians demanded that this largely Albanian inhabited town become a part of the new Albanian state. Under Austro-Hungarian pressure, Serbian forces aiding the Montenegrin siege withdrew. The Montenegrins persisted in the siege, however, and succeeded in taking the town on 22 April. A Great Power flotilla off the Adriatic coast forced the Montenegrins to withdraw less than two weeks later, on 5 May. Meanwhile in London, peace negotiations resulted in the preliminary Treaty of London, signed on 30 May 1913 between the Balkan allies and the Ottoman Empire. By this treaty, the Ottoman Empire in Europe consisted of only a narrow band of territory in eastern Thrace defined by a straight line drawn from the Aegean port of Enos to the Black Sea port of Midya.

Second Balkan or Inter-allied War

During the First Balkan War, while the Bulgarians contended with the major portion of the Ottoman army in Thrace, the Serbs had occupied most of Macedonia. Austrian prohibitions prevented the Serbs from gaining the Adriatic port in northern Albania that they desired. The Serbs then sought to strengthen their hold on Macedonia as compensation for the loss of the Albanian coast. The Greeks had never agreed to any settlement over Macedonia, and also indicated that they would retain the Macedonian areas they had occupied. The Bulgarians remained determined to obtain this area. Hostilities among the allies over the Macedonian question escalated throughout the spring of 1913 from exchanges of notes to actual shooting.

Russian attempts at mediation between Bulgaria and Serbia were feeble and fruitless. On the night of 29-30 June 1913, Bulgarian soldiers began local attacks against Greek and Serbian positions in Macedonia. These attacks became the signal for the outbreak of general war. Greek and Serb counterattacks pushed the Bulgarians back to their pre-war frontiers.

Just as the Bulgarian army began to stabilize the situation, Romanian and Ottoman units invaded Bulgaria. The Romanians sought to obtain southern Dobrudzha to broaden their Black Sea coast and to balance Bulgarian gains elsewhere in the Balkans. The Ottomans wished to regain Adrianople. The Bulgarian army, already heavily engaged against the Greeks and Serbs, was unable to resist the Romanians and Ottomans. Under these circumstances, Bulgaria sued for peace. By the resulting Treaty of Bucharest, signed on 10 August, Bulgaria lost most of Macedonia to Greece and Serbia, and southern Dobrudzha to Romania. The Treaty of Constantinople, signed on 30 September 1913, ended Bulgaria's brief occupation of Adrianople.

Consequences

The Balkan Wars resulted in huge casualties. The Bulgarians lost around 65,000 men, the Greeks 9,500, the Montenegrins, 3,000, and the Serbs at least 36,000. The Ottomans lost as many as 125,000 dead. In addition, tens of thousands of civilians died from disease and other causes. Deliberate atrocities occurred throughout every theatre of war. Another important consequence of the Balkan Wars was the alienation of Bulgaria from Russia. Until 1913, Bulgaria had been Russia's most important client in the Balkan region. Bulgaria's proximity to Constantinople afforded Russia a valuable base from which to bring pressure upon this vital area. The failure of Russian diplomacy to mediate the Bulgarian-Serbian dispute over the disposition of Macedonia led to Bulgaria's catastrophic defeat in the Second Balkan War and Bulgaria's subsequent turn to the Triple Alliance for redress. This left Serbia as Russia's only ally in the Balkans. When Austro-Hungarian chastisement threatened Serbia in July 1914, the Russians had to protect Serbia or else lose the Balkans completely.

The ambitions of the Montenegrins and Serbs in Albania greatly increased Austro-Hungarian antipathy towards these two south Slavic states. The Viennese government became determined that Serbian power should not increase in the Balkans. On three separate occasions, in December 1912, in April 1913 and again after the Balkan Wars in October 1913 the Austro-Hungarians came into conflict with the Serbs and Montenegrins over Albanian issues. Even though war resulted in the summer of 1914 from an event in Bosnia, the conflicts over Albania informed the Austrians' decision to fight the Serbs. The First World War was not the Third Balkan War; rather the Balkan Wars were the beginning of the First World War. Nationalist conflicts persisted in south Eastern Europe from 1912 to 1918. Problems of nationalism endured there into the 21st century.

17. World War – I

First World War 1914-18.

For thirty - six years after the Berlin Conference in 1878, Europe maintained an uneasy peace within its borders. The nations of Europe threatened one another several sinister forces were slowly working forward to a world catastrophe. In 1914, the Great War had broken out. It was the most disastrous resort to arms in which almost all the big powers were involved in it. Chief among the many factors that were responsible for this devastating and calamitous war were chaotic militarism, economic, imperialism, naval competition, excessive nationalism, censorship of the press and a system of secret alliances. The immediate cause of the war was the assassination of Archduke France Ferdinand, heir to the Austrian throne on June 28, 1914, Let us analyse the cause and courses of the First World War.

Causes of the First World War

Militarism

The dangerous and burdensome mechanism of great standing armies had created a sense of suspicion, fear and hatred among the people. Almost all countries kept a vigilant espionage system which was generally used to detect the growth of military power in the opposite camps. The existence of a powerful class of military officers was always dangerous. They tended to dominate the civilian authorities at times of political crisis. The Franco – Prussian War of 1870 led to an armament race in Europe. As a result of the financial burden became heavier and heavier. Armaments were intended to produce a sense of security. Contrary to this aim they always produced a sense of insecurity for the lives and property of the people. If one country increased it's and built strategic railways its fearful neighbours were straight away frightened into doing likewise. During the year 1914, the Russian Minister of War declared "Russia is red; France must be also. In a political crisis, therefore, the military leaders' quick to conclude that war was inevitable. A general mobilization thus, made war inevitable. The general staff worked out all the military correspondence in absolute secrecy. This was an evil of militarism.

Naval Competition

A terrible race to have control over the sea is general called Navalism. All European countries had directly or indirectly entered into the scene to exploiting their colonies in one way or the other. There was a hue and cry for overseas colonies. If it was possible Germany

had interfered in all international crises. Naval support was given to the most trusted countries. This attitude was further cemented by the idea of mercantilism. There was also an incessant race of new markets for the manufactured goods of the two armed camps. This made race naturally collided with the opposite party and created consternation. Germany was always suspicious of British naval supremacy in the seas. Having this in mind, Germany had enlarged and strengthened her naval power and built many submarines. She was followed by other countries.

Nationalism

The word Nationalism means love for one's own country. The spirit of aggressive nationalism and patriotism had a lot to do with the First World War. Most of the European nation had a blind belief that their national honour rested in conquering the territories of other nations. The territorial ambition led to minor as well as major bickering and skirmishes. To the Germans, Germany was the 'Fatherland. So they thought they were the ruling race of the whole world. Since Germany was the birth place of humanity patriotism took entirely a militant form. "My country, right or wrong" was the common slogan of the extreme patriots. Above all, this war - like spirit was sharpened by a scientific justification' of the war that is a biological necessity

Political and Economic Imperialism

Political domination coupled with economic imperialism paved the way for the First World War. England was the mistress of the seas. During the Napoleonic regime, France was a tiger on land. There was none to equal these two forces in the early nineteenth century. But in the later part of the same century, many other powers came to the forefront to challenge these nations. As a result of it there arose ideological and boundary disputes. Each country wanted to dominate the other by fair or foul means. When the British wanted to construct a Cape to Cairo Railway, the Germans had planned to obstruct it by constructing the Berlin to Bagdad Railway. When the news agents of the respective countries revealed these secrets, there arose open attacks (more or less a war of ideas). Every nation of Europe had a fervent and undaunted ambition to interfere in most of the colonial enterprises. When France had directly entered into the Moroccan Crisis to political supremacy, it was confronted with many enemies. No doubt, when Russia interfered in the Balkan problems, it had to counteract the activities of Germany. As the opening of the 20th century. Europe was like a power magazine

here, a fanatic was, more than enough to operate the trigger so as to spoil the whole atmosphere.

Secret Camps

Secret diplomacy among the great powers of Europe formed another cause of the war. Without the knowledge of common people, the Governments of Europe were signing secret treaties. In 1882, Germany, Austria and Italy formed the Triple Alliance. In the early years of the 20th century, England, France and Russia signed the Triple Entente (1907). Europe was divided into two armed camps. The rivalry between these two camps created a sort of balance of power in Europe. Up to 1913, these two armed - camps stood side by side but in 1914 they stood face to face. Diplomats from various countries were grouping and groaning over the ill treatment meted out to them by international problems. Aehrenthal the Austrian Foreign Minister was more than a match- for Izvolski the Russian Foreign Minister. The former duped and deceived the latter in the Buchlau Bargain. Brutal attacks came to Izvolski from all over Russia; whereas symptoms of applause loomed large on the horizon for the Austrian foreign minister. They were thus waiting for the opportunity to break their bones. In the latter half of the 19th century, Europe was bubbling and sporting with international tangles and crisis.

Darkening of the Press

In the early part of the 19th century, the press was given utmost freedom and they dominated the whole national affairs. After the signing of the secret treaties, the press was muzzled and news was kept secret even the people of a particular country, could not know, the actual experiencing in their own country. This also kept them in the dark as far as the international affairs were concerned. The press used to twist the facts and to give them a new colour so as to suit the people of the respective countries.

Other Causes

The 20th century witnessed much international anarchy in the World. The failure of Russia in the Russo - Japanese War (1904 - 1905) revealed to the world the hollowness of a world's power and trumpeted the emergence of Japan as a world power in the Far East. Each nation has its own way in international affairs. There was no international organization to make laws by which every nation could be asked to follow its rules and regulations strictly. It is generally said that the 20th century opened with thunders and fighting in the air. A series of

crisis succeeded one by one which made Europe more or less a battle - field. Every nation was going after finding suitable allies and trying to construct naval basis. International opinion was totally darkened and the thundering commands of heroes like Kaiser William echoed everywhere. When personal ambition dominates a man, he forgets for a while the greatest happiness of the greatest number. He forgets the fact that war is fought at the cost of many lives and thus brings untold misery to the People. After 1905 and 1907, relations between the Great Powers underwent a succession of dangerous crisis in a scattered part of the world. Each crisis was capable of causing a major war. The most persistent cause of diplomatic tension throughout the nineteenth century was Russia's southward pressure towards the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean. This pressure affected upon British commercial interests and upon Austria's territorial ambition.

They wanted to give a set back to the Russo phobia. After the signing of an Entente Cordiale with Russia in 1907, England Settled her major problems relating to politics with Russia. This gave a rude shock to Germany and Austria and threatened their security. The outcome was a series of crisis.

Morocco Crisis of 1905

Germany challenged French sphere of influence in Morocco. Kaiser visited Morocco and pledged German support to Moroccan independence. Not ready for war, France agreed to submit the question to an international conference. The Algeciras Conference (1906) reaffirmed the independence of Morocco and at the same time recognized French special interests in this Country.

Bosnian Crisis - 1908 of these the gravest occurred in 1908, in consequence of die Austrian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Austrians originally occupied Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1878 and the Congress of Berlin confirmed it. In 1908, the Young Turks rose in arms against Austrian control and deposed Sultan Abdul Hamid. A group of aggressive Austrian statesmen, therefore urged the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina - Secretly, the Austrians planned to annex the two provinces with the secret support of Russia. In return, Austria pledged to support the right of Russian warships to pass through the Strait, Bosphorus and Dardanelles. While the Russians made vain efforts to obtain British and French agreement to a revision of the Strait's Convention. Austria announced its annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in October 1908. The Turks and the Serbs were outraged and the Russians were beguiled. For several months there were symptoms of war between a Russo -

Serbian block and Austria, the later backed by Germany. For the time being, the war was averted, but it aggravated the relations between Russia and Austria. The consequence was the emergence of the Second Moroccan Crisis.

The Second Moroccan Crisis of 1911

Mean while, France attempted to convert Morocco into a French protectorate. When Germany sent a gunboat Panther, to the harbour at Agadir, war seemed inevitable. War was averted when both nations agreed to a compromise. Britain firmly backed France Germany ultimately obtained a part of the French Congo in return for a recognition of French rights to Morocco. The Moroccan crises of 1905 and 1911 constituted diplomatic setbacks to Germany. It drew France and England very close and also intensified hostility between the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente.

The Balkan Crisis of 1912 – 1913

The Balkan situations were one of the most important factors in causing the World War. It sharpened the antagonism between the Triple Alliance and Triple entente, stimulated a general increase in armaments, and led to the assassination of the Austrian Archduke with its catastrophic consequences. It was an old and complicated question which had troubled the peace of Europe for a century and a half. The progressive disintegration of Turkey produced a continual unrest in the Near East. The Hapsburgs were trying to preserve authority over subject peoples. Russia desired to cease her influence in the Mediterranean. The Balkan States had an ambition to extend their territories to include all peoples of their own nationality. Russia supported the expansionist policy of her ally Serbia. In 1910, the Balkan States formed the Federation of Balkan Kingdoms; they settled their differences and tried to drive the 'sick man of Europe' with bag and baggage. The Balkan nations declared war on Turkey and defeated her. The Bulgarian armies reached the outskirts of Constantinople. The European nations could not bring a peaceful solution to this problem. War went on for many days. Now, England interfered and the Treaty of London (May 1913) was accepted. Bulgaria and Serbia differed over the distribution of the spoils. War broke out between Serbia and Bulgarians. In this battle, the Bulgarians were crushed and the Treaty of Bucharest was signed. Austria intervened to force the creation of Albania and thus deny Serbia an outlet to the Adriatic Sea. In the Second Balkan War, Serbia could not gain an outlet to the Sea. This intensified the hatred of Russia and Serbia for Austria.

Immediate Cause of the War

On June 28, 1914 Archduke Francis Ferdinand, the heir apparent to the Austrian throne and his wife were assassinated at Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia by a twenty - years old Serbian youth named Gavrilo Prinsep. This spark later caused the explosion. The news of the murder shocked the whole Continent. Austria decided to settle her account on the question of Serbia and in this venture Germany promised her full support. Austria sent an ultimatum to Serbia and accused her that she was responsible for the murder. Hence, Austria demanded the immediate surrender of Serbia. Supported strongly by Russia, Serbia refused to carry out the terms of the ultimatum. However Serbia sent her apologies to Austria. On July 23, 1914 Austria rejected it and sent the final ultimatum to Serbia. Five days later, on July 28, 1914 Austria declared war on Serbia. On July 29, 1914 Germany gave orders of mobilization. Russia did the same. On 1st August, 1914, Germany declared war on Russia. On 14th August 1914, Germany invaded Belgium the neutral country, and on the same day Britain declared war on Germany. On 3rd August 1914, Germany, declared war on France. On 1st August 1914 itself Russia entered into the Armageddon. Turkey and Bulgaria joined the side of Germany. Italy, a dubious friend and a member of the Triple Alliance in the beginning later jointed the side of the Triple Entente (1915).

Course of the War

The war fought on land, sea and in air. The terrific weapons of warfare such as explosive shells, poison gas and submarines were used to the maximum. On the western front, the war was fought in Belgium and France. On the eastern front, the war was fought between Russia and her enemies Germany and Austria. On the sea, German submarines wrought havoc to the Allied warships and merchant ships. During the early phase of the war, the Battle of the Marne frustrated the German designs. On the eastern front the Battle of the Musurian Lake shattered the Russian armies. Russia, however, fared against Austria. But by the end of the year, the Russian campaign came to a standstill. In 1915, Germany captured Warsaw. By 1916, Russia ceased to be serious menace to the Central Powers. The war at sea went in favour of the Allies. In a desperate conditions. Germany resorted to submarine warfare which compelled the U.S.A. to enter the war against her. In 1914, President Woodrow Wilson urged the American People to be 'neutral in fact as well as in name', and issued a proclamation of neutrality. In April 1917, Wilson asked, the Congress to declare war on Germany. The main reason was following Germany's unrestricted submarine warfare had created consternation

and frustration in the minds of the Allies. The German U - boards attacked the enemy ships without attempting to save the crew and passengers. They torpedoed the ship of Neutral Nations. In 1915, over 100 Americans were lost when the British passenger vessel 'Lusitania' was sunk. This brutal incident outraged the Americans.

2). The allied propaganda had a lot to do with the American entry in to the war. They felt a kinship for England based on language and culture. They also wanted to support the French who helped them during the American War of Independence.

3) Hostility towards Germany increased day by day. The German attack of the Neutral Nations and sabotage of American industries were strongly denounced. The German attempt drew Mexico into a plot against U.S.A. was also revealed to the world

4), finally, the American idealism especially of Woodrow Wilson forced them to launch their attack on German submarines. He called the war "a war to end all wars" and declared that "the world must be made safe for democracy". The year 1917 was most critical. But the American entry turned the tables against the Central Powers. It also put an end to her traditional policy of isolation. Its entry in the war marked her emergence as a World Power in the near future. In March – October 1917, Revolution swept over Russia and Germany successfully imposed the Treaty of Brest Litovsk (March 1918) on a demoralized Russia. In the Near East the Ottoman Empire was gradually overran and in December 1917, General made an all out 'do-or die' effort to win the war. Both sides suffered very heavy casualties. Germany had thoroughly exhausted her manpower and her military leaders clamoured for immediate armistices. She was on the verge of starvation. On 11 November 1918, the Armistice was signed and thus ended the First World War.

Results of the War

The First World War was a calamity to humanity. It lasted for 1565 days. It involved total mobilizations of 65 million men. Among them 13 million had died in action, 23 million had been wounded, 7 million permanently crippled or disabled. The War had cost a huge amount of \$270 billion. Huge loans were raised from the public to conduct the War and Europe had borrowed ten million dollars from America itself. The growth of public debt resulted in the decrease of world production. Starvation pestilence and epidemic took away a large toll of the population. Europe had used to the full the immense sources of modern industry - aeroplane, the tank, the poison gas and submarines. Life in general was drowned in

a pool full of fear, over work and harshness. The war had brought about a radical transformation in the world. One age had died in the battle - fields of Europe and a new age dawned. The new generation had high hopes on the temporary peace.

But their aspirations and expectations were razed to the ground. The wars revolutionized all forms of social life and modes of thinking. The unemployed ex-service men used their weapons for their daily bread and this wrought havoc on the people. Liberalism, progressivism, humanitarianism and democracy gave way to economic nationalism, totalitarianism and communism. All these introduced warfare in life and opened the flood gates of mighty revolutions and aggressions. The war led to the collapse of four imperial powers in Europe. Germany, Austria – Hungary, Turkey and Russia the victors dictated treaties to the vanquished. The Treaty of Versailles with Germany, the treaty of Saint Germain with Austria, the Treaty of Trianon with Hungary, the Treaty of Neuilly with Bulgaria and the abortive Treaty of Sèvres with Turkey were the major peace treaties signed in Paris. Of all these, the important was the Treaty of Versailles. It imposed harsh conditions on Germany, who lost her territory in the West, North and East, Alsace - Lorraine was restored to France. Germany was made responsible for the war.

Therefore, huge war indemnity was imposed on her. Germany was disarmed and deprived of her colonies. The whole of her navy and most of her merchant vessels were confiscated. The French army was asked to occupy the left bank of the Rhine. The Ruhr and the Danzig were internationalized. The Germans hesitated to sign since it was dictated peace. But she was forced to sign it. Militarily crippled, nationally humbled, politically humiliated, territorially segregated and economically exhausted, Germany looked like a pale person just out of the game. She had future recovery only in dictatorship, Nazism in Germany under Adolf Hitler and Fascism in Italy under Benito Mussolini was the answer to the ‘dictated peace’ of Paris. Russia could not win over the war, for she was heavily affected by the Revolution. Finally, she emerged as the first totalitarian state under Communist flag. In the East, the thirsty Japan laid her hands on her neighbours for more and more territorial acquisitions. It is crystal clear that the Treaty of Versailles had in itself the ‘germs’ of the Second World War.

The Paris Peace Conference and the Treaty of Versailles

The Big Four

In 1919, the Big Four met in Paris to negotiate the Treaty: Lloyd George of Britain, Vittorio Emanuele Orlando of Italy, Georges Clemenceau of France, and Woodrow Wilson of the U.S. The Paris Peace Conference was an international meeting convened in January 1919 at Versailles just outside Paris. The purpose of the meeting was to establish the terms of the peace after World War. Though nearly thirty nations participated, the representatives of Great Britain, France, the United States, and Italy became known as the "Big Four." The "Big Four" would dominate the proceedings that led to the formulation of the Treaty of Versailles, a treaty that articulated the compromises reached at the conference. The Treaty of Versailles included a plan to form a League of Nations that would serve as an international forum and an international collective security arrangement. U.S. President Woodrow Wilson was a strong advocate of the League as he believed it would prevent future wars.

Negotiations at the Paris Peace Conference were not always easy. Great Britain, France, and Italy fought together during the First World War as Allied Powers. The United States, entered the war in April 1917 as an Associated Power, and while it fought on the side of the Allies, it was not bound to honour pre-existing agreements between the Allied powers. These agreements tended to focus on post-war redistribution of territories. U.S. President Woodrow Wilson strongly opposed many of these arrangements, including Italian demands on the Adriatic. This often led to significant disagreements among the "Big Four." Treaty negotiations were also weakened by the absence of other important nations. Russia had fought as one of the Allies until December 1917, when its new Bolshevik Government withdrew from the war. The Allied Powers refused to recognize the new Bolshevik Government and thus did not invite its representatives to the Peace Conference. The Allies were angered by the Bolshevik decision to repudiate Russia's outstanding financial debts to the Allies and to publish the texts of secret agreements between the Allies concerning the post-war period. The Allies also excluded the defeated Central Powers (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria).

According to French and British wishes, Germany was subjected to strict punitive measures under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. The new German government was required to surrender approximately 10 percent of its pre-war territory in Europe and all of its overseas possessions. The harbour city of Danzig (now Gdansk) and the coal-rich Saarland were placed under the administration of the League of Nations, and France was allowed to exploit the economic resources of the Saarland until 1935. The German Army and Navy were limited in size. Kaiser Wilhelm II and a number of other high-ranking German officials were

to be tried as war criminals. Under the terms of Article 231 of the treaty, the Germans accepted responsibility for the war and, as such, were liable to pay financial reparations to the Allies, though the actual amount would be determined by an Inter-Allied Commission that would present its findings in 1921 (the amount they determined was 132 billion gold Reichmarks, or \$32 billion, which came on top of an initial \$5 billion payment demanded by the treaty). Germans would grow to resent these harsh conditions imposed by the Treaty of Versailles.

While the Treaty of Versailles did not present a peace agreement that satisfied all parties concerned, by the time President Woodrow Wilson returned to the United States in July 1919, American public opinion was overwhelming in favor of ratifying the treaty, including the Covenant of the League of Nations. Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that 32 state legislatures passed resolutions in favour of the treaty, there was intense opposition to it within the U.S. Senate. Senate opposition to the Treaty of Versailles cited Article 10 of the treaty, which dealt with collective security and the League of Nations. This article, opponents argued, ceded the war powers of the U.S. Government to the League's Council. The opposition came from two groups: the "Irreconcilables," who refused to join the League of Nations under any circumstances, and "Reservationists," led by Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman, Henry Cabot Lodge, who were willing to ratify the treaty with amendments. While Lodge was defeated in his attempt to pass amendments to the Treaty in September, he did manage to attach 14 "reservations" to it in November. In a final vote on March 19, 1920, the Treaty of Versailles fell short of ratification by seven votes. Consequently, the U.S. Government signed the Treaty of Berlin on August 25, 1921. This was a separate peace treaty with Germany that stipulated that the United States would enjoy all "rights, privileges, indemnities, reparations or advantages" conferred to it by the Treaty of Versailles, but left out any mention of the League of Nations, which the United States never joined.

18. The League of Nations

Aims

Broadly speaking, the League of Nations was the first international organization formed for preserving international peace. Its two fold objects had been, "the reconstruction of the social order". This in turn, meant maintaining the status quo before the war. Indeed, the League of Nations was dream child because it has no written construction and machinery.

Woodrow Wilson introduced the Covenant in the objectives of the League. The aim of the League was the prevention of the war by the promotion of international understanding. The League applied itself to the amelioration of the grievances of the workers and strove towards international hygiene. While the Congress of Vienna of early 19th century had striven for the abolition of slavery, the League of Nations worked for the uplift of the backward nations of the World. To achieve this, the League introduced the mandatory principle. The Covenant of the League of Nations was its Charter and Constitution. It bound its members 'not to resort to war' to settle disputes, to accept the rules of international law as operated by the International Court at the Hague, to respect treaties and to publish them to do everything they could to improve labour and social conditions in their territories. The most important clause maintained was that if any member violated the provisions of the League, it would not only lose standing in the League but might be subjected to "economic sanctions" and such other actions as the Council considered fit. By "economic sanctions" and "trade relations" of other members would be topped. The colonies and the territories conquered from the defeated powers in the First World War were placed under the guardianship of the council. They were entrusted to be administered by the victorious powers as "Mandatory", that is those governed under the mandate of the League.

Organization

The League of Nations had its headquarters in Geneva in Switzerland. It comprised an Assembly and a Council. The Assembly consisted of representative of all member states. Each member states could send their representatives; but had only one vote. There were 44 states in the League of Nations. The council had nine members. Of these, five were permanent and the rest were non permanent. In the beginning, there were only four permanent members. Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan. Germany was recognized as a permanent member when she was admitted into the League in 1926.

The Assembly was the Parliament of the organization and the Council, a sort of Cabinet. The other organs were;

- 1) A secretariat consisting of a Secretary - General and a number of Assistants
- 2) International Court of Justice and
- 3) International Labour Organization (ILO).

This was set up to secure international agreement on wages, conditions of labour and general social conditions. There were many defects in the formation of the League which proved “a tragedy of high intentions self – defeated”. In the first place, two very important European powers such as Germany and Russia were excluded from the League. The main reason for this lies in the fact that Germany was thought to be loaded with war guilt and Russia with the Communist Revolution in 1917. Germany was not invited to join the League till 1926 and even after her entry into the League she did not regard the League covered sacred act. Secondly, though Woodrow Wilson promulgated the famous Fourteen Points, his country (U.S.A) did not join the League at all. On the other hand, the League was dominated by the big four - Britain, France, Italy and Japan. In 1919, President Wilson presented the Treaty of Versailles with its provision for League membership in the Republican - controlled Senate. Leading Republican senators, favouring isolation and personality hostile to Wilson, a democrat, let a long bitter fight against the League - Wilson's efforts ended abruptly when he suffered a paralytic stroke. The Senate by a wide margin rejected the Treaty of Versailles. Those who voted against the inclusion of America into the League forwarded the following arguments. The League might involve the United States in a war, thereby violating the American constitution which gives only the Congress the power to declare war.

Secondly, the League might interfere in domestic matters such as tariffs and immigration policies.

Thirdly, the League would be dominated by England and her dominion which had a total of six assembly votes. Lastly league membership would involve the United States in the Problems of the entire world and thus violate American's traditional policy of isolation. Although the United States stood outside the League, it co-operated with the League in a limited way. It joined the international labour organization, worked with League agencies to wipe out disease, suppress slavery and establish standards in communication and transport. It had no effective weapons to enforce its decision; it had no army or navy of its own. The member nations were to enforce to make even partial surrender of their sovereignty. No wonder, most of the nations have flouted the League after 1929.

Fourthly, every member state in the League was bent upon protecting and promoting its own interests and upholding its own claims. Thus it paved the way for nationalism. So, as days passed by, nationalist rivalries and jealousies arose among the member nations and their rivalries dominated International relations. Fifthly, there arose little “Leagues” with the

League which was the contribution of the member states. Thus, France formed such a little league consisting of herself, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania and Poland. A tendency like this was sure to be utterly disruptive. Sixthly Germany and her allies regarded the League as a revenge taking body. For example, France wanted to use the League and its machinery as an instrument to enforce compliance by Germany of the Terms and conditions of the Treaty of Versailles and also to ensure her own military security against Germany. Finally, the scheme of disarmament to which all the member nations gave their solemn approval could not be enforced by the League. It was here that the League failed most. In preventing aggression, the League failed miserably.

The conquest of Manchuria by Japan in 1933, and Italian invasion of Abyssinia; in 1935 rocked the very foundation of the League. In fact, there were cases of direct challenge to the League of Nations. The League had to remain a silent spectator in the above two cases. From 1936 to 1939, Hitler made it his business to twist the League's tail to see if it would roar or bite. To make matters worse, he re-militarized the Rhineland contrary to the Treaty of Versailles, overran Austria, then Czechoslovakia and last of all Poland also contrary to the Treaty of Versailles and the League Covenant. Mussolini invaded Abyssinia in 1935 and Italy withdrew from the League of Nations protesting against the reprimands of the League. Japan invaded Manchuria and thus broke the League's Covenant. Indeed, the League was a dead long before the Second World War. It disappeared in flames and in the configuration the League of Nations became the 'League of Nations'.

Achievements

However, it is incorrect to say that the League failed miserably achieving nothing. Germany was admitted in 1926 and Russia in 1934 in the League. It prevented a war between Bulgaria and Russia. It settled the question of Memel.

The International court of justice arbitrated in a number of cases and the international labour organization secured for the workers better wages and service conditions. It was a boon to the small nations who found it a friend and benefactor. A war between Greece and Bulgaria was timely averted in 1925 by mediation of the League. The Financial commissions of the League did much to give aid to war - torn states like Austria and Hungary. Also the League of Nations served in some non - political fields such as cultural, Medical, labour and communication. But in the matter of collective security, it failed not because it did not have the will to succeed, but because it did not - have machinery of its own. Though Russia joined

the League in 1934, her heart was never in it. In 1935, Italy violated the Covenant and withdrew from the League. Similarly, Germany also withdrew from the league in 1933. In short, one will hold that the League, of Nations was a success. But on the other hand, one could say that it was a though failure.

However, the League of Nation deserves credit for it was the first international organization set up to preserve peace and security. It also awakened its members to the danger of the international traffic in drugs and encouraged them to be cooperative in order to control it. It discussed many other humanitarian problems, such as child labour. By dealing successfully with many other minor problems it proved that an international organization can help men of good will to solve their problems.

19. The Russian Revolution

The Russian Revolution took place in 1917, during the final phase of World War I. It removed Russia from the war and brought about the transformation of the Russian Empire into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), replacing Russia's traditional monarchy with the world's first Communist state. The revolution happened in stages through two separate coups, one in February and one in October. The new government, led by Vladimir Lenin, would solidify its power only after three years of civil war, which ended in 1920. Although the events of the Russian Revolution happened abruptly, the causes may be traced back nearly a century. Prior to the revolution, the Russian monarchy had become progressively weaker and increasingly aware of its own vulnerability (and therefore more reactionary). Nicholas II—the tsar who led Russia in the years leading up to the revolution—had personally witnessed revolutionary terrorists assassinate his grandfather and, subsequently, his own father respond to the assassination through brutal oppression of the Russian people. When Nicholas II himself became tsar in 1894, he used similarly severe measures to subdue resistance movements, which were becoming bolder and more widespread every year. As Nicholas's newly imposed oppressions in turn incited still more unrest, he was forced to make concessions after each incident: it was in this manner that Russia's first constitution was created, as was its first parliament. These concessions continued gradually until Nicholas II's grip on power became very tenuous.

As Nicholas II grew weaker, Vladimir Lenin rose to prominence as the most powerful figure in Russia. Although this famous leader of the October Revolution was not even in Russia for the February Revolution—he had lived in self-imposed exile in Europe since 1900

and returned to Russia only in April 1917—he nonetheless exerted tremendous influence. Whatever history’s judgment of him, few other Russian revolutionaries possessed Lenin’s decisiveness and strength of vision for Russia’s future. Born in 1870 in the provincial town of Simbirsk as Vladimir Ilich Ulyanov, the young Lenin was profoundly affected by his older brother Alexander’s 1887 execution for being involved in a plot to assassinate the tsar. As a young adult, Vladimir joined the resistance movement himself and took the pseudonym Lenin but swore that he would never engage in the sort of “adventurism” that had ended his brother’s life. Nevertheless, his actions would one day become very adventurous indeed.

The revolution that Lenin led marked one of the most radical turning points in Russia’s 1,300-year history: it affected economics, social structure, culture, international relations, industrial development, and most any other benchmark by which one might measure a revolution. Although the new government would prove to be at least as repressive as the one it replaced, the country’s new rulers were drawn largely from the intellectual and working classes rather than from the aristocracy—which meant a considerable change in direction for Russia. The revolution opened the door for Russia to fully enter the industrial age. Prior to 1917, Russia was a mostly agrarian nation that had dabbled in industrial development only to a limited degree. By 1917, Russia’s European neighbours had embraced industrialization for more than half a century, making technological advancements such as widespread electrification, which Russia had yet to achieve. After the revolution, new urban-industrial regions appeared quickly in Russia and became increasingly important to the country’s development. The population was drawn to the cities in huge numbers. Education also took a major upswing, and illiteracy was almost entirely eradicated.

The Russian Revolution also had considerable international consequences. Lenin’s government immediately pulled Russia out of World War I, changing the balance of forces for the remaining participants. During the ensuing civil war in Russia, several nations, including the United States, sent troops to Russia in hopes of keeping the chaos from spreading beyond Russia’s boundaries. Over the next several decades, the Soviet Union actively sponsored and assisted Communist movements and revolutions around the world in an effort to broaden its sphere of influence. The country also played a fundamental role in the defeat of Nazi Germany during World War II. Threatened by the possibility of revolutions in their own lands, the governments of many Western nations viewed Communism as a spreading threat and moved to isolate the Soviet Union as much as possible. Following World War II and the advent of the nuclear age, a confrontation between the Soviet Union and the

United States took center stage. As this Cold War got under way, the two countries emerged as superpowers with much of the rest of the world falling in behind one or the other. A protracted nuclear arms race between the United States and Soviet Union would last until the USSR finally collapsed in 1991.

Lenin

Lenin has become known as the single most important and iconic figure of the Russian Revolution. Born Vladimir Ul'ianov, he took the pseudonym Lenin in 1901. Lenin was a charismatic leader of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks) who showed vision and determination in changing the economic, political and ideological foundations of society. However, much of his popularity was created through his personal cult that started emerging in Soviet Russia even before his death in 1924. Even today, Lenin continues to attract public attention and fascination, and it is practically impossible to find unbiased accounts that objectively present Lenin as a person rather than politician. Lenin studied law at Kazan University, where he became involved with the revolutionary cause and subsequently quit his course. He completed his legal studies at the University of St. Petersburg, sitting exams as an external student. After qualifying, Lenin worked as an attorney assistant, before moving to Samara, where he took part in 20 court cases: 16 criminal, and four civil. What we know about the cases from the archives proves that Lenin could have become a good defence lawyer had he not devoted his life to the revolutionary cause. Most of his adult life Lenin spent organising and writing for the Social Democratic movement, much of it in exile across Europe, Britain, and in Siberia. From 1903, when the movement split, he led the 'Bolshevik' faction of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party.

The German philosophers Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels were Lenin's most important influences, and both his literary work and practical life can be seen as attempts to continue their project. Lenin followed 'the father of Russian Marxism' Georgii Plekhanov, breaking earlier Russian revolutionary tradition. Instead of basing his politics around 'the Russian people', he came to place his hopes in the working-class of the world, aligning himself with the Social Democratic movement which already existed across Europe. In 1887, Lenin's Brother Alexander was arrested and hung for participation in the unsuccessful assassination attempt on Tsar Alexander III. This event is likely to have stirred his then-17-year old brother's interest in protest movements. The Soviet official story of Lenin's life

made Alexander into a hero. Lenin's collected writings amount to dozens of volumes, ranging from economics and philosophy to political theory and the question of immediate revolutionary tactics. Lenin's first major original work was *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* (1899), in which he argued against the Populists that Russia would not be able to avoid capitalism or industrialisation, and that Marx's ideas were therefore applicable to Russia, as well as to the leading industrial nations.

Lenin rejected the model of the democratic socialist party working legally through parliamentary institutions, arguing instead that a disciplined 'vanguard party' of professional revolutionaries was necessary for the success of a socialist revolution. Lenin sought to understand the development of the world economy after the period analysed by Marx in *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1916). Lenin argued that capitalism had reached its 'parasitic' stage, forming an interconnected world-system in which monopolies replaced competitive markets and where capitalism had increasingly come to rely on relations of domination between nations. This led leading industrial powers to exploit undeveloped parts of the world formally through colonialism and informally through the export of capital.

Lenin outlined his view of the state as a tool of class domination in *The State and Revolution* (1917), and described how he expected the state to 'wither away' as unnecessary once the world-revolution had been accomplished and class-rule was abolished. Just as important as Lenin's books, if not more important, were the journals and newspapers he was involved with. He edited *Iskra* (The Spark) from 1900–03 and was involved in *Pravda* (The Truth), which became the official newspaper of the Bolshevik party in 1912. Newspapers such as these were vital links between the Bolshevik theoreticians, many of whom spent much of their time in exile before the Revolution, and their supporters in Russia.

His role in the October Revolution

Lenin came to power in the Bolshevik Revolution in November 1917 (October in the old-style calendar), which overthrew the Provisional Government. He had been instrumental in winning the Bolsheviks over to a policy of armed insurrection in order to form a Soviet government, a policy which was carried out through the Military Revolutionary Committee of the Petrograd Soviet. After the October Revolution, Lenin became the chairman of the new executive power Sovnarkom, the Council of People's Commissars – an equivalent of cabinet ministers. Lenin's power rested less on this formal position than on his prestige among the leaders and supporters of the Bolshevik party, which became the All-Russia Communist

Party (Bolsheviks) in 1918. Lenin was a member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party, which consisted of five full members and three ‘candidates’. There was no one formal post for a party head or leader.

State and Revolution: Communist Russia under Lenin

Under Lenin’s leadership, the new Soviet state faced critical challenges which threatened its survival. He was a guiding force, navigating the regime through civil war, economic dislocation and famine, though at great cost. He insisted on pulling Russia out of the First World War, but at the expense of the punitive Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and bloody civil conflicts. Soviet rule was secured and the Constituent Assembly (parliament) closed, but the Soviet leadership had alienated other socialist parties and established a one-party state. Members of other socialist parties and factions had to either join the Bolsheviks or become ‘enemies of the state’. A number of progressive social measures were enacted, but the economic situation continued to worsen. In the struggle to retain power, workers’ democracy was eroded and the Party took total control over all aspects of economy and state building. The Bolsheviks had taken power with the expectation either that a world revolution would succeed in overthrowing the capitalist governments of the developed world, or else that they would themselves be overthrown by counter-revolution and international intervention. Neither of these occurred. They survived, but as revolutionary movements across Europe failed, they were left isolated as the rulers of a predominantly agricultural and ‘pre-capitalist’ country. Lenin died on 21 January 1924, after suffering a series of strokes.

Leaders of the Communist Party had been preparing for his death, concerned that the new Soviet state would lose legitimacy without its central figurehead. They built a ‘Lenin cult’ of symbols and myths to secure the legitimacy of the regime after his death. As part of this project of almost religious veneration, Lenin’s body was mummified and placed on display after a week of ceremonial and ritual. In the years of Lenin’s incapacitation and after his death, different groups within the Communist Party struggled to take control of the Politburo, which was the ‘collective leadership’ of the party. This struggle involved opposing visions for the future of the Soviet state and clashing personal ambitions. Lenin, in his final months, had been obsessed with maintaining the principle of ‘collective leadership’ as opposed to one-man rule, and unsuccessfully tried to have Joseph Stalin removed from his position of General Secretary. Stalin skilfully played the different factions against each other and built up his influence as the General Secretary of the Communist Party, steadily packing

the Politburo with his supporters until in the late 1920s, he came to hold dictatorial power. His defeated rival, Leon Trotsky, who was expelled from the Communist Party in 1927, exiled from the Soviet Union in 1929, and in 1940 was murdered by an agent of Stalin in Mexico.

20. Fascism in Italy

State of Italy in 1919 Italy entered the War on the side of the allies in 1915 against her traditional enemy, Austria. But she came out of the War shocked and resentful. As one of the victors. Italy, had hoped to gain spoils. Though, she had been granted Tyrol and Istria, she had not been given Flume and had not obtained control of the Adriatic. So, she felt aggrieved and frustrated. Italy's industry and finances were in an alarming state. The soldiers returned home from the wars only to join the ranks of the unemployed. There was a general discontent among the people due to high taxes and high prices. The politics of the country were in a State of confusion after 1918. There were quite a number of political parties in Italy. The 'Popularity' was started by a catholic priest in 1919. The Socialists were strong in the industrial centres of the North. By and by the Socialists became the country's strongest party and the Popularize held second largest number of seats in the legislature. The Communists also held a few seats. The many party system resulted in a succession of weak government which failed to improve the conditions to restore public confidence and even to maintain law and order. The weakness of this system became apparent during 1919–21, where none of the groups in the national government of Italy had leaders able to command with popular loyalty and no group was willing risk the dangers that a drastic control of the crisis might entail. Strike spread, Railway services were disturbed. Factory workers took over the plans and forced owners to accept labour as a virtual partner in management. Peasants took the lands forcibly from their masters. Street battles became common.

The middle classes were terrified expecting that at any moment the nation would be swept into a leftist revolution or anarchy. The widespread dissatisfaction within Italy was revealed to the outside world in September 1919 and the Italian airman and romantic writer, Gabriele D. Annuncio led a force of ex-soldiers to capture Flume. He occupied it for a year and established his own government within the city. Since Yugoslavia also claimed it. D. Annuncio was driven out of Flume which came under the League of Nations. Many of the disbanded soldiers of D'Annunzio joined Mussolini's popular Black shirts Movement. The reaction produced by the events connected with the occupation and evacuation of Flume by

the war veterans. The disappointment over the fruits of victory and the dissatisfaction with the Italian life were exploited by the Fascist party in recruiting supporters from the people, Mussolini, the leader of the Fascist party took advantage of the political discontent and the social unrest prevailing in Italy posed as the man who would save Italy's honour and prestige.

Benito Mussolini (1883 –1945)

Benito Mussolini, the founder of the Fascist party was born in 1883 at Dovia in the Romagna an area of Eastern Italy well known in the nineteenth century for its rebellious spirit. His Father a blacksmith was active as a revolutionary. His mother was a school teacher. They named their son Benito in honour of the Mexican revolutionist. Benito Juarez Mussolini in childhood was given fair education. He followed a varied career in his early years. He was a teacher, a farm labourer and mason. As a young man, he joined the Socialist party, went to Switzerland, there got in frequent difficulties with authorities for his labour agitation and was finally expelled.

When the First World War broke out, he became an ardent advocate of Italy's intervention in the War. But when he contended that Italy should fight with the Allies against autocratic Austria - Hungary, the Socialist party expelled him. He fought in the Italian army, was wounded and in 1917 set up his own newspaper in Milan, 'the Popolored Italia', was destined to become the official organ of Fascism. He studied the lives of Nietzsche, and Machiavelli and gained faith for superman forcefulness and justification for violent method. His knowledge of Roman history led him to believe that the Italian people would respond to the revival of ancient Roman customs as the raised arm salute. He also believed that the masses wanted a leader who would remind them of the Caesars and Napoleon. From ancient Rome, he took an emblem, the fascio a bundle of sticks or rods wrapped around an executioner's axe. This symbol of justice of ancient Rome not only represented order, justice and discipline, but also unity of the nation. From Garibaldi's red shirt followers, he got the idea of using a black shirt as the symbol of Fascist membership. When peace was restored in 1919, he founded the Fascist Fighting Corps (fascidi Cambattimento) to face two dangers "the conservation of the Right, the destructiveness of the Left".

The nebulous character of the Fascist programme helped to win adherents among those who easily succumbed to the hypnotic influence of Mussolini's high sounding generalizations. Through he avoided formulating any theoretical programme yet from the beginning, he made clear his two objectives which remained distinctive features of the

movement. One was the need of strengthening the authority of the state and the other was national syndicalism.

Growth of Fascism

The first fascist group was instituted at Milan in March 1919. The movement soon spread to other towns and villages. Assuming militant characteristics it attracted recruits from ex-soldiers, students and middle class youth in general. Its members had the uniform of black shirt. They were organized on military lines. Their motto was "Believe Obey, Fight". At the first Fascist Congress held in 1919, there were only 22 Fascist with seventeen thousand men. Two years later at the third Congress (1921) there were 2200 fascists with thirty thousand members.

Aims of Fascism

Fascism aimed at strengthening the authority of the state and raising the prestige of Italy among the European states. Fascism tried to revive the ancient glory and status of Rome and to redeem Italy from her troubles and humiliation. Fascism was opposed to Communism; therefore, it gained the financial support from wealthy land owners and industrialists, who considered that Communism was direct to their power and wealth. Mussolini was conscious of the influence of Roman Catholic Church and the established monarchy in Italy. So he toned down his out spoken attacks on them.

The March on Rome (October 1922) In September 1922, the Fascist party entrusted Mussolini with authority to use political or military force to bring Fascism into power. In October, when a short - lived administration resigned, a March on Rome' by the Fascists was organized. 30,000 Fascists marched from Milan to Rome joined on the way by many others. Fascist rising took place throughout Italy. The army also joined Fascist forces and the whole country came under the control of Fascism, to avoid a civil war, King Victor Emmanuel invited Mussolini to form a government. Under a threat of dissolution, the Chamber of Deputies voted him dictatorial powers. This meant that the responsible government vested in the person of the leader (duce) of Fascism.

Italy a Fascist State

During Fascist period, there was a considerable decline in the basic freedom of expression of the Italian people and decline in democratic practices. Though monarchy,

remained, the real power was concentrated in Mussolini's hands. He held the position of Prime Minister. He controlled the political, military and economic institutions of the kingdom. He was the commander of the Fascist militia and presided over the Grand Council of Fascism. When he assumed power, he discovered that he was unlikely to receive support within the Parliament, unless he altered its structure. Therefore democratic election was discontinued. Consequently in 1923 and 1928 the electoral system was so altered that Fascist majorities were obtained.

Features of Fascism

Fascism is an individualist. The state is omnipotent. It is all embracing, "outside of it no human or spiritual values may exist". According to Mussolini, "Everything is in the state, nothing against the state". The individual is recognized only in so far as he acts in the line with state, no groups, political or economic are tolerated as the part from the state. It is also anti - democratic. As authoritarian government, Fascism is the anti - thesis of democracy. Fascism repudiated the basic principle of democratic government, the right of the majority to rule. It exalts the leader rather than the people, because it substitutes quality for quantity. Fascism was opposed to Marxian collectivism. It declared that political and non economic factors make history. It also denied the doctrine of class struggle. It contemplated the fusion of all classes into a single 'ethical and economic reality'. It was also opposed to laissez faire. In this, Fascism agreed with often countries. It was also antipacifist, instead of peace, it exalted war, for it taught that war alone kept up all the energies of man to the highest pitch and set the mark of nobility on the nations which had the courage to face it.

Propaganda Freedom of speech and action were suppressed. Press was subjected to severe censorship and non cooperative newspaper editors were replaced by loyal Fascists. A net-work of spies provided an effective check on the free expression of opinions. Propaganda was evident in all aspects of life. Slogans painted on buildings and systematic Fascist, indoctrination in schools and among young people strengthened to join Fascist, Youth Organizations in their spare time. Italians who did not confirm to the Fascist way to life and who actively opposed the regime were sent into exile or to remote villages in the South.

Government

The Grand Council of Fascist party with Mussolini at its head was the ruling body of the country. The small and like minded group that composed it was chosen from those who

were most devoted to Fascism. The Council planned and controlled all phases of the party's action and controlled the Parliament. After 1928, the Council had great powers and it endorsed or rejected candidates to Parliament on lists to be submitted to the electorate who could vote on a whole list it had to be consulted on the succession to the throne and it ratified treaties, it controlled virtually all field of government. The Fascist militia and a special Fascist tribunal enforced Council's decision. Mussolini was the head of the Council. Commander in chief of the army and of all the armed forces, and Prime Minister. He initiated legislation, appointed officials and advised the King. Thus Mussolini emerged as a dominant figure in the totalitarian regime; he virtually became the dictator of Italy with unlimited powers.

The Economic Structure of the Fascist State

Fascism did not seek to place the whole economy under state control. It recognized private enterprises in certain branches of economic life while it imposed state control or state management in others. Bank and foreign trade were placed under the direct control of the government in addition to industries important for national defence in agriculture, small - scale industry and internal trade. Fascism accepted the principle of private enterprise. The employer was responsible for the direction of the industry and the worker was an active collaborator. The organization of production was national concern. Elaborate machinery was devised to give effect to these principles in every part of economic system. In order to define and co-ordinate the relations between capital and labour, Italian people were organized on a vocational basis in syndicates. In order to regulate the nature and scope of production in the national interests, all the productive forces were knit together into institutions known as Corporations, the Syndicate and the Corporations provided the frame work of the Corporate State. They represented the most important contribution of Fascism in the field of politics and economics. The Fascist party controlled industry and labour.

According to the laws passed in 1926, a Corporate State was set up. This broke down class conflict and made capital and labour dependencies of the central government. Employer - worker relations were handled under close government rule. Non - fascist unions were abolished. Workers could not strike and employers could not lock out employees. There were thirteen national syndicates of employers and workers divided according to occupations. Labour disputes were brought before tribunals which were made up of the employers and workers. They were known as corporations whose functions were primarily advisory. They

determined prices and wages, authorized or prohibited new industries, prescribed conditions for apprenticeship, intervened in trade disputes and controlled the economic life of the country. A Charter of Labour in 1917 announced that the maximum working week was fixed at six days of eight hours each, Workers could not be dropped because of illness or military service. Employers were obliged to share the expense of employee insurance against unemployment, illness, accident or old age. The labour syndicates were permitted to train apprentices and to run employment services. Legislation in 1928, 1930 and 1934 gave increasing political powers to the corporation's representative of occupations.

The plan of the Fascists was to do away eventually with the National parliament and to have in its place an advisory body representing the people according to their occupations to assist the Fascist Council.

The Lateran Pact (1929) an important step towards cementing, Italy into a closely coordinated single purpose unit was the reconciliation between the Catholic Church and the Italian Government. Throughout the centuries in spite of wars between the Papacy and its rivals for temporal power, Italian people had remained Roman Catholic in faith. In 1870, the will to national unity proved stronger than the people's desire to support the temporal powers of the Church. The Papacy has lost large tracts of Central Italy previously under its rule. Since 1870, the popes had retired into the Vatican City the area around St. Peter's in Rome. The result was that the relation between the Church and State was strained. Mussolini, who was aware of the church's influence in Italy wanted to improve the relationship and in 1929 by the Lateran Treaty of Concordat, he succeeded in doing so, Pope Pious XI recognized the Kingdom of Italy. The Church was given financial compensation for territories that they had lost in 1871.

The pope was recognized as sovereign ruler of the Vatican City State. The position of the Roman Catholic Church in Italy was greatly enhanced. Mass was frequently celebrated during State occasions. Roman Catholic laws concerning marriage and morals were to be enforced by State.

Progress and Benefits

Great material progress is the most successful aspect of Italian Fascism. Great attention was paid to the improvement of transport by rail and by road. With the increase of automobile transportation, roads were improved and new roads were built. The trend towards

more efficient transport between agricultural Industrial and trade centres led to better maintenance and modernization of railways. Military consideration also, had an important part in such improvement. The development of facilities for the tourist trade enhanced the prestige of Mussolini and Fascism brought large revenues to the country. Rome and other cities were improved and made attractive. Ancient monument was repaired. Festivals and cultural events showing Italy's past glory were celebrated. Aeroplanes and luxury liners were built. State controlled film industry was established.

To achieve self sufficiency in food. Italy waged the 'Battle of Grain' which proved successful. Increased industrial production attracted foreign capital for investment in Italy. Agriculture was improved by using modern fanning equipment. The vast Pontine Marshes in the neighbourhood of Rome were drained and became highly productive. Model towns were built on them. Due to Italy's lack of oil and her inadequate coal supplies, water power works were constructed. The utilizations of power plants and electrification of railways and industries brought improvement of conditions throughout the country. But especially in the previously backward regions in the South and in Sicily. Hydroelectricity was utilized more fully in the north as a basis for industry. After the Fascists came to power, sport and outdoor life became part of national programme. Stadiums were built, teams from different areas completed for national prizes. Mass excursions were promoted and people became acquainted with regions they had not known before. Such constructive moves were published as Fascism. Fascist period has left its mark in the architecture also especially in public buildings.

Foreign Affairs

Aims

The dominating motive of the foreign policy of the Fascist regime was the desire to increase the prestige of Italy. Mussolini's ambition for expansion proved a disturbing factor in the sphere of international relations. Italy was disappointed over the sphere of territories allocated to her after the War 1914– 18. She wanted to get rid of the shame of humiliation that she had undergone. Italy needed territories to settle her surplus population. This need became greater after the United States of America had introduced entry of Immigrants from European countries. Therefore it was necessary for Italy to look elsewhere to which her surplus and poor population could go. She also needed markets for her surplus manufactured goods, and when Italy followed a policy of expansion she came into conflict with other countries and with the League of Nations.

a. Albania- Italy felt that she had certain rights over Albania which was not recognized by the Allies while drawing up the peace Treaty in 1919. These rights were recognized by the Allies in 1921. In 1923 some Italian officers who were working on the boundary projects were murdered by the Greeks. Italy demanded certain compensations which the Greek Government refused to grant. However the Italian influence increased in Albania.

b. Yugoslavia another neighbouring country with which she came into conflict was Yugoslavia. A treaty was concluded in 1924, allowed Italy's influence over Yugoslavia. c. Abyssinia (Ethiopia) The most important part of Italy's foreign policy was concerned with her ambition in East Africa. She possessed Italian Eritrea and Italian Somaliland. Italy wanted to annex Abyssinia also. When Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1898, she was defeated at Adowa. When Fascists came to power, the invasion of Abyssinia began in 1935 and continued to 1936. Emperor Haile Selasie appealed to the League of Nations. The result was the imposition of economic sanctions on Italy, but they proved ineffective since oil was excluded from the list of prohibited items. Meanwhile, the foreign ministers of France and Britain worked out a scheme by which Italian ambitions would be satisfied at the expense of the Abyssinians. Mussolini encouraged pressing further his claims and in 1935 he annexed the whole of Abyssinia which together with Eritrea and Somaliland formed an Italian Colony. The conquest of Abyssinia by Italy revealed the weakness of the League of Nations.

Italy and Germany

When Italy was engaged in war with Abyssinia, Italy and Germany realized their need for mutual friendship. So, in October 1935, the first of a series of agreements known as the Axis agreements were signed between the two countries. In Mussolini's early years of power, Hitler looked up to him as a model dictator. But after 1936, it was Hitler who became the dominant partner and Mussolini followed him. The link between Italy and Germany became stronger as time went on and the events of the later thirties were gradually preparing the ground for the Second World War.

Italy joined Germany in the Second World War.

The fall of Mussolini

While the Second World War was going on; there had been many crucial political changes inside Italy. On the night of July 24th 1943, a meeting of the Fascist Grand Council was held at Rome and passed a vote of no confidence on Mussolini as leader. Marshal

Badoglio was pointed Prime Minister by the King. Mussolini was imprisoned. Many factors contributed to the downfall of Mussolini. The Italian troops were not successful in the wars. The dictatorial attitude of Mussolini was strongly resented by the officers of Army. The Italians were blaming all these disasters on Mussolini's axis agreement with Germany. The final cause for his downfall was the Allied attacks on Sicily in July 1943 and the bombardment of Rome by air. Badoglio did not make any changes in Italian policy. He continued the War as well as Fascist regime. When Italy signed an armistice with the Allies and later declared war on the Germans. Mussolini was rescued from his imprisonment by German parachutist. He established his rule in North Italy; however, he was shot dead by Italian partisans in April 1945. By the peace treaty with Italy signed in 1947, Italy ceded border areas to France and Yugoslavia. Italy agreed to pay minor reparations and to limit her military forces. She surrendered her colonies and gave the United Nations the Adriatic seaport of Trieste as a Free Territory available for Yugoslavia use. By referendum in 1946, the Italian people deposed monarchy and Italy became a republic.

In 1948, the new Republican constitution came into force. According to the constitution by which Italy was governed today, legislative powers are exercised by a bicameral legislature; executive powers are in the hands of Prime Minister and a cabinet chosen responsible to the legislature. The president of Italy is merely a symbolic head of state.

21. Nazism in Germany

Introduction

After the First World War, Germany fell on evil days. She was not only a defeated country but was also one without any form of government. The two problems she had to face were restoration of the economy of the country and the creation of a stable form of government. Towards the end of 1918, Germany was a scene of wide spread political disorder. Socialist and Communist risings took place against Kaiser and his government. Meanwhile, Kaiser abdicated and Friedrich Ebert, a moderate Socialist, became President. The Communist risings which took place in Berlin were led by Luxemburg. It was suppressed and the two leaders were killed. There were other risings also of left-wing but they were on a small scale. Many of the soldiers who had fought War were bitter against their Government for signing the armistice in 1918. One of them was an insignificant corporal named Adolf Hitler. They wanted to continue fighting and also to establish a right wing

regime in Germany. Many of the ex-soldiers joined the Free Corps an organisation which had received a secret approval from Ebert, the President.

Later on, discontented persons from every walk of life jointed this organization and finally the undisciplined and unemployed youth of the country also swelled up its ranks. There were fanatical supports of militarism and nationalism. They were responsible for putting down Communist risings and the assassination of left – wing leaders. One of the leaders of the Free Corps Dr. Wolfgang Kapp led a rising and protesting against the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and, also, against the new government which had accepted them. The rising, was easily defeated by a general strike organized among the workers of Berlin, in 1920 Kapp fled to Sweden. In the midst of this political confusion resulting from Right and Left. The new republic was established. A national assembly met a Weimar in order to draw up a constitution. The result of this meeting was the Weimar constitution and the republic which adopted this constitution was known as the Weimar Republic.

The Weimar Constitution Provisions were made for a Parliament, which was to consist of two houses. The Lower Chamber, the Reichstag, was the most important. It consisted of deputies elected for a term of four years by universal suffrage, for men and women over twenty on a system of proportional representation. According to this each political Party was granted one representative for each 60,000 votes obtained. The Upper Chamber consisted of representative of the federal states, and the Prussian provinces, who would vote roughly in proportion, little states represented, though Prussia was not allowed more than two fifths of the total votes. The Powers of the upper chamber were limited to delaying legislation already passed by the Reichstag. There was to be a President elected by universal suffrage for a period of seven years. He occupied the position of head of the state. He had the power to appoint and dismiss the Chancellor to dissolve the Reichstag and rule by decree in time of emergency.

The Chancellor was more powerful than the President and was a member of the Reichstag where he should be able to command a majority of votes. He chose the Cabinet and they both were responsible to the Reichstag. Provision was made for a plebiscite on controversial matters within the country. A supreme court was established. The Constitution guaranteed freedom of the press, of speech and of assembly and restricted personal and property right in the interest of general welfare. It provided for universal suffrage for men and women over twenty. The sovereign power proceeded form the people for the first time in

German history. The Weimar Constitution was a genuine democratic document. The Framers of this constitution were very ambitious and hopeful. They expected too much in too short a time. In 1919 the new constitution was compelled to accept the Treaty of Versailles. It was not easy for Germany to change form a rigid autocracy with its militarist tradition into a full-fledged republic.

The Weimar Republic

Having framed the constitution, the National Assembly returned to Berlin and acted as the Reichstag until it was replaced by the election of 1920. The early years of the Weimar Republic were difficult years of national humiliation and economic adversity. Germany was treated as an outcaste among the nations. Her territory was occupied by foreign troops and she had to submit herself to supervision of foreign commission for the execution of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. The heavy burden of reparations led to the economic crisis in 1923. In the beginning, Germany tried hard to fulfil her obligations and was only able to do with the foreign loans. At the beginning of 1923, Germany was not able to continue her payments to France. Consequently, the French military sources occupied the Ruhr Valley, the industrial centre of Germany. This French occupation lasted till 1925. The German workers refused to work for the French occupation force. The government, instead of taxing the rich for the reduction of national debt, resorted to inflation. As a result of the French occupation of the Ruhr Valley, the German workers laid down their tools and refused to serve the invaders. Attempting to support the idle industries and men, the Government, had to print mere paper money which led to greater inflation. German money lost its value and the cost of living went up by leaps and bounds.

These adverse economic conditions had two important results. Extremist political organizations such as the New Nazi party and the Communist Party flourished in 1923 and threatened the stability of the new Government. The useful result of these difficulties was that the United States of America decided to lend large sum of money to Germany in order to help her get over the economic crisis. By the Dawes plan in 1924 and Young Plan in 1929, accepted by the German Foreign Minister, Gustav Stresemann, Germany received valuable aid from the United States of America; Reparation was reduced by a system of phased instalments. The fulfilment of German's obligations was the keynote of Stresemann's policy. He wanted to demonstrate to the world that Germany could be a responsible member in the society of nations. By the new financial arrangements, the years after 1924 saw an economic

recovery inside Germany. By the Treaty of Locarno (1925), Germany was accepted by the Western nations and in 1926 Germany joined the League of Nations. This happy state of affairs ended after October 1929 the month of the Wall Street Crash. The German economy had existed on American loans and when they were terminated, the economy declined with disastrous results. Production decreased and unemployment rose. It affected the political situation also. No political party commanded a majority in the Reichstag. The President Von Hindenburg was compelled to govern by decree. It was against this background of economic and political disasters, the new party the Nazi party, assumed power in Germany. The leader of this party was Adolf Hitler.

Adolf Hitler

Adolf Hitler was an Austrian by birth and an artisan in the building trade by profession. His father was a minor customs official at School. He was quite undistinguished though he had a particular liking for history. After leaving school he tried various occupations but was unable to settle into anything definite. He was a road sweeper, an artist, a labourer and a house painter by turns. It was during this period he developed the ideas which became basic to Nazi Movement, especially about the social inequalities and the inferiority of the Jews. After staying at Vienna for many years, he returned to Germany, to Munich to which he was attached for the rest of his life, when the War broke out, in 1914, he joined the army and retired as a corporal in 1918. He was extremely disappointed when the armistice was signed by the Kaiser in 1918. He wanted to continue fighting.

He remained in the army after the War and was employed by the military authorities as a spy within Germany to discover the opinion of the Germans. It was during this time he attended a meeting of the German Workers Party - a new right wing party with strong views on race and nationalism. This party was founded by Anton Drexler. Hitler was admitted as seventh member. By and by, the party developed into a nationwide organization, with Hitler as its leader. It changed its name to the National socialist German workers party known as Nazi from the first four letters of National or as National Socialism. It adopted as its symbol, the ancient symbol of the swastika. Many Germans were discontented with the Treaty of Versailles. Among them were less Goering and Goebbels who joined this new party.

The Munich Putsch

The new Nazi party attempted to overthrow Government of Germany by force. The attempt was made at Munich and the Nazis expected to receive more support than they actually gained. This happened when the French occupied the Ruhr and the German self – confidence needed a stimulus'. Hitler called to secure the support of either the separatists (who wanted to separate the Southern area of Bavaria from German control) or the other in Munich. The Weimar Government suppressed the rising completely. Hitler was sentenced to five years imprisonment. In fact, he served only nine months. It was while he was in prison, that Hitler wrote *Mein Kampf* (My struggle) which was partly an autobiography by and partly a document of Nazi ideas. He repudiated the parliamentary practice of majority rule. The main idea that it advanced was the superiority of the Aryan race over inferior races just as the Jews and to some extent the slaves. There was a suggestion for the extermination of the inferior races. He also laid down the idea that Germany must expand both in area and population. The aim of National Socialism must be to secure for the German people ‘an extension of the space in which our people must live’. Conquest of Russia and expansion of Germany in the east were part of his scheme for providing living space for the Germans. He expressed a feeling of hatred towards France in the following words. “France is the external and mortal enemy of the German nation”. Regarding the mass of the German people, he said they should not be given democratic rights as they were incapable of using them. Instead, they must accept authority over them. In short, *Mein Kampf* continued “a programme of future persecution, war and autocracy and the basic tenets of *Mein Kampf* were never changed. It became the Bible of Nazism”.

Nazi Propaganda

By addressing large audiences, he vehemently criticized the Treaty of Versailles. He also drew up a programme which contained twenty five points. The first demand was “the union of all Germans in” a Pan German State based on the principle of self-determination. The second was the abrogation of the treaties; the third included the need for colonies for providing a settlement of the surplus population. He planned to replace the professional army by a national army and also to create a strong central authority in Germany. Semitism occupied prominent place in programme which paved the way for exclusion of the Jews from the rights of citizenship, 16.6.3 Growth of National Socialism There was hardly any progress made by National Socialist Party during the period between 1924 - 29 During the years of prosperity, the Nazi representation in the Reichstag fell and in 1928, there were only 12 members. The economic and political chaos after 1929, added to the autocracy of Chancellor.

The years between 1930 and 1932, were favourable for the growth of the Nazi party which has 230 members in the Reichstag, when Von Hindenburg appointed Hitler as Chancellor, in 1933 the Nazi Party was the single political party that dominated the elections. In this way Germany followed the precedent set by Italy and became a totalitarian state. In August 1934 President Von Hindenburg died, the offices of president and Chancellor were merged. Thus Hitler became the dictator of Germany and began a spectacular career that created a terror all over Europe within next five years.

Causes

The rise of Socialism can be traced to the sovereignty of the terms imposed upon Germany by the Treaty of Versailles. The degrading conditions of the Peace Settlement destroyed the self - respect of German people. In their despondency they were ready to follow the leader who would help them to regain their self respect. This view is a disputable one. In the first place, fourteen years had elapsed between the War and the Nazi Party's coming to power. Secondly, when Germany's prestige was at its lowest ebb, the National Socialists were not too powerful. Thirdly, the Nazis came to power. After Germany recovered her status after Treaty of Locarno, and her entry into the League of Nations. Lastly, the occupied territory had been completely evacuated and the payment of reparations was ended in 1931. Growth of Communism in Germany was another factor which encouraged the National Socialists to consolidate their power. In 1930 and 1932, the Nationalists suffered a reverse, and the Communist won 100 seats. But the widespread of a communist revolution furnished the National Socialists with all resources they needed to carry out their programme. The wealthy Germans gave their support to the Nazis as bulwark against Communism.

Unlimited mean of publicity was provided through the support of the leading film and press magnets that belonged to a party on the extreme Right. The historic feud between the Teutonic and Slavoc races was revived and strengthened by the desire to gain control of the natural resources of the Ukraine. The Anti - committer (Anti - Communist) Pact created between Germany and Japan in 1936 strengthened the position of the totalitarian States. This gave rise to the opinion that the National Socialists had saved Germany from communism. The economic unrest that prevailed in Germany had been fully exploited by the National Socialists to consolidate their position. They worked upon the anti capitalist feeling of the lower middle class composed of peasants and small traders to whom they made lavish promises. Agriculturists who were burdened with debt were assured to help from public

funds. Petty shopkeepers were encouraged by their promise that the large stores would be communalized immediately. The Nazis enlisted in the cause a large number of unemployed men. The policy of Anti Semitism followed by the National Socialists and the organization of Storm Troopers made the National Socialists very powerful in Germany. The tactic of terrorism, the use of propaganda and the lack of unity among those who opposed National Socialism, enabled the Nazis to become predominant in Germany.

Hitler as a Dictator

Lenin and Mussolini became dictators after several years, but it took Hitler only little more than eighteen months to gain supreme power in Germany. In February 1933 the Reichstag was set on fire just before election and Hitler accused the Communists of being responsible for his act of anarchy. This resulted in wholesale persecution of Communists, their internment in concentration camps and exclusion from officers of importance. In 1933 Hitler was able to secure two thirds majority in the Reichstag which gave him supreme power. By and by all other political parties were suppressed. Leaders like Rohm who helped Hitler to supreme power in the early days were considered as a source of danger to his regime in 1934 and they were either shot or suffered persecution. Finally, after the death of Von Hindenburg, Hitler became the sole head of state.

Thus, the Third Reich was established and intended by Hitler to last for a thousand years, it collapsed in 1945, after lasting for twelve years. 16.6.6 Internal Policy In the Third Reich, the forces of liberalism were suppressed; nationalism in its most extreme form became powerful. "Totalitarianism and racial exclusiveness served as the twin - pillars of the National Socialist regime" One of Hitler's first decrees was to lay down that, "There is only one political party in Germany and that is the National Socialist German Worker's Party". The influence of the party was felt in every sphere of life, social, political, economic or cultural. It abolished the freedom of the press, the radio, the universities, schools, stage and cinema. There were no individual unions. Government was centralized and it was vested in the Dictator. Hitler consolidated his control on the government by appointing Nazi leaders to important posts. He followed the Anti Jewish policy. He deprived the Jews of their right for citizenship, to follow different professions and to own property. Even non Aryan Christians suffered the same fate. They were brutally persecuted and excluded from the economic and cultural life of Germany.

The persecution of the Jews and non - Aryan Christians was followed by the persecution of Roman Catholics and Protestants, because they could not be fitted into the National Socialist conception of the state. Thus, National Socialism found itself opposed by the three religions of the Western world. Hitler was able to dominate most of the Lutheran Church through Pastor Luding Muller, but a section of the church led by Pastor Neimoller was opposed to Hitler. Neimoller and many other pastors were sent to concentration camps. The Catholic Church signed a Concordat with the Nazi regime in 1933 by which the liberty of Church was guaranteed. Later the Concordat was broken and persecution continued.

Economy under Hitler

The most important factor which made Hitler's regime popular was the improvement in German economy. The abolition of reparations by the Allies contributed to this improvement. He inaugurated large public works schemes. German armament and Hitler's attention to the army helped to solve the question of employment. Big industrial concern like the firms of Krupp and Tyson supported Hitler in his career and he have them encouragement to expand. He wanted to make Germany economically self sufficient. In order to do that, the expansion of German lands would be necessary and that might end in war. In the place of trade unions a 'Labour Front' was established in 1934; both employers and employees represented in it aimed at improving the condition of the labourers.

Foreign Policy

Under the Weimar Republic, successive German Government had followed a policy of collaboration with the Western powers. The increasing friendship between France represented by Briand and Germany by Stresemann was a special feature of the foreign policy of the twenties. This led to world friendship as witnessed in the Locarno Pact in 1925. The spirit friendship did not survive after the Weimar Republic, but the fear of War, made the leading statesmen of Western Europe especially those of France and Britain to follow a policy of economic and later on territorial appeasement towards Germany. Hey felt that great injustice had been done to Germany by the Treaty of Versailles. After Hitler's accession of power in 1933, the foreign policy of Germany was completely changed to one of aggression. The new regime rejected compromise and relied on force. The repudiated treaties and resorted to sudden attacks without a warning. Taking advantage of the prevailing views about Treaty of Versailles and weakness of the League of Nations, Hitler appealed for disarmament by all the powers. When it was felt that his plea for disarmament was getting no support

among the powers he withdrew from the Disarmament Conference at Geneva in 1933 and also from the League of Nations. Germany renounced the terms of the Treaty of Versailles about the restriction of her army and introduced conscription in 1935 in the same year, the Anglo - German Naval Treaty was signed by which Britain recognized German's right to build a navy though reduced in size.

The rearmament by Germany in 1935 prompted the formation of alliance among European powers. In 1936, Hitler ordered the German troops to occupy the demilitarised Rhineland and thus repudiated the Treaty of Versailles for the second time. The Western powers did nothing about it and Hitler was encouraged to make further demands. In October 1936, the first agreement between Germany and Italy, known as the Rome - Berlin Axis was made. The Anti - Comintern Pact was signed between Germany and Japan in 1936. Italy joined the Anti - Comintern Pact in 1937. Thus the three countries associated together. This resulted in tripartite pact between Germany.

Italy and Japan.

Hitler's policy of securing for the German people enough living space (lebensraum) made him to launch on his aggressive campaign. The first victim of Germany's territorial ambitions was the Austrian Republic. a. The Anschluss the German- Anschluss (union) with Austria took place in 1938. The Austrians had many characteristics in common with the Germans; both belonged to the Teutonic race and spoke the same language. As early as 1919, there was a move on the part of the Austrians to unite with the German Reich. A new situation arose when the National Socialists came into power in Germany. The National socialists were encouraged to resort to terrorist methods, when they were persecuted by the Austrian Government they fled to Germany. The German Reich openly encouraged subversive element in Austria. Dr. Dollfuss the Chancellor, who had come under the influence of Italy, suspended the constitution and ruled as a dictator. He attempted to set up a Corporate State on the model of Fascist Italy. In 1934, Austrian National murdered the Chancellor at the investigation of Germany.

The new Chancellor Dr. Schuschanig followed the policy of his predecessor. In 1938, he was summoned to Germany and forced by Hitler to appoint a leading Austrian and Nazi as Minister of the Interior and give greater freedom to the Austrian Nazis. When Schuschnigg suggested a plebiscite to be held on the question of the union of Austria with Germany, Hitler forced him to resign fearing that the majority of the Austrians would vote for the

independence of the country. The German forces occupied Austria in 1938 and Austria became part of the German Reich. Italy supported this move. There was general satisfaction all over Germany. France and Britain considered this action of Germany justifiable on the grounds of social kinship. Czechoslovakia was filled with fear as a neighbouring country. b. Czechoslovakia became in many respects a model democratic republic. She followed a policy of friendship with her neighbours. Her main problem was with minorities, the Hungarians, the Poles and the most powerful group being the Germans in the West. A powerful pro-Nazi Party was led by Konrad Henlein.

The Germans under his leadership demanded self-government for Sudetenland where the Germans were concentrated. Germany was about to invade Czechoslovakia in 1938. Britain tried to maintain peace between Germany and Czechoslovakia. It was decided that the area occupied by the Germans should go to Germany but Germany wanted the whole of Sudetenland. c. The Munich Pact (1938) The conference at Munich was attended by Chamberlain the British Prime Minister, Daladier of France.

Hitler and Mussolini.

Sudetenland was given to Germany. So, at the cost of Czechoslovakia, peace was maintained in Europe and war was averted for the time being. Yet the international difference continued to centre in Czechoslovakia. Since Munich, it had suffered further aggression. In November 1938, a large portion in the south was given to neighbouring countries. Rumania, the eastern district was occupied by Hungary in 1939. Hitler demanded that all Germans living in other parts of Czechoslovakia should be given special privileges. The Czechs gave way to his demands. By 1939, Czechoslovakia ceased to exist as an independent state.

The Final Stage of Aggression (1938 - 39)

In March 1938 Hitler forced Lithuania to hand over the German Mainland, a strip of territory to the South of Lithuania where the population was predominantly German. Finally, Hitler turned his attention to Poland. He demanded two things; the control of all road and rail transport across the 'Polish Corridor' to East Prussia and the possession of the seaport of Danzig where the Germans were in a majority. In the light of the events in Czechoslovakia, Britain and France gave assurance to Poland of protection in the event of attack by Germany. Hitler denounced the Anglo-German Naval Treaty assigned in 1935.

The Western Powers turned towards Russia in 1936 in their search for allies. Negotiations were suspended due to changes in the Foreign Ministry in Moscow. Molotov replaced Litvinov. A non aggression pact was signed between Russia and Germany. In the event of war, Germany was sure that she would not be faced with a war on the eastern as well as on the western front. Hitler knew that the Western Powers would come to Poland's help if he attacked her. The people in Germany also were not as enthusiastic about war in 1939 as they were in 1914. Hitler insisted that the Poles should accept his demands. When they failed to do so, Hitler moved the German troops into Poland without any declaration of war (September 1, 1939). Both Britain and France declared war on Germany. Thus began the Second World War.

22. The Second World War (1939 - 45)

In a sense, the Second World War was the offspring of the Peace settlement of 1919. As noted earlier, the spirit of vengeance which the victorious Powers exhibited in drawing up the clauses of the Treaty of Versailles made the German revengeful. The peace makers gave a one sided verdict in analyzing the cause of the war and consequently Germany was charged with having started the war. The way in which Germans was asked to pay a huge war indemnity was deeply resented among the Germans. At any time, no wonder, they were ready to defy the clauses of the Peace Treaties. Hitler came forward with the promise to redeem the Germans and the nation considered him its leader and saviour.

Causes of the Second World War

Colonial and commercial rivalry also became an important factor for the outbreak of war. Italy, Japan and Germany were deeply disappointed after the first - World War for the simple reason that Japan and Italy could not get a fair share of the spoils and Germany was deprived of their colonies. They were jealous of the fact that a major portion of the earth's surface was monopolized by Britain, France, America, Belgium, Holland and Portugal. Foreign markets were closed to Japan, Italy and Germany. They were not able to procure raw materials to run their factories. No wonder they tried to compensate by jumping upon weak nations. It was on this basis that Japan attacked Manchuria in 1931. Italy attacked Abyssinia in 1935 and Germany adopted a policy of Aggression in 1936.

a. Another cause of the War was Japanese imperialism. The ambitions of Japan increased during World War I. Although both Japan and China had fought on the side of the Allies

during World War I at the end of the War in 1918, Japan was allowed to have many concessions at the expenses of China. She started developing her navy. By 1930, the strength of Japan rapidly increased. In 1931, she pounced upon Manchuria and occupied the country in spite of the action of the League of Nations. However, this did not satisfy the Japanese ambitions. In 1937, Japan started her aggression upon China and the Chinese cities one by one fell into the hands of the Japanese forces. Not only Peking but also Nanking fell before the Japanese forces. When World War II broke out in 1939, the Sino - Japanese war was still in progress. Japan entered the war in 1941 when they attacked she pearl Harbour. However, she had already joined the Berlin - Rome - Tokyo Axis. The Pan Japanese programme of expansion and conquest was bound to result in war and peace was impossible in such circumstances.

b. There was also the conflict of ideologies between dictatorship on the one hand and democracy on the other. Countries like Germany, Italy and Japan represented one kind of ideology and Great Britain, France and the U.S.A. represented another pattern. Basically, the distinction between the two ideologies lay in the different attitudes towards the individual in the state. In the case of democracy, the individual was regarded the creator and beneficiary of all states activities. He could be interfered with, only when his acts were prejudicial to the interests of other citizens. Under the totalitarian regime, the individual did not figure anywhere. He was to be merged with the state and sacrifice for the sake of the state. The two ideologies also differed in spiritual, economic and territorial matters.

c. As noted earlier, the failure of the League of Nations made the path clear for another war. It miserably failed in all its attempts at disarmament. Since the entire world was bubbling and boiling with crisis, war was inevitable. The League of Nations ceased to exist as an effective force after her failure on the question of Manchuria and Abyssinia. Both big and small states lost their confidence in that international organization and the only alternative left was that the parties may have a trial of their strength by an armed conflict. At last fortune smile on Russia and she won the war.

In fact, it was the beginning of the end of Germany. d. At this juncture, Japan decided that the time was ripe for the creation of her eastern empire. On December 7th 1941, she launched her treacherous air attack on the U.S. navy at Pearl Harbour in Hawaii destroying a greater part of the fleet. From Indo - China (Vietnam), they launched an attack on Malaya and Siam. They quickly overran the ill prepared British defences of Singapore and Hongkong,

and the Japanese advanced towards India. The Americans were driven from the Philippines and the Japanese occupied the entire main Island in that area. It is strange that Japan, which once joined hands with Great Britain in the First World War, joined with the Axis Powers, in the Second World War. e. By attacking the Pearls Harbour, Japan dragged the U.S. also into the War, thereby digging its own grave.

The moment American entered the field, the tide of war had turned in 1943 in favour of the Allied Powers. The year, 1944, proved to be a fruitful one for the Allies. In that year, the liberation of France took place. By July 4, Rome was also liberated. By July 1944, the Russians had recovered all their territory and carried the War vigorously against Germany. On 7th May 1945, the War came to an end in Europe with the unconditional surrender of the German High Command. A few days before this, Hitler had committed suicide and in Italy Mussolini had already been shot dead by Italian partisans. f. In the meanwhile, on the Pacific, Front, the U.S.A. has taken the offensive against Japan in late 1943. On August 6th 1945, with the ultimate purpose of smashing Japan the first atom bomb was dropped on Hiroshima. In one devastating blast, the city was totally destroyed. Russia now declared war upon Japan and invaded Manchuria. On August 9th the second atom bomb was dropped on Nagasaki and on 14th August Japan surrendered.

The Second World War came to an end in 1945. 17.4 Course of the War As we have seen earlier, the global war broke out on September 3, 1939, when Germany rejected the demand by Great Britain and France to withdraw her troops from Poland. Warsaw, Poland's capital was bombed and seized on September 27th. Under the terms of the Soviet German Pact, Russian forces occupied Eastern Poland on September 17th. Russia also annexed the Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and, after a four month war secured territories from Finland. Germany next overran Denmark and Norway. (1941) and Sweden which came to terms with Hitler and promised help. Then Holland, Luxemburg and Belgium were invaded by Germans. In May 1940, France was severely attacked in the north and from the centre and she surrendered in June 1940. The Collapse of the French troops placed the British in a perilous position. Thus, by June 1940, German armies occupied the whole of Western Europe. Now, Hitler's sole aim was to take possession of Great Britain as a whole. Winston Churchill, the British Prime Minister, infused courage into the heart of his people.

The German Air Force struck in London and the Battle of Britain had begun. There was every possibility for Germany to win the game. But fortunately American came to the

rescue of Great Britain. Soon after World War II started, President Franklin D Roosevelt requested the Congress to pass the Neutrality Acts of 1939. These laws permitted the belligerents the purchase war materials, provided they paid cash and carried the goods away in their own vessels. Cash and carry was designed to give limited assistance to England and France and at the same time maintained American neutrality. After the fall of France, however America began to give military aid to England by all means. Later, America gave aid to other Allies, including Russia. In the meantime Hitler made the biggest mistake of the war in threat on June 22, 1941 he tore up the Soviet German Pact and launched his force Against Russia. Hitler invaded Russia for simple reason that Russia might stab Germany in the back. Both sides staked everything and threw all the man - power.

Character of the War

1. Total War The war was fought not only by armed forces at the battle - front but also by civilians in factories and at home. Even school children took part, collecting scrap metal, rubber and newspaper. This most extensive war was fought on all major seas, and in Africa, Asia and Europe. It involved almost 60 nations. Seven of them on the side of the Axis.
2. To plan a global military strategy, top Allied leaders held a series of conferences such as the ones at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam.
3. Scientific Progress Scientists and engineers devised or adopted for war purposes such inventions as radar, guided missiles, jet propelled planes, magnetic mines and atom bombs. World War II witnessed the use of blood plasma, 2. Global War penicillin and sulphur drugs to save lives.
4. Major role of the Aeroplane Great fleets of aeroplanes attacked troop and naval units, destroyed railroads and industrial establishments and prepared the way for invasion.

Consequences

It has been estimated that more than 70 million people were actively engaged in the War. More than 22 million people were killed and the military expenditure involved in the War was more than 1,117, 000,000,000 and damage to property was more than twice this figure. After the War was over, separate peace treaties were concluded with Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Finland. Even before the end of the War, the 'Big Five' such as U.S.S.R., U.S.A., Great Britain, France and China held a number of conferences. Italy was forced to surrender African empire and she was also asked to pay war indemnities to the

Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and Greece. In administration, Germany was divided into two; West Germany was put up under the control of Britain and U.S. and East Germany under that of the Soviet Union. A new democratic constitution for Japan was set up by U.S. with an elected Parliament and cabinet responsible to it. The first election under the new constitution was on 10th April, 1946. The Asian and African colonial people embraced intense nationalism and this hastened the downfall of Western imperialism.

One important result of the war lies in the fact that both the United States and the Soviet Union emerged as two super power having entirely two different political ideologies. In both Italy and Germany, the War entirely put an end to dictatorships. Moreover, it had created the urge for freedom. Consequently, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon and Indonesian countries attained freedom. The People's Republic of China was established. Added to all these to maintain peace and amity for humanity as a whole, the United Nations Organization came into existence.

23. The United Nations Organization

Introduction

When the Second World War was still going on, peace lovers of the world wasted no time in straining every one of their nerves to set up a world body to preserve international peace and unit. Hence the establishment of United Nations Organisation. The peace lovers who played the leading role in creating this world body were President. Roosevelt (U.S.A). Prime Minister Churchill (Great Britain) and Stalin (U.S.S.R). Under their ceaseless initiative, representatives of fifty – one nations met at San Francisco on April 25, 1945, while the war was still going on and devised a plan for lasting peace. The plan adopted in this conference was embodied in the form of a charter which is a charter of the U.N.O.

Eighteen acres of land in and Manhattan, New York up the U.N. Head quarters, this land was a gift to the U.N. by John D. Rockefeller. Jr...One of the multimillionaires of the world. Strictly speaking the United Nation is not a nation. For it is a world government. But the U.N. is great force to keep the peace in the world. Its main purpose is to preserve international peace and security to raise the standard of living and to better the way of life for people in all parts of the world. This is indicated in Article I of the Charter. Article 2 stresses the equality of all members in the Organisation and emphasizes the point that it will not intervene in any internal affairs of States, except to enforce measures already decided upon,

The Charter declares that “in order to ensure all, the rights and benefits and resulting from membership, all shall fulfil in good the obligations assumed by them”. The cost of the U.N. born by all its member nations is very cheap. The average American pays eleven cents a year. People of other countries even less. The share of each country is fixed according to its ability to pay. The U.N. has five official languages, namely Chinese, French, Russian, Spanish and English. If a delegate speaks in any one of these five languages, in interpreters immediately translate the speech into other languages. The member nations of the U.N. are bound together by their Charter or Constitution. The U.N. has been called an international Bill of Rights, Since the U.N. Charter came into force on October 24, 1945, and this day has been observed as U.N.Day.

Organization of the U.N

There are many committees, commissions and councils in the U.N. to help carry out its purposes the charter itself names only six principle organs, namely.

1. The General Assembly
2. The Security Council
3. The Economic and Social Council
4. The Trusteeship Council
5. The International Court of Justice
6. The Secretariat

The general Assembly is the central organ of the U.N. All member countries are represented in it. The General Assembly meets regularly each year for a period of about three months. Each member country can send five representatives, but has only one vote. It has got the power of removing any member country for violation of the provisions of the Charter on the recommendations of the Security Council. At present there are 205 members in the U.N from 1992. The Security Council was designed to be the main guardian of peace. While the General Assembly deals with all questions, the Security Council only deals with questions of peace and security. In the initial stages, there were only eleven members in the Security Council, but in 1966 the number was raised to fifteen. Five of these nations are permanent members. They are United Kingdom, United States, Soviet Union, France and People's

Republic of China. The other ten members are elected for two year term by the General Assembly.

The Veto voting in the Security Council is different from voting in the General Assembly. Each member nation of the 15 in the Security Council is represented by only one delegate and has one vote. Generally on matters dealing with the conduct of business, decisions are made by seven states. But on all other matters, the five permanent members must be included in majority vote for seven. When any permanent member votes against a decision, this is called a veto. When any permanent member is itself involved in a quarrel where force is used, it cannot vote.

The Economic and Social Council works for the economic and social advancement of all people. It is elected by the Assembly for a three year term. The work of the council is assisted by special committees. These committees make special studies of the spot and pass their recommendation to the Economic and social council. The main functions of the council are as following. 1. It initiates studies and recommendations on International social, economic, culture, educational, health and other related matters. 2. It works for the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedom of all people. 3. Besides holding international conference on any matter of concern, it also coordinates the work of several specialized agencies.

The Trusteeship Council supervises the work of those States. It took over the administration of various territories. Some of them were the old mandates of the League of Nations it was composed of those members administering trust territories and those permanent members of Security Council who administer trust territories. The international Court of Justice is established at The Hague Netherlands. It is composed of 15 judges elected by the General Assembly and Security Council. The judges serve for 9 years and may be re-elected. The Court deals with all cases of international disputes put before it. It also gives judicial advice to General Assembly. Security Council and other organs of the United Nations. The Secretariat comprises the Secretary General and his staff. The Secretary General is appointed by the Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council. Secretaries General of the past and present have been Mr. Trygve Lie (Norway). Mr., Dag Hammarskjold (Sweden) Mr. U.Thant (Burma), Mr. Kurt Waldheim (Austria) Cuellar (Peru) and Kofi Annan. At present Pan-Ki-Moon is the secretary- general of U.N.O who belongs to South Korea.

The Secretary - General has the duty of bringing before the Organisation any matter threatening peace and he gives a yearly report to the Assembly, He enjoys greater powers than did his predecessor in the League of Nations. In addition to these six bodies, there are some specialized agencies which deal with mainly specific international problems. Mention may be about them: (1) The international Labour Organization (I.L.O). Its aim is to improve labour conditions (2) The Food and Agricultural Organization (F.A.O.). Its aim is to infuse knowledge relating to food and agriculture. (3) The United Nations Education Scientific and Culture Organization (U.N.E.S.C.O). It aims at promoting international peace and security through education, science and culture. (4) The International Bank of Reconstruction and Development (I.B.R.D). It assists the reconstruction and the development of member countries by lending loans for constructive purposes. (5) International Monetary Fund (I.M.F). Its objects are to establish an International Monetary System stabilizes currencies and to promote international trade. (6) World Health Organization (W.H.O) its functions are to co-ordinate international health work, to eradicate epidemic and other disease and to promote the improvement of nutrition, housing sanitation etc,

Important Problems before the U.N. 1945 –1984 the early work of the U.N, was made difficult through the development of ideological conflict (Cold war) between the United States and Soviet Union. However, it has done yeomen service to humanity. One of the first matters before the Security Council was the Persian complaint in 1946 that Soviet troops were still in northern Persia beyond the agreed time. The Security Council earnestly requested Persia and the Soviet Union to report the progress made in withdrawal by 6th May. Fortunately by that date Soviet troop had been withdrawn.

Greece

The outbreak of the Civil War in Greece in 1946 presented the United Nations with a number of difficult problems. In December 1946 the Greek Government complained that Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia were aiding the Communist guerrilla forces across their frontiers. A Commission of investigation was sent out and reported their intervention was taking place. But the Soviet Union denied the charge. However, the Assembly appointed a special committee to investigate.

The Soviet Union did not participate in this special committee. At last the war ended at the instance of the American help to Greece. In this case, the U.N. had found the east - west conflict cutting across its efforts to stop the fighting. 18.3.2 Indonesia At the end of the

Second World War, both the British and the India troops had occupied Indonesia. The native severely detested the alien presence on their soil. So, fighting broke out. In 1946 a truce was achieved and by the truce both the troops were to occupy the place. However, soon Indonesia became a republic. But the Dutch aimed at incorporating the Indonesian Republic in the Dutch Common Wealth on similar lines to the British. This was not liked by the Indonesian people; thereby hostilities broke out between them. This question was brought before the General Assembly, but the Dutch claimed that Indonesia belonged to her and so it was an internal problem. A true between the Dutch and their opponents was signed in 1948. Again trouble started in January 1949; the Security Council earnestly requested a cessation of hostilities and also recommended the creation of completely independent Indonesia. For this purpose the U.N. appointed a special commission and the Republic of Indonesia came into being on 27 December, 1949.

Hungary issue

The Soviet Union undertook a military action in Hungry in 1959. The question was brought before the Security Council and the Security Council in turn requested the Soviet Union to cease the military action. But this was vetoed by the Soviet representative. The General Assembly also passed resolutions requesting the Soviet Union to respect the right of the Hungarian people, but the resolutions were ignored by Russia. 18.3.4 Kashmir issue serious conflict arose in 1948 between India and Pakistan over Kashmir issue. The Government of Kashmir decided on union with India in 1947, but there was immediate opposition from the Muslim tribes and at the same time Indian forces entered Kashmir. India accused Pakistan for encouraging Muslim opposition but this was denied. U.N. observers assisted in securing a cease fire in 1949 and a truce line was established. But despite numerous efforts by the U.N. no agreement on the future of Kashmir was achieved. Friction arose later between the two countries and this lead to the out-break of the war in September 1965. The war ended by the Tashkent Declaration of 1966 between the two states.

Palestine Issue

The British Government brought the question of Palestine before the U.N. and requested its assistance dealing with the conflict between the Jews and Arabs. A UN Special Committee on Palestine was setup. The Committee proposed the division of Palestine between Jews and Arabs and establishment of an international government for Jerusalem. This led to further strife between the two rival groups. In 1948, Britain withdrew her forces

and the State of Israel was proclaimed. This was done at the Instance of the U.N; Swedish mediator, Count Bernadotte. But the creation of the new Israeli Nation was not liked by the Arabs.

Then the Arabs attacked Israel but the U.N. warned of deterrent step to be pursued if the Arabs did not stop fighting. Soon the Swedish mediator was assassinated and another mediator, Ralph Bunche, was sent. He secured an armistice between Israel and the Arab States in 1949. However this did not help the problem. The accession of Nasser in Egypt further worsened the situation. On 29th October, 1956, Israel forces invaded Sinai and the Gaza strip. She had complained of Nasser's refusal to allow the passage of Israeli vessels through the Suez Canal and that the Arabs had infiltrated over her borders. It precipitated further struggle in that both Great Britain and France took direct action against Egypt, the Soviet Union was also involved in the strife against Great Britain, fortunately for mankind the calamity was averted by the U.N. and on November 2, the General Assembly demanded the withdrawal of Israel, French and British troops. Israel, Britain and France agreed to a cease – fire and Nasser accepted the U.N. force. Following the Arab – Israel War of 1967 U.N Security Council passed several resolutions calling for a cease fire. These resolutions accepted by the victorious Israelites and eventually by the three vanquished Arab States. Helped to end the hostilities. The security council later unanimously adopted a resolution calling for the withdrawal of Israel troops from the conquered territories the right of every state in the Middle East to live in peace, free navigation of international water ways, just settlement of the refugee problem and the appointment of a special U.N. representative by the Secretary General to seek agreement in accordance with this resolution. Gunnar Jarring, a Swedish diplomat who had been appointed as the U.N. representative could not make any progress towards a settlement.

The Arab – Israeli forces had another round of fighting in the year 1973 and the War was brought to an end by the United Nations. Egypt had won-back much of the territories that she lost during the 1967 conflict. It is no exaggeration to say that much been achieved under the auspicious of the U.N. towards peace in the Middle East, the Suez Canal has been re-opened for international shipping once again. Serious discussion has been going on in the U.N. Security Council over the question of creating a separate state for the Palestinian refugees. Since 1975, the Palestine Liberation Organization (P.L.O) has been given permanent observe status at the U.N.

Actions Pertaining to Social and Economic Matters

Children's fund

In 1946, the General Assembly created the United Nation International Children's Emergency fund (UNICEF). It provides foods, vitamins and medicine to millions of needy children; it trains nurses to help mothers in proper child care. UNICEF's activities now permanent are financed by voluntary contribution of governments and individuals. 18.4.2 Declaration of Human Rights In 1948 the General Assembly overwhelmingly approved the declaration of Human Rights. The declaration states that all human beings are born free and equal and without discrimination of any kind, are entitled to (a) Civil life, liberty, freedom of religion, speech and assembly; and a voice in their government; (b) legal right, freedom from arbitrary arrest and the right to a fair trial; (c) economic rights employment participation in labour unions, an adequate living standard, private property, and leisure time; and (d) social rights education and cultural life. Although those ideals will not soon be realized throughout the world they provide a standard of achievement for all people and nations.

Genocide Convention

In 1948, the General Assembly adopted the Genocide convention, drawn up by the commission on Human Rights. The convention declared illegal the deliberate extermination of any human group as the Nazis had attempted against the Jews and provides the victims be tried before an international court. The convention, ratified by 63 nations, represents attempt to rally world opinions in favour of granting all people freedom from fear.

Technical Assistance

In the year 1949, the U.N. and several specialized agencies, began the expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. This endeavour, new part of U.N. Development Programme, coordinated efforts to improve social and economic conditions all over 140 underdeveloped countries chiefly in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Several thousand technical experts have helped under - developed people to increase food production, develop natural resource and industries, fight disease and reduce illiteracy. Also nationals or under - developed countries have received fellowship for study abroad so that they can return to their homelands as expert technicians and professionals.

Improvement of the U.N.

Over League of Nations the League of Nations included Russia only for a short time and never secured American membership. The U.N. contains both these great world powers. Firstly, the League Covenant permitted members to withdraw great world's powers. Secondly, the League Covenant permitted members to withdraw as in the cases of Germany, Italy and Japan. The U.N. Charter contains no such provision. Thirdly, the agencies of the League required a unanimous vote to recommend action. The U.N. Security Council requires nine out of fifteen votes (including the big five) and the U.N. General Assembly requires two-thirds vote. Lastly the League handled social and economic problems through minor and sometimes temporary agencies. The U.N. Economic and Social Council is a major and permanent agency.

An analysis of the United Nations

The United Nations is the World's most representative body of nations. It is a "Parliament of Man" accurately mirroring the hopes and fears of mankind. The U.N. provides a forum where any member nation may discuss world problem and present its point of view to world public opinion. Through the U.N. many international problems had been solved; brought closer to a closer to a solution or at least kept from erupting into major war. The U.N. has secured the military co-operation of a number of member nations. To give an example U.N. is doing its utmost to secure a permanent peace settlement in the Middle East. The specialized agencies have worked steadfastly towards eliminating some of the economic and social cause of war. The U.N. in short keeps the world from reverting to total international anarchy. It serves as a bridge between the opposing sides in the cold war and enables the neutral nations to bring their influence to bear upon world problems.

A Pessimistic View:

Problems besetting the U.N there are important blocs in the U.N. and U.N. members often consider international problems on the basis of bloc interests. The Western bloc generally supports American leadership. The communist bloc consistently follows Russian Policy. Of late, Communist China which has found its way in United Nations as a permanent member of the Security Council has now created bloc of its own. The Afro-Asian bloc mostly remains neutral; they can use their voting power to influence either the Communist or the Western bloc. The veto power given to permanent members of the Security Council has severely limited the effectiveness of Security Council and decreased its importance. The U.N. has no permanent military forces of its own. It depends upon member nations to honour

resolution requesting armed forces. The U.N. finds itself in financial crisis because certain nations have not paid all their subscriptions.

Specialized Agencies of United Nations

The UN maintains close working relationships with 15 international organizations that have been designated as "specialized agencies" of the UN, even though they are independent legal entities. Each specialized agency operates autonomously under the UN's umbrella, with its own governing body, procedural rules, membership, and funding mechanisms. Some of the specialized agencies predate the UN, having been established in the 19th century or in the aftermath of World War I by the League of Nations, the UN's predecessor. Some were founded concurrently with the UN at the end of World War II. Others were created more recently to meet emerging needs.

An alphabetical list of the UN's specialized agencies follows. For each specialized agency, its headquarters city, a brief description of its mission and a link to its website are provided. Visit the online Directory of UN System Organizations for a comprehensive listing of all UN-affiliated entities.

Food & Agriculture Organization (FAO) - Rome

The FAO coordinates international efforts to fight hunger and improve nutrition and food security by supporting research, facilitating the exchange of information and best practices, and by encouraging countries to adopt legislative and regulatory frameworks to promote sustainable agricultural development.

International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) - Montreal

The ICAO works with the 193 member states of the Convention on International Civil Aviation to develop consensus-driven international standards and practices to facilitate safe, reliable, efficient, and sustainable international air travel.

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) - Rome

IFAD was established in 1977 to work directly with the rural poor in developing countries, empowering them improve their agricultural practices, raise their productivity and incomes, and thereby eliminate poverty, hunger, and malnutrition.

International Labour Organization (ILO) - Geneva

Since it was founded in 1919, the ILO has solicited input from national governments, employers, and workers to establish internationally recognized labor standards enshrined in multilateral treaties. The ILO also develops policies and practices to promote safety and equality in the workplace and maintains a database of national laws governing labor and employment practices. The ILO was designated as the first specialized agency of the UN in 1946.

International Monetary Fund (IMF) - Washington, DC

The IMF's core mission is to maintain the stability of the international monetary system and mitigate the impact of financial crises. It does so by providing temporary financial assistance to national governments to help them cope with balance-of-payments adjustments and discourage them from resorting to competitive currency devaluations, which prolonged the Great Depression of the 1930s.

International Maritime Organization (IMO) - London

The IMO is responsible for maintaining the regulatory framework that governs the international shipping industry, ensuring a level playing field of universally recognized safety, security, and environmental standards for ship operators.

International Telecommunications Union (ITU) – Geneva

Founded in 1865 to promote international cooperation in the emerging telegraph industry, the ITU continues to facilitate connectivity in modern telecommunications networks. In addition to allocating the global radio spectrum and satellite orbits, the ITU oversees the development and adoption of technical standards that enable networks to interconnect seamlessly across national borders. It also strives to improve access to these technologies in underserved communities.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) - Paris

UNESCO promotes international cooperation in the fields of education, science, and culture. It places particular emphasis on recognizing the equal dignity of all cultures, the protection of cultural heritage in all its forms, and maintaining the right to freedom of expression.

United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) - Vienna

UNIDO's core mission is the promotion of industrial development for poverty reduction, inclusive globalization, and environmental sustainability. It accomplishes these goals through research and analysis, the development of normative standards, networking, knowledge transfer, and technical and industrial cooperation.

United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) - Madrid

The UNWTO works with national governments and private stakeholders to promote tourism as a driver of economic growth and development that is inclusive and accessible to all. It also facilitates the advancement and sharing of environmentally sustainable tourism policies and practices.

Universal Postal Union (UPU) - Bern, Switzerland

Since its founding in 1874, the UPU has set the rules for international mail and parcel delivery and provided a forum for cooperation and information-sharing among postal services worldwide. It also promotes the improvement of postal products and services through the adoption of new technologies.

World Health Organization (WHO) - Geneva

The WHO coordinates efforts among its 194 member states to improve the health of individuals and the provision of healthcare services. WHO's current priorities include increasing access to universal health coverage, the prevention and treatment of communicable and non-communicable diseases, and capacity-building measures to enable countries to manage health emergencies and prevent pandemics.

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) - Geneva

WIPO provides a policy forum for drafting and revising the treaty-based rules that recognize intellectual property rights at the international level. It also offers a range of services for protecting IP rights across borders, establishes common standards and classifications to facilitate information sharing among national IP offices and stakeholders, maintains searchable databases of national IP laws, and provides mechanisms for resolving IP disputes without litigation.

World Meteorological Organization (WMO) - Geneva

The WMO promotes international cooperation and coordination among the national meteorological and hydrological services that monitor the weather and climate conditions produced by the interaction of the Earth's atmosphere with the land and oceans. In addition to establishing technical standards to enable accurate observations, the WMO also facilitates capacity development, data exchange, and technology transfers.

World Bank - Washington, DC

The World Bank is an international financial organization which aims to reduce poverty by providing financing, policy advice, and technical assistance to developing countries. It consists of two core institutions. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) provides loans to middle-income and credit-worthy poorer nations, while the International Development Agency (IDA) offers loans and grants to the world's poorest countries. Three affiliated institutions (the International Finance Corporation, the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency, and the International Centre for the Settlement of Investment Disputes) focus on strengthening the private sector in developing countries. Together, these five institutions comprise the World Bank Group.

The United Nations is not meant to be a world government. It is a loose confederation where member states retain their Sovereignty. The United Nations is only an instrument available for their use. Although the U.N. embodies mankind's highest hopes, its strength and influence will be determined by the wishes of the World's people and Government. The success of the United Nations as instruments for the establishment of law and order throughout the world may come only through slow steps, but by such slow steps have been advanced from the brutality of primitive existence to the achievements of civilization. The record of the past world seems to justify the hope in the future.

24. Cold War: it's Origin, Causes and Phases

Origin of Cold War

There is no unanimity amongst scholars regarding the origin of the Cold War In 1941 when Hitler invaded Russia, Roosevelt the President of USA sent armaments to Russia. It is only because the relationship between Roosevelt and Stalin was very good. But after the defeat of Germany, when Stalin wanted to implement Communist ideology in Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria and Rumania, at that time England and America suspected Stalin. Winston Churchill, the Prime Minister of England in his 'Fulton Speech' on 5 March 1946 said that

Soviet Russia was covered by an Iron Curtain. It led Stalin to think deeply. As a result of which suspicion became wider between Soviet Russia and western countries and thus the Cold War took birth.

Causes of the Cold War

Various causes are responsible for the outbreak of the Cold War. At first, the difference between Soviet Russia and USA led to the Cold War. The United States of America could not tolerate the Communist ideology of Soviet Russia. On the other hand, Russia could not accept the dominance of United States of America upon the other European Countries.

Secondly, the Race of Armament between the two super powers served another cause for the Cold War. After the Second World War, Soviet Russia had increased its military strength which was a threat to the Western Countries. So America started to manufacture the Atom bomb, Hydrogen bomb and other deadly weapons. The other European Countries also participated in this race. So, the whole world was divided into two power blocs and paved the way for the Cold War.

Thirdly, the Ideological Difference was another cause for the Cold War. When Soviet Russia spread Communism, at that time America propagated Capitalism. This propaganda ultimately accelerated the Cold War.

Fourthly, Russian Declaration made another cause for the Cold War. Soviet Russia highlighted Communism in mass-media and encouraged the labour revolution. On the other hand, America helped the Capitalists against the Communism. So it helped to the growth of Cold War.

Fifthly, the Nuclear Programme of America was responsible for another cause for the Cold War. After the bombardment of America on Hiroshima and Nagasaki Soviet Russia got afraid for her existence. So, it also followed the same path to combat America. This led to the growth of Cold War.

Lastly, the Enforcement of Veto by Soviet Russia against the western countries made them to hate Russia. When the western countries put forth any view in the Security Council of the UNO, Soviet Russia immediately opposed it through veto. So western countries became annoyed in Soviet Russia which gave birth to the Cold War.

Phases of the Cold War

The Cold War did not occur in a day. It passed through several phases.

First Phase (1946-1949): In this phase America and Soviet Russia disbelieved each other. America always tried to control the Red Regime in Russia. Without any hesitation Soviet Russia established Communism by destroying democracy in the Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia and other Eastern European Countries. In order to reduce Russia's hegemony, America helped Greece and Turkey by following Truman Doctrine which came into force on 12 March 1947. According to Marshall Plan which was declared on 5 June, 1947 America gave financial assistance to Western European Countries. In this phase, non withdrawal of army from Iran by Soviet Russia, Berlin blockade etc. made the cold war more furious. After the formation of NATO in 1949, the Cold War took a halt.

Second Phase (1949-1953): In this phase a treaty was signed between Australia, New Zealand and America in September, 1951 which was known as ANZUS. America also signed a treaty with Japan on 8 September, 1951. At that time by taking armaments from Russia and army from China, North Korea declared war against South Korea. Then with the help of UNO, America sent military aid to South Korea. However, both North Korea and South Korea signed peace treaty in 1953 and ended the war. In order to reduce the impact of Soviet Communism, America spent a huge amount of dollar in propaganda against Communism. On the other hand, Soviet Russia tried to be equal with America by testing atom bomb.

Third Phase (1953-1957): Now United States of America formed SEATO in 1954 in order to reduce Soviet Russia's influence. In 1955 America formed MEDO in Middle East. Within a short span of time, America gave military assistance to 43 countries and formed 3300 military bases around Soviet Russia. At that time, the Vietnamese War started in 1955. To reduce the American Power, Russia signed WARSAW PACT in 1955. Russia also signed a defence pact with 12 Countries. Germany was divided into Federal Republic of Germany which was under the American control where as German Democratic Republic was under Soviet Russia. In 1957 Soviet Russia included Sputnik in her defence programme. In 1953 Stalin died and Khrushchev became the President of Russia. In 1956 an agreement was signed between America and Russia regarding the Suez Crisis. America agreed not to help her allies like England and France. In fact West Asia was saved from a great danger.

Fourth Phase (1957-1962): In 1959 the Russian President Khrushchev went on a historical tour to America. Both the countries were annoyed for U-2 accident and for Berlin Crisis. In 13 August 1961, Soviet Russia made a Berlin Wall of 25 Kilometres in order to check the immigration from eastern Berlin to Western Berlin. In 1962, Cuba's Missile Crisis contributed a lot to the cold war. This incident created an atmosphere of conversation between American President Kennedy and Russian President Khrushchev. America assured Russia that she would not attack Cuba and Russia also withdrew missile station from Cuba.

Fifth Phase (1962-1969) which began from 1962 also marked a mutual suspicion between USA and USSR. There was a worldwide concern demanding ban on nuclear weapons. In this period Hot Line was established between the White House and Kremlin. This compelled both the parties to refrain from nuclear war. In spite of that the Vietnam problem and the Problem in Germany kept Cold War between USA and USSR in fact.

Sixth Phase (1969-1978): This phase commencing from 1969 was marked by DETENTE between USA and USSR- the American President Nixon and Russian President Brezhnev played a vital role for putting an end to the Cold War. The SALT of 1972, the summit Conference on Security' of 1975 in Helsinki and Belgrade Conference of 1978 brought America and Russia closer. In 1971, American Foreign Secretary Henry Kissinger paid a secret visit to China to explore the possibilities of reapproachment with China. The American move to convert Diego Garcia into a military base was primarily designed to check the Soviet presence in the Indian Ocean. During the Bangladesh crisis of 1971 and the Egypt-Israel War of 1973 the two super powers extended support to the opposite sides.

Last Phase (1979-1987): In this phase certain changes were noticed in the Cold War. That is why historians call this phase as New Cold War. In 1979, the American President Carter and Russian President Brezhnev signed SALT II. But in 1979 the prospects of mitigating Cold War were marred by sudden development in Afghanistan. Vietnam (1975), Angola (1976), Ethiopia (1972) and Afghanistan (1979) issues brought success to Russia which was unbearable for America. American President Carter's Human Rights and Open Diplomacy were criticised by Russia. The SALT II was not ratified by the US Senate. In 1980 America boycotted the Olympic held at Moscow. In 1983, Russia withdrew from a talk on missile with America. In 1984 Russia boycotted the Olympic game held at Los-Angeles. The Star War of the American President Ronald Regan annoyed Russia. In this way the 'New Cold War' between America and Russia continued till 1987.

Result of the Cold War:

The Cold War had far-reaching implications in the international affairs. At first, it gave rise to a fear psychosis which resulted in a mad race for the manufacture of more sophisticated armaments. Various alliances like NATO, SEATO, WARSAW PACT, CENTO, ANZUS etc. were formed only to increase world tension.

Secondly, Cold War rendered the UNO ineffective because both super powers tried to oppose the actions proposed by the opponent. The Korean Crisis, Cuban Missile Crisis, Vietnam War etc. were the bright examples in this direction.

Thirdly, due to the Cold War, a Third World was created. A large number of nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America decided to keep away from the military alliances of the two super powers. They liked to remain neutral. So, Non-Alignments Movement became the direct outcome of the Cold War.

Fourthly, Cold War was designed against mankind. The unnecessary expenditure in the armament production created a barrier against the progress of the world and adversely affected a country and prevented improvement in the living standards of the people.

Fifthly, the principle 'Whole World as a Family' was shattered on the rock of frustration due to the Cold War. It divided the world into two groups which was not a healthy sign for mankind.

Sixthly, The Cold War created an atmosphere of disbelief among the countries. They questioned among themselves how unsafe were they under Russia or America.

Finally, The Cold War disturbed the World Peace. The alliances and counter-alliances created a disturbing atmosphere. It was a curse for the world. Though Russia and America, being super powers, came forward to solve the international crisis, yet they could not be able to establish a perpetual peace in the world.

Military Alliances

Alliances are a central and constant phenomenon in international politics throughout history. Whether we look at ancient periods, at the middle ages or at the centuries of Bismarck or Napoleon, we find states forming alliances. As George Liska has put it, "It is

impossible to speak of international relations without referring to alliances; the two often merge in all but name.”

Military alliances are related to collective security systems but can differ in nature. An early 1950s memorandum from the United States Department of State explained the difference by noting that historically, alliances "were designed to advance the respective nationalistic interests of the parties, and provided for joint military action if one of the parties in pursuit of such objectives became involved in war." A collective security arrangement "is directed against no one; it is directed solely against aggression. It seeks not to influence any shifting 'balance of power' but to strengthen the 'balance of principle."

In the Indo-Pacific region, the department has strengthened alliances and partnerships by deepening interoperability, expanding deterrent networks, and executing maritime security and awareness operations. Also in the Indo-Pacific, the U.S. conducted a record number of freedom-of-navigation operations in the South China Sea over the past year, more than any other year since 2015, to deter China's malign behaviour. For example, in July 2019, the USS Nimitz conducted exercises with the Indian navy in the Indian Ocean. That exercise, Esper said, demonstrates a shared commitment between the two nations to support a free and open Indo-Pacific region. Seven uniformed personnel, many with rifles, walk together on a gravel road.

In November 2019, the United States also participated in its first joint military exercise with India a partnership Esper called "one of the all-important defence relationships of the 21st century." In the Middle East, the United States has led a coalition of more than 80 partners to ensure the enduring defeat of the ISIS physical caliphate. And in September, the United States joined a group of nations to establish the International Maritime Security Construct, in which the U.S. partners with eight countries, Lithuania being the most recent.

The goal of the group is to maintain order and security in the Persian Gulf and the Gulf of Oman. When it comes to foreign military sales, the department has improved policy and practices by lowering costs and introducing competitive financing opportunities, which have increased U.S. competitiveness and improved interoperability among partners. Efforts involving arms sales to partner and allied nations not only increase interoperability between the U.S. military and the militaries of partner and allied nations, but also mean that the U.S. military and those nations will work together in ongoing training and technical assistance as part of the deal.

The alliances of the Cold War were publicly acknowledged peacetime coalitions. In these respects they differed from most previous alliances, such as the partly secret German-Soviet Nonaggression Pact (1939), which was concluded less than 10 days before Germany invaded Poland and started World War II. Modern alliances generally require a joint effort far more integrated than was necessary in earlier times. For example, in the coalitions of World War II, combined agencies for military and economic planning were a common and conspicuous feature. Even in less tightly knit alliances, such as NATO, great importance was attached to close and cooperative action, both military and political, particularly in maintaining the West's strategy of nuclear deterrence and in managing conflicts in regions on the European periphery, such as the Balkans.

In the aftermath of the Cold War and in the absence of clear European blocs at the beginning of the 21st century, scholars and policymakers debated whether alliances required an enemy to remain cohesive. For example, some policymakers argued that there was no justification for NATO's continued existence given the disappearance of the Soviet Union. In contrast, others claimed that the organization could and should evolve to play an increased role in conflict management on Europe's troubled periphery, particularly in the Balkans. The latter view eventually prevailed, as NATO undertook its first uses of military force in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1995 and against Serbia in 1999. Beginning in the same period, NATO membership was enlarged to include most former Soviet satellites or their successor states and the newly independent Baltic republics. Concurrently, various high-profile crises underscored the traditional approach to alliance making. For example, following the terrorist attacks in the United States on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, the administration of U.S. President George W. Bush forged a diverse coalition comprising a variety of old (e.g., the United Kingdom) and new (e.g., Uzbekistan) partners to combat international terrorism.

Marshall Plan

On April 3, 1948, President Truman signed the Economic Recovery Act of 1948. It became known as the Marshall Plan, named for Secretary of State George Marshall, who in 1947 proposed that the United States provide economic assistance to restore the economic infrastructure of post war Europe. When World War II ended in 1945, Europe lay in ruins: its cities were shattered; its economies were devastated; its people faced famine. In the two years after the war, the Soviet Union's control of Eastern Europe and the vulnerability of Western

European countries to Soviet expansionism heightened the sense of crisis. To meet this emergency, Secretary of State George Marshall proposed in a speech at Harvard University on June 5, 1947, that European nations create a plan for their economic reconstruction and that the United States provide economic assistance. On December 19, 1947, President Harry Truman sent Congress a message that followed Marshall's ideas to provide economic aid to Europe. Congress overwhelmingly passed the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, and on April 3, 1948, President Truman signed the act that became known as the Marshall Plan.

Over the next four years, Congress appropriated \$13.3 billion for European recovery. This aid provided much needed capital and materials that enabled Europeans to rebuild the continent's economy. For the United States, the Marshall Plan provided markets for American goods, created reliable trading partners, and supported the development of stable democratic governments in Western Europe. Congress's approval of the Marshall Plan signalled an extension of the bipartisanship of World War II into the post war years.

On the basis of a unified plan for western European economic reconstruction presented by a committee representing 16 countries, the U.S. Congress authorized the establishment of the European Recovery Program, which was signed into law by U.S. Pres. Harry S. Truman on April 3, 1948. Aid was originally offered to almost all the European countries, including those under military occupation by the Soviet Union. The Soviets early on withdrew from participation in the plan, however, and were soon followed by the other eastern European nations under their influence. This left the following countries to participate in the plan: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and western Germany.

The Marshall Plan was very successful. The western European countries involved experienced a rise in their gross national products of 15 to 25 percent during this period. The plan contributed greatly to the rapid renewal of the western European chemical, engineering, and steel industries. Truman extended the Marshall Plan to less-developed countries throughout the world under the Point Four Program, initiated in 1949.

NATO

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), military alliance established by the North Atlantic Treaty (also called the Washington Treaty) of April 4, 1949, which sought to

create a counterweight to Soviet armies stationed in central and eastern Europe after World War II. Its original members were Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Joining the original signatories were Greece and Turkey (1952); West Germany (1955; from 1990 as Germany); Spain (1982); the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland (1999); Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia (2004); Albania and Croatia (2009); and Montenegro (2017). France withdrew from the integrated military command of NATO in 1966 but remained a member of the organization; it resumed its position in NATO's military command in 2009.

NATO's mission is to protect the freedom of its members. Its targets include weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, and cyber-attacks. At its July 11, 2018, meeting, NATO approved new steps to contain Russia. These include two new military commands and expanded efforts against cyber warfare and counterterrorism. It also contains a new plan to deter Russian aggression against Poland and the Baltic States. Trump agreed to these measures. On July 8, 2016, NATO announced it would send up to 4,000 troops to the Baltic States and eastern Poland. It increased air and sea patrols to shore up its eastern front after Russia attacked Ukraine. NATO responded to U.S. requests for help in the War in Afghanistan. It took the lead from August 2003 to December 2014. At its peak, it deployed 130,000 troops. In 2015, it ended its combat role and began supporting Afghan troops.

NATO's protection does not extend to members' civil wars or internal coups. On July 15, 2016, the Turkish military announced it seized control of the government in a coup. But Turkish President Recep Erdogan announced early on July 16 that the coup had failed. As a NATO member, Turkey would receive its allies' support in the case of an attack. But in case of a coup, the country will not get allied help. If the stability is threatened, NATO will defend non-members. On August 28, 2014, NATO announced it had photos proving that Russia invaded Ukraine. Although Ukraine is not a member, it had worked with NATO over the years. Russia's invasion of Ukraine threatened nearby NATO members. They worried other former USSR satellite countries would be next.

As a result, NATO's September 2014 summit focused on Russia's aggression. President Putin vowed to create a "New Russia" out of Ukraine's eastern region. President Obama pledged to defend countries such as Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. NATO itself admits that "Peacekeeping has become at least as difficult as peacemaking." As a result,

NATO is strengthening alliances throughout the world. In the age of globalization, transatlantic peace has become a worldwide effort. It extends beyond military might alone.

NATO's 28 members are Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, and the United States. Each member designates an ambassador to NATO. They supply officials to serve on NATO committees and send the appropriate officials to discuss NATO business. These designees could include a country's president, prime minister, foreign affairs minister, or the department of defence head. On December 1, 2015, NATO announced its first expansion since 2009.

It offered membership to Montenegro. Russia responded by calling the move a strategic threat to its national security. It's worried by the number of Balkan countries along its border that have joined NATO. NATO participates in three alliances that expand its influence beyond its 28 member countries. The first is the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, which helps partners become NATO members. It includes 23 non-NATO countries that support NATO's purpose. It began in 1991. The Mediterranean Dialogue seeks to stabilize the Middle East. Its non-NATO members include Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco, and Tunisia. It began in 1994. The Istanbul Cooperation Initiative works for peace throughout the larger Middle East region. It includes four members of the Gulf Cooperation Council. They are Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates. It began in 2004.

NATO also cooperates with eight other countries in joint security issues. There are five Asian countries, which include Australia, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Mongolia, and New Zealand. There are two cooperative countries in the Middle East: Afghanistan and Pakistan.

NATO's primary purpose was to defend member nations from threats by communist countries. The United States also wanted to maintain a presence in Europe. It sought to prevent a resurgence of aggressive nationalism and foster political union. In this way, NATO made the formation of the European Union possible. U.S. military protection gave European nations the safety needed to rebuild after World War II's devastation. During the Cold War, NATO's mission expanded to prevent nuclear war.

After West Germany joined NATO, the communist countries formed the Warsaw Pact alliance. That included the USSR, Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany. In response, NATO adopted the "Massive Retaliation" policy. It promised to use nuclear weapons if the Pact attacked. NATO's deterrence policy allowed Europe to focus on economic development. It didn't have to build large conventional armies.

The Soviet Union continued to build its military presence. By the end of the Cold War, it was spending three times what the United States was with only one-third of the economic power. When the Berlin Wall fell in 1989, it was due to economic as well as ideological reasons. After the USSR dissolved in the late 1980s, NATO's relationship with Russia thawed. In 1997, they signed the NATO-Russia Founding Act to build bilateral cooperation. In 2002, they formed the NATO-Russia Council to partner on shared security issues. The collapse of the USSR led to unrest in its former satellite states. NATO got involved when Yugoslavia's civil war became genocide. NATO's initial support of a United Nations naval embargo led to the enforcement of a no-fly zone. Violations then led to a few airstrikes until September 1999. That's when NATO conducted a nine-day air campaign that ended the war. By December of that year, NATO deployed a peacekeeping force of 60,000 soldiers. That ended in 2004 when NATO transferred this function to the European Union. Protecting democratic freedom among its 28-member nations remains NATO'S core purpose. As a political and military alliance, the coalition's value to global security continues to be paramount.

Its longevity, since its inception in 1949, is attributed to its members' shared values championing democracy, freedom, and free-market economies. NATO has remained America's most important Alliance. The collective defence arrangements in NATO served to place the whole of Western Europe under the American "nuclear umbrella." In the 1950s, one of the first military doctrines of NATO emerged in the form of "massive retaliation," or the idea that if any member was attacked, the United States would respond with a large-scale nuclear attack. The threat of this form of response was meant to serve as a deterrent against Soviet aggression on the continent. Although formed in response to the exigencies of the developing Cold War, NATO has lasted beyond the end of that conflict, with membership even expanding to include some former Soviet states. It remains the largest peacetime military alliance in the world.

SEATO

Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), regional-defence organization from 1955 to 1977, created by the Southeast Asia Collective Defence Treaty, signed at Manila on September 8, 1954, by representatives of Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The treaty came into force on February 19, 1955. Pakistan withdrew in 1968, and France suspended financial support in 1975. The organization held its final exercise on February 20, 1976, and formally ended on June 30, 1977.

The formation of SEATO was a response to the demand that the Southeast Asian area be protected against communist expansionism, especially as manifested through military aggression in Korea and Indochina and through subversion backed by organized armed forces in Malaysia and the Philippines. Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos (the successor states of Indochina) were not considered for membership in SEATO for reasons that related to the Geneva agreements of 1954 on Vietnam. These states were, however, accorded military protection by a protocol. Other nations of South and Southeast Asia preferred to retain their foreign policies of nonalignment.

The treaty defined its purposes as defensive only and included provisions for self-help and mutual aid in preventing and countering subversive activities from without and cooperation in promoting economic and social progress. SEATO had no standing forces but relied on the mobile striking power of its member states, which engaged in combined military exercises.

CENTO

Central Treaty Organization (CENTO), a mutual defence and economic cooperation pact among Persia, Turkey, and Pakistan, with the participation of the United Kingdom and the United States as associate members. CENTO replaced the Baghdad Pact Organization, after Iraq withdrew from it in 1959. Central Treaty Organization (CENTO), formerly Middle East Treaty Organization, or Baghdad Pact Organization, mutual security organization dating from 1955 to 1979 and composed of Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and the United Kingdom. Until March 1959 the organization was known as the Middle East Treaty Organization, included Iraq, and had its headquarters in Baghdad.

CENTO had an elaborate organizational structure, including a council of ministers, a secretariat, and an economic committee, with subcommittees in the health, trade, and communications fields. The council of ministers, CENTO's supreme source of authority, met annually at the prime ministers' or foreign ministers' level, alternatively in Tehran, Islamabad, Ankara, London, and Washington. A council of deputies held fortnightly meetings at the Ankara headquarters at the ambassadorial level.

CENTO was provided with a powerful military committee as well. Although no military command structure or any combat troops were ever assigned to the organization, the military committee was its pivotal arm, conducting periodic joint military exercises. Formed at the urging of Britain and the United States, the Central Treaty Organization was intended to counter the threat of Soviet expansion into vital Middle East oil-producing regions. It was never very effective. Iraq withdrew from the alliance in 1959 after its anti-Soviet monarchy was overthrown. That same year the United States became an associate member, the name of the organization was changed to CENTO, and its headquarters was moved to Ankara. Following the fall of the shah in 1979, Iran withdrew, and CENTO was dissolved.

Warsaw Pact

The Warsaw Treaty Organization (also known as the Warsaw Pact) was a political and military alliance established on May 14, 1955 between the Soviet Union and several Eastern European countries. The Soviet Union formed this alliance as a counterbalance to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), a collective security alliance concluded between the United States, Canada and Western European nations in 1949.

The Warsaw Pact supplemented existing agreements. Following World War II, the Soviet Union had concluded bilateral treaties with each of the East European states except for East Germany, which was still part of the Soviet occupied-territory of Germany. When the Federal Republic of Germany entered NATO in early May 1955, the Soviets feared the consequences of a strengthened NATO and a rearmed West Germany and hoped that the Warsaw Treaty Organization could both contain West Germany and negotiate with NATO as an equal partner. Soviet leadership also noted that civil unrest was on the rise in Eastern European countries and determined that a unified, multilateral political and military alliance would tie Eastern European capitals more closely to Moscow.

The original signatories to the Warsaw Treaty Organization were the Soviet Union, Albania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, and the German Democratic Republic. Although the members of the Warsaw Pact pledged to defend each other if one or more of them came under attack, emphasized non-interference in the internal affairs of its members, and supposedly organized itself around collective decision-making, the Soviet Union ultimately controlled most of the Pact's decisions. The Soviet Union also used the Pact to contain popular dissent in its European satellites, for example in Hungary in 1956, in Czechoslovakia in 1968, and in Poland in 1981.

By the 1980s, the Warsaw Treaty Organization was beset by problems related to the economic slowdown in all Eastern European countries. By the late 1980s political changes in most of the member states made the Pact virtually ineffectual. In September 1990, East Germany left the Pact in preparation for reunification with West Germany. By October, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland had withdrawn from all Warsaw Pact military exercises. The Warsaw Pact officially disbanded in March and July of 1991 following the dissolution of the Soviet Union.

Effect of the Cold War

The effects of Cold war are as below:

(a) The world divided into two groups: Russia was leading Communism. America was leading Capitalism and Democracy. Competition of power became extreme between America and Russia.

(b) Growth in weapon's competition: The super power of Russia and America was based on weapons only. Both the countries were strong in different sections of forces. Army, navy and air force got powerful. The able administrative system implemented modern missiles, fighting airplanes, nuclear weapons, submarines. This was the effect of cold war.

(c) An inspiration to nuclear weapons competition: In the Second World War, America destroyed the cities of Japan, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, by dropping atomic bombs on them. Russia also proved its capacity by performing the nuclear test. The world was on the threshold of ruin.

(d) Discredit of UNO: UNO put forth an idea of one world. But the competition of power, nuclear weapons, and the partition of the world created many problems for UNO. The

Security Council helped to solve the problems, faced by UNO because of the Veto Power of big nations. "The entire world is one family". UNO didn't achieve it. It was a discredit for UNO.

(e) Human welfare was neglected: Fear and terror were created by cold war in the world. Lot of money was spent on the weapons. Development was neglected. 25% of income was spent on weapons and their research. Commodities were also neglected resulting in scarcity. Due to cold war, welfare of mankind was totally neglected.

(f) The growth of Non-Aligned Movement: Many of the countries unwillingly participated in the group of super powers because of the political and economical pressure. But India's Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Yugoslavia's President Marshal Tito and Egypt's President General Gamal Abdul Nasser dared not to mix in any group. These prime countries started Non-Aligned Movement.

Finally, the Russian President Mikhail Gorbachev and US President Ronald Reagan suggested that every country in the world should cut off the military power and end the cold war.

25. European Common Market

As the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the six Member States of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) had decided at their conference in Venice on 29 and 30 May 1956, the Intergovernmental Conference on the Common Market and Euratom, chaired by Belgium's Foreign Minister, Paul-Henri Spaak, included two groups responsible for studying the technical problems entailed in drafting the Treaties establishing, respectively, the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Atomic Energy Community (EAEC or Euratom). Constituted on 26 June 1956 in Brussels, the Common Market Group was chaired by Hans von der Groeben, a director in the German Ministry for Economics. Its work was to take until 23 March 1957, just two days before the signing in Rome of the EEC and Euratom Treaties.

Despite insistent pressure from Spaak, negotiations in the Common Market Group proved much more laborious than those in the Euratom Group. The French and German delegations found it very hard to compromise at all on issues including harmonisation of employment-related costs before the shift to phase two of the Common Market transition period; establishment of the common external tariff (CET); how to link the overseas countries

and territories (OCTs) to the EEC; competition rules; and introduction of the institutional system. German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and French Prime Minister Guy Mollet had to intervene on several occasions to bring about political compromises and prevent the negotiations from grinding to a halt. The French negotiating positions were certainly very restrictive. For example, Paris saw harmonisation of production conditions as a prerequisite for dismantling tariff barriers and opening up the Common Market. Similarly, the French delegation refused to contemplate moving on to stage two until the stage-one objectives had been fully met. Determined to keep the tightest possible rein on its monetary policy, France also set numerous conditions for complete elimination of restrictions on the movement of capital.

Drawing on the Spaak report, the Common Market Group produced detailed provisions for the free movement of persons and workers, freedom of establishment and the free movement of services and capital. However, discussions at Val Duchesse about the competition rules to apply in the Common Market were dominated by national interests and concerns for the competitiveness of national economies. It also proved impossible to provide in the Treaty for development of a common short-term economic policy.

26. The Rise of a two Superpower and its Effect on World Order

In the time since the United States emerged as an independent country, there have been four major attempts by would-be hegemon to use war to secure political supremacy in Europe. These attempts constitute some of the most important events in recent European history: the tumultuous career of Napoleon I, the last genuine French opportunity for continental dominance; the First and Second World Wars, in which Germany made its bid to reign supreme in Europe; and the Soviet challenge to the West. The great military adventures

of Napoleon, Wilhelm II, and Adolf Hitler all were near-successes, and two of the three adventurers Napoleon and Hitler even controlled, at some point in their careers, most of the vital strategic and industrial areas of the European continent.

However, all three men faced military pressure from offshore powers- Britain in all three periods of continental warfare, the United States in the latter two; without this pressure, it is probable that any of these three bids for hegemony would have been successful. And if France or Germany had been successful in consolidating a vast continental empire, a seismic shift in European politics would have resulted. Europe would have bowed to a 'New Rome', a multinational super state possessed of awesome military-political power. This European superpower would have been at a massive military, economic, and diplomatic advantage in its relations with other states and the balance of power system would have ceased to operate in Europe; instead, the continent would have been commanded by the New Rome. As a result of the Second World War, the political organisation of Europe was transformed, but instead of being controlled by one superpower, the continent was torn between two. The United States, while not interested in exercising political hegemony over Western Europe, was dedicated to assuring the region would not fall under the control of the Soviet Union.

Although contemporary observers (quite reasonably) believed that, given the ambitions of the Soviet leadership and the militant nature of Soviet ideology, war between the West and the Soviet Union was likely, the Soviet challenge to the West was the only one of the four hegemonic bids that was not resolved by a costly continental war. There was no great military surge westward by the Soviet Union (except, of course, in the closing days of the Second World War when the USSR conquered most of Eastern and Central Europe and created a constellation of satellite states). The prolonged Cold War was resolved in favour of the West in two senses: first, Europe eluded Soviet domination; second, it did so without fighting a war in which the West would have paid a terrible price even if it had emerged victorious. Despite its ambitions and capabilities, the Soviet Union was militarily cautious and ultimately unwilling to turn its awesome military apparatus against the West. The USSR lacked the political will to turn 'potential military energy' into 'kinetic military energy', and so it quietly marched into oblivion; the Soviet Empire fell apart but its huge military strength remained unused while its own government and society were allowed to fall apart. As Soviet control of the Warsaw Pact countries disintegrated and the fourth militaristic try for European hegemony ground to a halt, the then European Community saw the opportunity radically to change its structure and function by creating a 'deep' European Union that would have

considerable regulatory authority, control a single currency, maintain a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), and so forth. Many Europeans had long dreamed of such a political order; even before the creation of the (comparatively modest) European Coal and Steel Community, there had been a belief among a sizeable section of the European elite that individual and societal 'Europeanism' should be encouraged. Indeed, at least some of the proponents of the 1950 Schuman Plan were acting with commendably far-sighted strategic vision and planning for the eventual birth of a federal Europe.

With the collapse of Soviet power, the outside military pressure on the EU countries was removed, and the political environment was suitable for the first attempt at consensual European unification. However, this attempt to reshape the European Community to form an ever-closer European Union can be also considered to be, in a certain sense, the fifth bid for European hegemony. It is an attempt to create a super state that will be politically superior to the current nation-states of Europe and will be (by far) the greatest military and political force on the continent. But this ongoing bid substantially differs from the first four in motivation and means. The four previous bids were all essentially nationalistic and based on coercion. The fifth is supra-nationalist in concept and goals are pursued through legal, economic, and bureaucratic means: the creation of Western European political institutions and the use of the European Union structure thereby created was to forge the nation-states of Europe into a single super state.

This belief in the desirability of a united Europe has gained increasing acceptance as the Europeanizing institutions have come into being and grown progressively more powerful. A century ago, a citizen of any Western European country who proposed that a supranational entity should be empowered to decide what national laws were or were not acceptable; that supranational bodies should be allowed to regulate commerce between the European states; and that the national currency should be abandoned and monetary decision-making placed in the hands of a supranational body, would, at best, probably be thought to be a charming Utopian;" at worst he or she would be thought a traitor. But today, after much debate and half a century of work, it is possible to imagine that Europe is on the latter part of a journey toward unification. Western and Central Europe is a potentially awesome centre of power: a continental super state would rival the United States in terms of wealth and population. An EU state would possess all the economic, diplomatic, and military prerequisites for the creation of a political superpower.

Furthermore, the European Union would not suffer the handicap that bedevilled the great European conquerors of the nineteenth and twentieth century's: insufficient time to integrate their conquered areas into a coherent super state. The EU today contains, among other countries, Spain, Germany, Italy, France, the Benelux states, and Great Britain - the most significant European centres of military and economic power east of the Russian border are now integrated into the EU and the organization is poised to expand further eastward into Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and other strategically significant areas. But it is possible that the EU will ultimately fail to live up to the expectations of its founders; Europe may simply lack the will needed for strong, effective international action. Engagement-minded Europeans might have considerable difficulty dragging their more timid brothers and sisters into the sort of international street fighting - figurative and literal - in which superpowers must, of necessity engage if they are to maintain and improve their position in the world. Many citizens of countries like Denmark and the Netherlands enjoy the sense of national virtue that comes with the fact that their governments do not participate very much in the rougher side of international life. That moral luxury will not be available to Europeans who are citizens of a superpower- a superpower is, by its nature, active on the international scene in every sense. But given the greatly differing military political histories, sizes, and wealth of today's European states, it is difficult to say what sort of EU strategic culture will emerge and whether that culture will be amenable to the exercise of military power." Furthermore, the European Union of today is also not structurally organized so as to facilitate the exercise of international power; most importantly, the EU lacks a strong executive with the authority to act as a commander-in-chief. If a truly authoritative executive branch is not created (and the creation of such an office is fraught with political problems), it is difficult to see how it would be possible for the European Union effectively to conduct international relations. Some of the most powerful European political figures are already proposing significant changes in European structures that would address this problem, including the creation of a powerful secretary-general ship to guide to CFSP. In any event, these structural topics are unlikely to be decisive: if the European Union becomes so 'deep' that a totally integrated foreign policy is a realistic possibility, it is likely that the organization will evolve bureaucratic structures necessary efficiently to carry out the CFSP.

If Europe does create the political structures necessary to function effectively as a superpower, it would have a world-wide role, but would also undoubtedly have regions of special interest. North Africa is an obvious candidate, and the potential threat from radical

Islam is one of the main worries of Southern European policy-makers. Maintaining an uninterrupted flow of Middle Eastern oil is also clearly vital to Europe, and it is also notable that the ex-colonial powers within the EU have a long-standing interest in sub-Saharan Africa and the Far East. Also, the proposed EU expansion to the East would have a direct effect on foreign policy, and the matter of where and when the organisation expands would obviously be a key issue. Then there is the Russian Question - if Russia is the twenty-first 'sick man of Europe', burdened with staggering levels of crime, corruption, and political plotting, Europe can expect a plentiful basket of problems to emerge from the troubled Heartland. If, however, a new regime manages to rejuvenate Russian military power and political institutions, place the economy on a sound path, and restore the desire for Russian hegemony in Eurasia, Europe may face a much more serious problem - and it may have to face that problem without meaningful help from the Americans.

If Europe is to become a superpower, there will undoubtedly be a period of transition, as the super state adjusts to its new role. But, in general, there is quite understandable confidence that the 'New Europe' will act to enhance peace and security in the world. Certainly, a united Europe would, if it was so inclined, be capable of acting as a powerful ally to the United States. Because all European defence spending would come from one budget pool, united Europe could field a magnificent force: multiple carrier task forces, space assets, a multi-division expeditionary army and marine force, massive airlift and sealift capability, and all the other marks of superpower military strength would all be within budgetary reach for Europe. This could have the indirect effect of substantially decreasing the American financial commitment to defence. Since the Second World War, the US has provided a 'security surplus' that protected Europe. By building and maintaining its vast military strength, the United States has not only provided security for itself: the existence of the potent American military strength has also provided security for NATO allies at little cost to those allies. But if the European Union was inclined to have a military strength worthy of its economic capacity and diplomatic pretensions, the European Army would be a potent force in its own right. This has obvious appeal for American 'budget hawks'. If Europe were willing to act as a full partner to the United States in the maintenance of world order, protection of trade, and punishment of unacceptable aggression - 'burden sharing' in the most literal sense - American defence obligations would be much lighter, and the United States could therefore reduce its military budget and obligations. Europe would no longer be dependent on a security surplus provided by the United States and the Americans and Europeans could

redefine their security relationship however they wished. Most likely, the United States would withdraw some or all of its forces from Europe, as well as decreasing overall force levels. However, the very existence of a European superpower overturns the current European-American security bargain, and would certainly damage, if not sever, the Atlantic link. The emergence of a European superpower goes against the very core of the NATO bargain. If the European Union develops into a superpower then there would inevitably be, on the American side, an inevitable desire to draw inward and, on the European side, an unwillingness to accept the leadership of the United States.

The positive aspects of Europe's potential superpower status should not, however, obscure the fact that there are also significant potential disadvantages for the United States if Europe takes command of its security destiny. The United States has long treasured its position as the key player in European security; and its role as the provider of Europe's security surplus gave it by far the loudest voice in NATO chambers. Although the United States never enjoyed the virtually unlimited authority that the would-be European hegemony aspired to, the western hemisphere superpower was and is clearly the 'first among equals' in NATO; the United States is clearly the most important. The European nations have allowed themselves to be cajoled on matters ranging from the Suez Crisis to nuclear weapon deployments because they have ultimately preferred propitiating American leaders rather than risking US alienation from Europe. On certain matters, like the question of over-flight rights in the April 1986 American bombing of Libya, European governments have been willing to exert their independence even at the risk of ruffling the American eagle's feathers a bit - but they have been ultimately cautious and not pushed the tolerance level of the United States." A strategically independent European government would be free to pursue its own international goals, and the United States would have little leverage to prevent Europe from doing as it wished. Just as the United States refused to stay forever in the shadow of the Old World powers, the European Union would not forever consent to a status inferior to the United States. In today's one-superpower world, the United States is unquestionably supreme, but in a two-superpower world Europe would have its own compelling foreign policy priorities, and it is to be expected that European and American goals would sometimes clash. If European leaders came to believe that the security relationship with the US was a secondary consideration, or is altogether expendable, it is inevitable that European leaders would feel increasingly free to act in their own perceived interests, regardless of the preferences of American leaders. This could express itself in any number of ways, some partly symbolic,

such as the American loss of exclusive rights to the position and other command positions, and some more threatening to American power, such as possible conflicts over who would have dominant influence in North Africa, the Middle East, and other areas.

One potential irritant to European-American relations is trade. It would not be at all surprising if the European Union takes an increasingly belligerent and protectionist attitude towards trade: many of today's European leaders have aggressive instincts in trade matters and would like to use the authority of the European single market as a club to bludgeon trading partners. This aggressiveness may worsen as Europe unites, particularly if American, Japanese, or other leaders strike similarly bellicose postures. The temptation for European leaders would be to press for trade advantages both for personal political advantage and (probably illusory) economic benefits. It is possible that the World Trade Organization (WTO) and related structures will have become so deeply rooted as to prevent twenty-first century trade wars, but an alternative scenario is entirely possible: that the WTO will at some point be undermined and that the free-trade structure will collapse. And foreign trade and especially the perception of 'cheating' in trade arrangements, may be one of the surest ways to arouse violent passions among the peoples of the Western democracies in the twenty-first century: it is a topic in which citizens feel they have vested interest and trade issues easily lend themselves to the gross oversimplification of demagogues. Even more problematical for the United States, Europe may choose to pursue bilateral security relations with Russia, China, Japan, India, and other states and could even create separate alliance structures. If Europe and the United States become hostile in their mutual attitudes (for whatever reasons), it would not be unexpected that the former would seek to balance American world power through an alliance with another power dissatisfied with the pre-eminent American position in the world in general and the Pacific in particular. Even though it is not possible to say precisely which alliances may develop in the future, any situation in which Europe is antagonistic to the United States is ominous. The mere existence of a European military-political rival (or semi-rival) threatens the American position, not only in Europe and surrounding areas, but also in the Pacific Rim, a vital area that should be of ever-increasing strategic importance in the next century. There is a danger that one of two possibilities may eventually become reality. First, and most menacingly, a two-superpower world could develop in which the United States and Europe are antagonistic to a very high degree and a long period of tension or even cold war ensues.

However, this possibility seems to be remote: there is no great ideological gulf separating Europe and the United States and the history of the Cold War period has created a history of co-operation between the United States and the democratic European states. Second, and more likely, a freewheeling multipolar world could evolve in which the US, Europe, Japan, Russia, China, India, and other powers all vie for advantage, perhaps forming temporary blocs and alliances. This would be what one might call a 'Revenge of the Old World Order' scenario: the return of the traditional world of great power relations, and with it the possibility of great power war.

Although Europe and the United States may never actually fight each other, it is quite possible that both powers would back different parties in a war between, for instance, Russia and China. Whatever the faults of the present world order, at least there is little likelihood of a great power war in the near future. The United States uses its leading role to discourage violence between powers, and at present it is essentially impossible for any power to form a coalition that could defeat the United States in the field; however, the United States can assemble coalitions and use them against 'international outlaws'.

Thus, the Pax Americana is maintained. This world is, of course, still a depressingly imperfect place: the United States is reluctant to use its authority to stop thugs who are determined to work out their ethnic hatreds in strategically marginal areas; great power peace offers little comfort to the victims of the war in Bosnia, Rwanda, and elsewhere. But the Pax Americana is; the most authoritative and sturdy system for discouraging a great power war that one could reasonably hope to design at this point in history. Any significant change in this heretofore admirably successful method of ordering world affairs could be injurious or even catastrophic to world order and peace; the sage advice that 'if it ain't broke, don't fix it', has a certain resonance in international affairs. So long as this uni-polar system is maintained, there will be no war between the great powers, and that is no insignificant feat. Fundamentally altering Europe's role in the world and transforming the trans-Atlantic relationship would deeply alter the international environment and, although many of those changes may be desirable, it also offers some troubling prospects. However benign the intentions of those who promote a common European foreign policy, the rise of a European superpower may have an effect on world order quite the opposite of the one intended.